

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2.30 p.m., Monday, May 17, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the loge to my left, where we have some members of the House of Commons and also some former members of this Legislature: the Honourable Walter Dinsdale, Brandon-Souris; Craig Stewart from Marquette; Gordon Ritchie constituency of Dauphin; Jack Murta, Lisgar; Jack Epp, Provencher; Dean Whiteway, Selkirk; Cecil Smith, Churchill and the Honourable Walter Weir, former Premier.

We also have in the gallery 25 students Grade 5 standing of the St. Norbert School under the direction of Mr. Boss. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

And we have 13 students Grade 10 and 12 standing of the Swan Valley Regional Secondary School under the direction of Mr. Cherniski. This school is in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

And 55 students Grade 5 standing of the Montrose School under the direction of Mrs. Ketchen from the Constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Elsie Kernested, praying for the passing of an Act for the Relief of Elsie Kernested, as Administratrix of the Estate of Philip Lloyd Kernested.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports, Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington) introduced Bill 78, an Act for the Relief of Ernest Robert Anderson.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina) introduced Bill 77, an Act to Incorporate Carman Golf Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition)(Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether Mr. Marc Eliesen who was rehired from the British Columbia Government some weeks ago by the Manitoba Government is in fact still a resident of British Columbia and not resident in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I really couldn't say where he is resident, I believe he continues to be a Canadian citizen. He has been hired for a period, as I believe I indicated in the House, running to, I have forgotten, either June 1 or June 30, and then beyond that time I believe that there are other arrangements in place elsewhere in Canada.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate if the efforts of the Manitoba Government in retaining Mr. Eliesen have been primarily to fill an interim period where he is to be a party employee by the NDP in British Columbia.

MR. SCHREYER: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but it's a free country and whatever employment he wishes to take after the 1st of June or the 30th of June, is his business, not mine.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate to us the nature of the contribution that Mr. Eliesen is making to Manitoba while he's being paid for by Manitobans.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, yes. He is working on matters that emanate primarily through the Department of Finance and the Planning Secretariat. Part of it has to do with the gearing up for the fiscal negotiations that have to do with the new Fiscal Arrangements Act that has to be put in place in Canada before the end of 1976.

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate if his Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will be discussing the proposed Garrison Project with Governor Link as I believe he is today in North Dakota.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd be surprised if there wasn't some discussion relative to the proposed Garrison Diversion, in that my colleague is meeting with officials of the State of North Dakota with respect to their concerns about the Souris River Basin from both a diversion point of view and also, I suppose, largely as a result of their problem this spring with flooding. Therefore their concern would be with drainage and with matters generally pertaining to the Souris Basin.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I address a supplementary question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate to the House if he will be getting a report from his Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he returns from Minot.

MR. SCHREYER: Presumably so, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development in charge of lotteries. I wonder if the Minister or the government have been able to determine over the weekend if in fact the Government of Canada has the right to enter into the lottery business especially after Parliament . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Asking for a legal opinion. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if Mr. Gil Goodman from his department was enunciating government policy with respect to plea bargaining when he appeared before the Manitoba Bar Association meeting over the weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am certain that Mr. Goodman was there as a professional expressing opinions as a professional in a panel which dealt with a legal procedure known as plea bargaining.

MR. GRAHAM: Then, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General is telling us that he was not enunciating the policy of his department.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, he was enunciating views which were his own views but not necessarily those of the Attorney-General or the Government of the Province of Manitoba, but his views as an individual with, I believe, some 18 to 20 years of experience as a Crown prosecutor under the previous government in Manitoba as well as under this government.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, two items flowing from last week and an under-taking of last week and of the previous week.

The one is to table a sessional document, I suppose I would have to call it, in response to a question by the Honourable the House Leader of the Opposition. It is not a statement as such but rather a copy of the Hydro Task Force Report of 1973-74 along with two accompanying statements relating to two separate sections of the said report.

TABLING OF REPORTS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Perhaps I should apologize to you, Sir, for not having multiple copies but presumably that can be arranged under your auspices.

Also I would like to remind honourable gentlemen that having received - I believe they have received a letter of invitation from the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro with respect to Saturday, the 3rd of July - I would like to remind honourable members there is some importance in having some firm indication of intent in response to the invitation by on or about 10 days from now.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary question to the Attorney-General then. Can the Attorney-General confirm that Mr. Justice Hamilton was expressing the viewpoint of the Government of Manitoba with respect to plea bargaining?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Justice Hamilton again was expressing his opinion as a Judge, a Judge with some standing and experience in the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Manitoba, his opinion only, certainly not the opinion of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. GRAHAM: A final supplementary then. Can the Attorney-General then indicate to this Chamber: what is the official position of the Government of Manitoba with respect to plea bargaining?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, until such time as there is a clear need to divert from the standard procedure in connection with plea bargaining, we have continued to use plea bargaining where in the discretion of the counsel involved in any particular case it warrants usage, not before and not under any other circumstances. So that it's been left to the discretion of the attorneys that are involved in any particular case as to when to use plea bargaining.

MR. GRAHAM: A final supplementary. Does the Minister then concur that plea bargaining should be carried out in confidence behind closed doors or should it be in the open venue of the courts.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows very well that I'm presently in Estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General and this probably is an area that could be best raised there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Acting House Leader, whoever that may be, and ask him if he can give the House some indication of how many more bills are to be introduced and whether the introduction of those bills will be prior to or after the application of speed-up?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Well in response to the last question, Mr. Speaker, I can only indicate that speed-up will be as speed-up happens. As far as the number of bills are concerned, I believe somewhere in the neighborhood of 12 or 14.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Autopac concerning his announcement that Brandon would no longer be the operating headquarters for Autopac. Can the Minister indicate if this is a change in policy of the government in terms of its stay option program or its programs of decentralization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the setting up of the offices in Brandon, the statement that I made last week is no different than the statement I made approximately a year ago, that we will try and have what departments that are possible to run an efficient insurance system, and all departments that can be put into Brandon will be done so.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could then clarify as to where exactly the head office for Autopac will be located. Will it be in Brandon or will it be in the Brunswick Hotel?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether his government has authorized studies into the determination of the feasibility of a lithium mine at Bernic Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice. I have heard tell of that very subject matter but I'm not aware of it specifically enough to answer extemporaneously. I'll take it as notice.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder then if the First Minister can take as notice the question as to whether the government is participating in the studies or whether the studies are being undertaken by Tantalum Mines alone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, if I could restate the question to the Minister responsible for Autopac. Could the Minister indicate which will be the location of the executive offices for Autopac in terms of the primary locus of business. Will it be in the downtown core of Winnipeg or will it be in Brandon itself?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated before on numerous occasions, the executive officers of the corporations will be located in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether this will involve any transfer of personnel from the present operation in Brandon to the Winnipeg office and can he describe what in fact will be the designation for the Autopac services or offices in Brandon itself?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's no transfers at all envisaged in this. It's a general planning for the moving out of rented premises into a building of its own. And I might add that the Brandon facilities when the building is complete in Brandon envisage a growth in excess of 100 staff in the next number of years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture which I perhaps normally wouldn't but he indicated to the House last week that his department was actively involved in the organization of a "Farm Workers Association" in Portage la Prairie area. My question to the Honourable Minister is: Can he give the House any indication as to the state of the negotiations between the Farm Workers Association at Portage la Prairie and the employers? Will there be work for the association on the vegetable farms in and about Portage la Prairie this summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I do want to correct the Member for Lakeside. Last week I indicated that we were involved in connection with both the employers and the employees of that particular area. We continue to be so involved. As a matter of fact, tomorrow there's a meeting in my office of the two together.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, a further question. In the event of a breakdown of those negotiations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Hypothetical.

MR. ENNS: Hypothetical.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health. Can the Minister advise the reason for two expensive new Denticare clinics in Swan River as well as those established elsewhere throughout the Valley?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I don't know of any finalized action as far as that is concerned and this is a question that could have been debated in the Estimates. Now I don't really know if my honourable friend feels that we're going to review all the Estimates over again.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. BILTON: I thank the Minister for his comments. As he knows as well as I do the Estimates are now finished, but I wonder if the Minister in his wisdom will advise in due course the cost factor on a twelve-monthly basis.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt about that, we're accountable to the House and all the information will be given to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs. In his absence can I direct my question to the First Minister? I have a question for the First Minister in the absence of Minister for Corporate and Consumer Affairs. In view of the report or decision by the Public Utilities Board labeling the rural service in Manitoba as the worst in Canada, and using such statements and labels as atrocious, would the First Minister give consideration to reviewing the service in the rural parts of Manitoba and upgrading it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to read that passage along with other passages of the decision of the Public Utility Board. The passage is in my opinion highly subjective. The pace with which the Manitoba Telephone System proceeds to lessen the loading, if I may put it that way, of rural multi-party line service is one which personally I would hope they would proceed with apace. As one who comes from a rural part of Manitoba, the matter of overloading of rural multi-party line service is historic and almost legendary. It certainly has not been worse than it has been in the past.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if it is the worst in Canada, will the First Minister give some consideration to reviewing service or multi-service phones in the rural parts of Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Well I repeat, Sir, that is subjective, although I do not wish to quarrel with the subjectivity that is evidenced in the report, I just finished saying that certainly it would not displease the government if the Telephone System were able within the confines of its budget to proceed to give a higher priority to rural multi-party line upgrading of service. I think that really answers your question directly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LES OSIAND (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Has the Province of Manitoba been advised of any of the intended changes in the Port of Churchill operation that are disturbing the local community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Churchill is quite aware, having discussed this on many previous occasions, the matter of port operations at Churchill, operations of the National Harbours Board, all matters marine at Churchill, are under the purview of the Government of Canada. However, I could advise the Honourable Member for Churchill that in recent days there have been a series of meetings taking place in Churchill, and even today for that matter in Winnipeg, involving representatives of the Port of Churchill authority and representatives of the Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, and that as a consequence I believe that urgent representation will be made, if it isn't already made, by the three provinces with respect to the fact that some of the rumoured or proposed changes at Churchill are looked at as being very negative and adverse in terms of the optimum utilization of the Port of Churchill. Specifically, Sir, I refer to the fact that at the time of the Western Economic Opportunities Conference at Calgary that the Government of Canada did give formal and I believe written indication of intent that they would, for example, provide funding for the dredging of the turning basin at Churchill, that has not been done since 1973 it hasn't been done; also there was to be budgeting for the extension and improvements of the wharfage capacity. That, Sir, has not been done, at least to any significant extent, and as a consequence the three provinces I believe will be making very formal presentation to the Federal Department of Transport in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can the Minister report on whether there have been discussions held between trading officials from Japan and officials from the Manitoba Government concerning the sale of cultural and art objects by native people from Manitoba to Japanese outlets?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce and Transportation Services) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, there very well may have been, I'm not aware of any detail, but as the honourable member should know we have a Manitoba Trading Corporation which is actively involved in promoting the sale of Manitoba-made products, not only in Canada and United States but elsewhere in the world.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether the government has supported, or is considering supporting any marketing studies for cultural art objects produced by native communities and tribes and groups in Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Well I'm not sure whether I understand the question completely, whether we're supporting a study for the exportation or sale of such objects abroad. Well, again, if that is the question, again that is something that could be and it would be handled in a matter of course. But if the honourable member is vitally interested I could take the question as notice and report.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then. In addition to whatever assessments may be made by the training corporation is the Department of Industry and Commerce itself providing any assistance or support for undertaking marketing surveys or analysis for the sale and distribution of these kinds of objects or products?

MR. EVANS: Well, again, I'm not aware of any major study that's being undertaken at the present time. I might add, however, Mr. Speaker, that there is an ongoing process of promoting Manitoba-made products and sometimes this does involve market research and a similar promotional research, and these would be done as a matter of course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. It pertains to the Port of Churchill, and ask the First Minister if he could confirm whether or not Mr. Scharf has been relieved of his duties in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have information which I would be certainly prepared to relay to the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, although in doing so he will realize, Sir, that this is not a matter coming under the administrative or constitutional jurisdiction of Manitoba. The information, I provide it as one citizen to another, really is simply that this matter is I believe going to be the subject of some commitment of a hearing in about 10 days to two weeks in Ottawa.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, Order for Return.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that an order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following:

MR. SPEAKER: it's been asked to be dispensed . . . Is it agreed to?
(Agreed) So ordered.

MR. GRAHAM'S Motion:

1. The number of acres of land purchased by the Province of Manitoba through its various departments for the purpose of wildlife management for the years 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975.

2. The number of acres of land purchased in each rural municipality and local government district for wildlife management during each of the years 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975.

3. The number of acres of land purchased in each of the above mentioned years which have been allowed to return to a natural habitat.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader wish to proceed with Second Readings? Third Readings. Very well. Bill No. 7, The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

GOVERNMENT BILIS - THIRD READINGS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill 7, and Act to amend The Farm Machinery and Equipment Act for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works. Order please. The Honourable Minister doesn't wish to speak.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 10 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: I may suggest to honourable members there is no way you can dispense with a motion, otherwise it doesn't pass through the House. Bill No. 23, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

BILIS NO. 23 and 8 were read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 37. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I'll let this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 46 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, it's not our intention to delay passage of Bill 46, but I would like to say that we approach it with some mixed feelings on this side because of the feeling that we had that we would have an opportunity on the Progressive Conservative benches in the opposition to provide more input into Bill 46, than we subsequently found was available to us. We had expected some opportunity between sessions to present some ideas with respect to the legislation and to be involved in the framing of the final submissions to the House and as the Minister of Labour is aware we were somewhat dismayed by a turn of events that prevented us from doing that effectively, so we view 46 with some misgivings, Sir.

Nonetheless this particular piece of legislation is necessary in order that we can get on with the business proposed in the House last year in the original Statute, it was Bill 57 of last year's session, and as a consequence we're prepared to proceed at this stage and hopefully will have an opportunity at committee stage to present and have available to us some attention to some suggestions which we've tried to develop.

The bill before us is relatively innocuous in that it tidies up the dates necessary to make the Pension Benefits Act workable in total. You'll recall, Sir, that last year we only dealt with two parts of it in the House, Parts I and III, and Part II was left for further consideration. Some considerable time passed in excess of what the Minister himself had anticipated with respect to the development and formation of a Pensions Commission for the province and the appointment of a superintendent, resulting in, as we recognize, in some necessary changes in wording and dates of effectiveness. Those are essentially what are in front of us in Bill 46, so there's no reason for not proceeding at this stage.

BILL 46

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

I think one admirable feature that we should comment on as it moves through this Second Reading step is the amendment pertaining to the making available of information on the record with respect to pensions to persons or their agents who have a legitimate right of enquiry. Under 57 last year there was a fairly wide latitude available to persons seeking information, having to do with pensions and pensions' plans. The present bill in one of its sections, as the Minister pointed out, will tidy up that aspect and will tighten whatever unrealistic loopholes are available there, provided the proper regulation is formulated. The bill specifically points out, Sir, that that kind of information will be available to a person or his or her agent appointed in writing and subject to the regulations to be formulated. Presumably the regulations will be firm enough and realistic enough that what the Minister is attempting to do in the change before us is achieved.

I would hope therefore that at the committee stage we have an opportunity to obtain from the government an indication of just what will be involved in that regulation. At that time we'd also hope for the opportunity to talk to the superintendent of pensions and members of the Pensions Commission, as to what they have been able to develop and what they've been able to formulate in the few months past since they've been on the job. So, having been frustrated in our hopes for input earlier this year and late last year where this legislation is concerned, we are hopeful that that opportunity is not completely dead and that it will present itself to us at committee stage, and will be looking forward to that stage of the legislation, Sir, for that reason. At this point therefore, we can give second reading without further delay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 58 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 58. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm holding the debate of course now and closing the same. The reason I did so I wanted to double-check on one of the amendments contained within the bill to make sure as to its accuracy, and also the necessity of proposing a further amendment when we get into committee. I now find that it will be necessary to make an amendment and indicate to the committee now an amendment will be forthcoming.

Having said that there is no further requirement for the holding of the bill any longer in the House.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 62. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

BILL NO. 64 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Bill 64 has aroused some attention and some controversy thus far because of the change that it involves in its approach to merit increases for employees of the province. I would like to acknowledge at this point, Sir, that we recognize the possible difficulties, the incipient difficulties involved in the change proposed under one of the major amendments contained in this legislation.

We recognize that there is perhaps a danger, well not perhaps but there is the possibility of inequity for public servants of the Province of Manitoba where their merit increases are concerned as a result of the step that government proposes to take with regard to its application of the merit increase rule.

As the Minister has pointed out in his introduction to the bill a few days ago, the approach to the merit increase will not be as automatic as has always been the case

BILL 64

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) in the past when there is a promotion for a public servant involved that includes within it a full step increase in salary. So that, for example, if a public servant should be coming up to his or her anniversary date at a particular point in the calendar year when he or she would be eligible for that merit increase, and should that public servant be promoted and have his promotion entail a full step increase in salary a few weeks or months prior to that anniversary date, then the automatic increase that would ensue under normal circumstances on that anniversary date would not necessarily ensue in this case - what the government is saying in effect is that the performance of an employee in a new assignment requires some assessment before merit increases are automatically applied. The government is saying that only in the case where an increase in salary has been involved, as I understand it, so for that reason I think one has to be fairly careful and objective about the amendment that the government is proposing. For that reason I think it's unwise to rush to criticism.

There are aspects to this step that require study and attention and no doubt will be receiving comment from representatives of the public service of the province and perhaps other members of the community when we are in committee stage on the bill; and I think that it's a proposed amendment that requires a very conscientious attention so that nobody is short-changed, so that nobody is treated unfairly.

But on the surface, Sir, I must say that although we have misgivings about it because we recognize that it could redound unfairly to the public servant of this province, which is something all of us wish to avoid, on the surface it probably deserves to be moved through this state of legislation and brought before committee where that possible difficulty can be examined more thoroughly and where the persons who are most directly involved, the public servants, the civil servants themselves, can comment and can elaborate on their own concerns.

The question of merit increases is one that deserves the full respect of everybody in this Chamber and I'm sure that we're all agreed that there should be no tampering with that institution. At the same time all of us as Manitobans and all of us as Canadians recognize the merit of a good day's pay for a good day's work and the necessity for that kind of thing, particularly in this period of restraint when all of us are involved collectively and co-operatively in making sure that our economy is healthy. I know there would be no public servants in this province who would advocate that they should be treated separately or differently from anybody else required to make this contribution towards a stable economy. So that I'm sure we'll have an honest and a conscientious approach taken to it.

I'll be interested in hearing in detail what the Manitoba Government Employees Association and their leadership has to say and what that Association feels with respect to this proposed amendment because it's important that the morale of that service be maintained at as high a level as is practical and possible and it's important that the relationship between the province and its servants be maintained at the highest possible level. If there is something involved here that is going to diminish that morale and is going to diminish that relationship in any way then the government as well as the opposition is going to have to take a very careful look before taking any such step.

On the surface it appears that the Government Employees Association, the MGEA is deeply concerned about what is happening to their right of salary increases under the proposed amendment, and that should be concern for all of us, Sir, and I wish to assure you, that it is concern for us on this side. But lacking an indepth presentation on the subject at this point and in hopes that that kind of an indepth presentation will be made at committee stage, I must say in speaking for my colleagues that although we do it reluctantly and with misgivings we acknowledge that we can see the government's point of view in this proposed amendment, at least at this point. The objective is to ensure that persons get merit increases for merit, not just because there is some kind of statute or regulations into which we are locked by practice and procedure, and I can't argue with the principle that merit increases should be based on merit and when a person in any capacity moves into a new and higher position that it is reasonable to suggest that it would take some time to assess that performance before

BILL 64

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)further increases could be granted. If there were no step increase involved in the promotion, well then there would be a much stronger case to make for saying that this amendment should not pass, but since there is, as I understand it the step increase related to the promotion involved, then I must confess, Sir, that at this stage I am prepared to accept the proposal of the government for examination and for assessment by the representatives most concerned themselves at committee stage.

There is another amendment that I have perhaps more difficulty with Mr. Chairman, proposed to the Civil Service Act in this bill before us 64, and that's the one which says that a collective agreement between the government and a bargaining unit will take precedence over a regulation under the Act if those two rules or those two processes are found to be inadvertently in conflict with each other, where, as the Minister described it, a bargaining unit and the government inadvertently reach agreement on some item, or reach accord on some item that is subsequently found to be in conflict with a regulation under the Act, the collective agreement will take precedence over the regulation.

I have difficulty with that amendment on the surface, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that I am not clear in my own mind who it will be who interprets or determines inadvertence. How do these things happen inadvertently? Do they truly occur by accident or by inadvertence, or is it cynical to suggest that sometimes conflicts of this kind can develop by design? Whether we can be satisfied on that point by the Minister at committee stage will persuade me one way or the other as to whether this amendment is realistic. I think that I appreciate what the Minister is trying to do in the amendment; I think that certainly all things being equal collective agreements reached in good faith should be regarded as binding, notwithstanding what went before, but I'm uneasy about the reference to inadvertence because as I say it's not been demonstrated to me who will interpret the inadvertence, who will determine just precisely why and how and in what spirit that particular agreement was reached. And there may very well be, Sir, agreements that are reached between a bargaining unit and the government that are detrimental to aspects of the public service itself and to the intent of the Act itself, and that should not be given precedence over regulations with which they are in conflict. It doesn't take much imagination to conceive of situations where the regulations should certainly prevail, in fact that's what regulations are intended for, and I would think that any agreement in conflict with them would have to be scrutinized very carefully to determine which of the two agreements, which of the two procedures should prevail.

So I'm unhappy about what would be a clear-cut stipulation here that the collective agreement should prevail over the regulation, and I would hope that we can receive from the Minister a further elaboration on that point; either when he closes debate or at committee stage, that would prevent the kinds of conflicts of interest and the kinds of actions from happening that could subvert the whole intent of the Act, or could subvert the whole intent of many particular clauses and sections of the Act.

So I must give only nodding and reluctant passage to the bill at this stage, Sir, I don't wish to hold it up but I'm not satisfied either with respect to the amendment having to do with merit increases or with that which I've just referred having to do with conflicts between collective agreements and regulations, and we'll hope that those two aspects of the bill can be thoroughly straightened out and thoroughly strengthened to our satisfaction at the next stage. With those reservations, I would clear it through second reading, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make my points or views on Bill 64, an Act to Amend the Civil Service Act and, Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with one of the principles in the bill, that is, 57.1. I know we should not refer to the sections of the bill, but I have no reservations, but I certainly have reservations in respect to this bill in respect to the sliding anniversary dates for the merit rating.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's not fair to the employees and I think we're doing away with the merit rating or making the employee go without a merit rating for quite

BILL 64

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)some time because he was promoted --(Interjection)-- Well I know the Minister and the government bench is saying, well he's getting a promotion so that's an increment. So that's exactly what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's fair, even though the employee is getting a promotion, I know that, he is getting a promotion but what we've done, we've done away with the merit, with his merit increase. --(Interjection)--We have. Well he won't get it for almost - it may be a year and a half before he'll get one, I feel that --(Interjection)--Well I'm entitled to my views. I feel that the employee is entitled to a merit increase, and promotion has got nothing to do with a merit increase. What has promotion got to do with it? It's a completely different thing. That's my feeling, that's my opinion. So I do feel that the government, if there's a dilemma, perhaps maybe change, make the merit increase take effect, let it take effect the same time as the promotion, so maybe there's a way to solve it. But I still feel because the employee may go, even though he was promoted, he may go for 18 months or so without a merit increase. That's my feeling.

The point is correct. Our only difference is, the government is saying in this instance because he's already got a promotion he's not entitled to a merit increase, well I take a different point of view, I feel the promotion has got nothing to do because his position has changed, or he has been promoted, has got nothing to do with his merit increase, so he's still entitled to the merit increase, and that's the way I feel.

So I will not hold the bill back. I know that the government did get involved I believe in the Court in this situation some time ago, and if I'm not mistaken I think the courts ruled in favour of the employee, and perhaps this is the reason why we have a bill before us, an amendment, so that would be clear and there'd be no misunderstanding and so that the government would have it their way, and the government says they did not--(Interjection)--Well if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: Well that is still more interesting, Mr. Speaker, because if that's the case, if that's the case, then I say the government is wrong in this one principle under the bill. I'm not arguing with the other principle in regulations subject to collective agreements but I certainly have strong reservations and I think it's not fair to the employee. I will allow the bill to go to second reading of the committee so we can hear representations, and then I'll make my decision to support the bill or not, support the bill at that time, but at the present time the way I read the bill and the way I understand it, the government once there is a promotion to an employee the government says, okay you're getting a promotion, therefore you're not entitled to a merit increase, and I take a different view. I say that promotion has nothing to do with the merit increase, it's a completely different thing, and if that employee was entitled to a merit increase, then he/she should get it because he's justified to get it, so that's the way I see the legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, I will let the bill go into Law Amendments with strong reservations and maybe a vote against it if I have a better understanding in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Insurance Corporation.

MR. URUSKI: I'll be closing debate, Mr. Speaker, if there's no one else . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Minister does, I wonder if I might take a moment to indicate we have a group of students from the West . . . Heights School of Grade 11 and 12 standing. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill. On behalf of the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon. The Honourable Minister.

BILL 64 (Cont'd)

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first of all appreciate the comments made by the Member from Fort Garry and the Member for Assiniboia on this bill. In both their comments - the Member from Assiniboia indicated that he was opposed to it, to the section dealing with merit increase, and the Member for Fort Garry indicated that he thought there may be a possibility of an inequity.

Well first of all the assumption made by the Member for Assiniboia and comments that had been made in press, of course, with respect to merit increase, that are made on the basic assumption that there has been no monetary increase prior to the anniversary date, when in effect there has been a promotion and the employee has had an increase, so the employee in effect, meritoriously and with his qualifications in effect exhibited good merit and had really changed his job classification. He has been upgraded and he has gone into a new job classification, as a result, the intent is to set his anniversary date at the time he steps into his new job, that is really the intent of the change in increase.

Now the Member for Assiniboia indicated that with respect to the court case - I believe that the judge in question was in effect interpreting the Act as he saw it, although the intent of the government has never been to do anything any differently than is the case now. When an employee gets a promotion and an increase at a particular time during his service, he then changes his job classification and his anniversary date will change, and will change with the time of his promotion and his pay increase at that time, so that next year, a year from that time, in his new classification he will be entitled to a merit increase if his performance in that job deserves that increase.

Now the member for Fort Garry indicated that he wasn't sure of the advertently portion of the Act as who by advertence makes the error regarding the collective agreement. The intent here is, for example, where an issue arises in negotiations where the negotiating committee of the government agrees to bargain on a particular item and an agreement is reached between the bargaining unit and between the government and the MGEA or the bargaining unit who they're bargaining with, an agreement is reached on a particular item, but after the agreement is signed it is found that in regulation there may be a regulation which does not recognize the agreement that has been reached between the two parties, so for the length of that collective agreement the amendment is made so as not to cause any conflict between regulations and mutually agreed to bargaining, that the items that have been agreed to in the collective agreement shall supersede any regulations that may be in effect on that particular item which was bargained for.

Really I believe that there has been the odd case on some monetary issues of mileage and these kinds of things which are items of expense, which are from time to time bargained and there is a regulation on it, if an agreement is reached before the regulation is changed the agreement will supersede the regulation. That is really the intent of that.

There have been statements made about employees possibly not getting increases for almost two years. Well, Mr. Speaker, the statements really make or use the basic premise that I started with, that there really has not been an increase in the length of time and increases avoided, or an increase is not received due to merit, but the fact of the matter is when an employee receives a promotion he changes his job classification and does receive an increase in pay, and as a result the anniversary date from changing his job from one classification to another with the receipt of a higher category classification he receives an increase in pay, and of course the anniversary date of his promotion changes and a year hence from his promotion increase in pay, he will then again be eligible for a merit increase.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there will be representations made in committee and I thank the honourable members for their contributions and we'll look at the bill further in committee.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 65. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. Bill 54. No? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION PRESENTED and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair, for Tourism and the Honourable Member for St. Vital in the Chair for Attorney-General.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - TOURISM, RECREATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 110 on Page 56. (d) Tourism Development Services: (1) Salaries - the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions I'd like to raise to the Honourable Minister on Tourist Development Services. I wonder if he could give the Committee some idea what directives or incentives that he provides to the students who are coming out of Red River College in the administration of the tourist industry, the administration of hotels and the food industry, and if in fact there is some input or directives coming from the Minister's office to these young people.

Mr. Chairman, the problem seems to lie around, in the hotel industry in the city today you'll find that there are many many people working in the hotels today that are not citizens of this country, they're from all countries, especially Europe, who take great pride in being a maid looking after a hotel room or looking after the service needs of the public. The Canadian tourist and the tourists that are coming to this city and travelling around this province have, for the past three or four years, been very unhappy with some of the staff and the attitudes and the manner in which they're treated by these people that are serving them. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the reason or why the cause or the shortage or the tremendous turnover of these people seems to come about. Many young people that I have spoken to or people that might be interested in the industry say, well it's downgrading to be classed as a chambermaid or doing some of the work in the industry. Yet if you speak to these people that come, especially from Europe, they take great pride in looking after the needs of the public and they think it's an honour to serve all the needs of people that happen to be under their care. It's a matter of some concern, Mr. Chairman.

If we're going to fully develop the service that tourists demand today and the marketplace being so competitive, then I think maybe the directive should come from the Minister's office or the schooling system to let them understand once and for all that this is a very highly competitive industry. If we can't provide the staff to staff these service industries then we may as well forget that we are in the tourist business.

It's quite evident, Mr. Chairman, if you travel on weekends. Many of these hotels and restaurants on the weekends have a terrible time to get staff to come in on weekends. Why, I don't know. I'm sure the wages are good. The working conditions I'm sure are acceptable, but it's very difficult. As you travel around in the country you'll find that the problem there with the restaurant operator and the service station operator, on weekends they have to pay them double time or time and a half, which is overtime, and in many cases they don't make enough from the gas station operation to pay the help that they need. So basically they either close it up and take the day off work themselves or try and operate it themselves.

A classic example that comes to my mind on this is the Yellowhead Highway which goes right through our province. It's a new tourist route, brings new traffic in here and the service industries along that route are having lots of problems to find staff that will work, especially on weekends. I hope the Minister does get in touch with the Minister of Highways on that particular route and hopefully can suggest to him that if we're going to be in the business of attracting tourists from especially the northern parts of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia down that route, we've got to upgrade that highway in this province. If anybody wants to take an example of what the other provinces are doing, just drive on the Yellowhead route in Saskatchewan, perfect absolutely.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) Drive on it in Alberta, excellent route. You drive in Manitoba and you'll find that there are sections of the road that's good and then you'll run into a long stretch that's in terrible condition. I would suggest to the Minister that he should work much closer than he is with the Minister of Highways at the present time if we're going to be honestly and sincerely in the tourist business. That's one thing that will bring tourists to your province as quickly as anything is the route that you have for them to travel.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to bring to the Minister's attention is somehow - and maybe the Minister of Industry and Commerce can help in the development of tourists. As the Minister of Industry and Commerce knows and I know, we're getting a rotten deal from Air Canada and that's nothing new. I went through some figures the other day which showed that on the western provinces, the profit of Air Canada was some \$17 million profit for the trade. That run between Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal showed a loss of \$19 million. Now those statistics should be glaring enough for us somehow to get it across to the Government of Canada that we have a potential out here, we can pay our way. These routes, package routes or stop-off tours into Brandon and the other centres which are not there, Sir, at the present time. If the way we have to do it is to change the government in Ottawa well maybe that's the answer to it, and get some new policies that are better for the tourist industry in the west.

But the other one, Mr. Chairman - and I did notice that the Minister said that he's redirecting his tourist ads. But I'm wondering now that we're in the energy crisis and the problems of the economy today, where the intent and the drive of his department is for the next year? Where are you looking at the biggest potential of tourists that you are going to draw into this province? Are you expecting them from the south? Are you expecting them from the west? Or from the east? Are they coming in by air? Where is your intent or where is your policy and where are you directing most of your resources? Those few questions, Mr. Chairman, would be helpful.

One other thing that I'm wondering too that came to my attention is what travel agencies do you work in liaison with? Somebody suggested to me the other day, that the government works with some outside agencies, out of British Columbia, or I don't know where it is. I didn't know anything about it but they suggested that the local travel agencies in some cases maybe we could work closer with them, in closer liaison with them or give them more incentives than they have had at the present time to bring us more tourist dollars into our province. With those few questions, Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased to hear the Minister's reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to pose a question or two that I think would be added on to what my colleague from Roblin has stated. I know there are people who are writing in for maps. Now this is probably dealt with by the Department of Highways, but nevertheless it's in concert with the Department of Tourism and Recreation. I know one particular case where a constituent, not a constituent of mine but a constituent from Glenboro, had written about three weeks ago about getting maps because they're in the business. When people are travelling through the province they're requesting maps of the interesting points that they can visit while in the Province of Manitoba. They're interested in the campsites and what-have-you. I've had a number of complaints, Mr. Chairman, because they're not getting any response from the government in regards to requests for maps and things like that. I thought maybe I'd just pose that at the present time.

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

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, I would like to attempt to answer some of the questions posed of me. First of all the type of courses that the Honourable Member for Roblin was talking about, Mr. Chairman, is had in three different ways as far as I'm informed. One is a course that is being given at Red River Community College. It's a two-year course which relates to the hotel, motel, restaurant industry in general and the admission criteria is quite similar to other courses being provided at Red River. There are courses

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) being given equally through the Hotel Association. It's a short course. They made mention of that course while making a presentation to Law Amendments the other day.

We, as a department, do give a one and two-day course on a regional basis. We've had personnel for the last approximately four months giving courses that relate to the hospitality industry generally. This is reaching a lot of people and I believe is being quite helpful to the industry across the province. I believe more of this is sought by different sectors of the industry and all three that are now involved, that is Colleges and Universities, the Hotel Association and my department, will continue offering these types of courses.

In regards to package tours, Mr. Chairman, we do have package tours that are arranged through different airline companies and we make our arrangements directly with them usually - Frontier Airlines and so on. There's not that many to my knowledge, that are being had through Air Canada, or C.P. Air, but mainly carriers that are local in nature like Wardair, Frontier to Denver, Manitoba and different areas.

The tourist drive itself and the switch of priorities between what we've seen up until now and what I've indicated in my opening remarks would be a switch from 1976, will be redirected mainly to the closer provinces and states meaning that we'll concentrate our time, effort and dollars towards Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario, North and South Dakota. That's mainly because of the trend as we can read it, as we had it last year in the statistics, that because of the energy crisis we believe that more people from the nearby provinces will be visiting Manitoba. We'll be concentrating equally a lot of our efforts in promotion in Manitoba itself in regards to trying to get more Manitobans to explore their own province. I believe this will prove to be quite beneficial as it has in the past.

We happen to know, based on the statistics, that the nearby provinces like I indicated, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario, North and South Dakota included, are much more sure pertaining to a market for our province. I think the responsibility that we jointly have, that is the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and the City of Winnipeg, if they're affected and the different industries, is to try and keep these people here longer. Once we do have them in Greater Winnipeg we should attempt to have them explore the rest of our province. That's the type of lure material that we're now providing. Instead of having one large brochure for the province, we're having it on a regional basis. We've been criticized for splitting up that type of brochure but I think it will prove to be beneficial. First of all it costs less and secondly, it gives in a more precise way the breakdown on a regional basis.

The maps being provided by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs are the maps that are supplied to us by Highways. We do have shaded areas on the maps that indicate sites that can be seen in the province like provincial parks. They're shaded areas on the maps themselves. If there ever is a shortage of those shaded area highway maps, we do just supply the ordinary highway maps as they come to us. But I'm informed that we do prepare or alter the highway maps to reflect different sites - provincial parks, wayside parks and so on, on those highway maps.

I've had a request to have a special provincial map made specifically by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. That would cost quite a bit to have a special map produced for that purpose. It's been found to be quite feasible to adapt the highway provincial map and have our department make some minor amendments to it. The only thing that I'm not too happy with is that the highway map as supplied to us, leaves a portion of our province and leaves the extreme north of our province out of the highway map and that is something that we're hoping to rectify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just a few moments on Tourist Development. I don't too often have an opportunity to speak specifically on behalf of my own constituency. I'd like to on this occasion but further than that, speak generally for Tourist Development on the west side of the Interlake country and particularly the development along No. 6 Highway, which has become with the extending of this hardtop road now right into the nickel belt country of Manitoba, to Thompson, truly one of the great highways of Manitoba.

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. ENNS cont'd) I've always looked with some envy to the kind of work that some of the other organizations do with respect to other roadways that we have which tend to, as arteries, lead into tourist development. There is this Highway Association 83 of which my friend and colleague, the Member for Roblin, has a great deal of knowledge about or the promotion of the Yellowhead Route, No. 4 route from Edmonton right down through to the States.

But, Mr. Minister, we have, with the continuing work on No. 6 Highway, one of the true and major north-south arteries in this province that my judgment deserves a bit more attention. I know there is a fair bit of work being done. I'm appreciative of the work that the Parks Branch has done on the southern reaches of it with respect to the Communities of St. Ambroise and the development of the Lake Manitoba beaches in that particular area. But I would think just generally to make that highway a more attractive route for travellers, north-south travellers to travel, I would ask the department to attempt to arrive at some balance in terms of the attention that is being paid. We sometimes feel, Mr. Chairman, that anything east of the Interlake, upwards on Lake Winnipeg, the old Winnipeg Beach, that has all been redeveloped to a really first-rate facility, day facilities. Many people come and visit that. We have a big investment going on in the development of Hecla Park. That's all on the east side of the Interlake. But I remind the Honourable Minister that running straight through into that big nickel belt country, Thompson, and now with the further connections that this government is providing with further roads north that, Mr. Chairman, is undoubtedly the longest and most important economic highway that we have in this province. The combination of No. 6, 391 and from there on to the other mining communities, hopefully I'm sure if the Honourable Member from Churchill were here, to finally connect right up to Churchill in years to come. So that is our north-south artery that I think that we should become very proud about, just as proud as the members that belong to the Highway 83 Association are, that leads all the way down to the Texas State, that the people of the Yellowhead Road are who have been able to promote special signs, special designation of signs, "You're now travelling on the Yellowhead Route." I would like to see from my Minister of Tourism and Recreation a little bit more attention paid to Highway No. 6 and 391. In fact I'd like No. 6 and 391 to become synonymous, make it a highway that we all understand. I don't particularly care, make it 9, make it 1, make it 6. But it's a north-south corridor of tremendous importance.

I want to take a bet with the Honourable Minister. If he leaves, as I leave every day on the Perimeter Highway, he would likely miss it because as of the moment it has a designation standard size, you know, Junction No. 6, white sign that far and most of my friends when I tell them to come up and have a barbecue with me at the ranch or something like that, they tend to miss No. 6 highway. They tour around the perimeter a few times before they know where to cut off. Somewhere along the line it says "Gypsumville" but quite frankly with all due respect to Gypsumville, Gypsumville doesn't excite the imagination of the southern traveller, the tourist that we're trying to attract, as does the word "Thompson" for instance or simply "North" or the vision of the north or something like that.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not being super critical of the Minister at this particular time, I simply say, simply say, that the Minister, having developed the east side of the Interlake to a fair degree - that is, Mr. Chairman, he had the good sense to follow most of the plans laid down for him by the previous administration such as the development for Hecla Park which was negotiated and settled in the FRED agreement which I signed in 1967; having agreed to the redevelopment of the old Winnipeg Beach properties; having in fact done a tremendous job - and I make no bones about complimenting this government at having done a first-rate job on the redevelopment of the eastern portion of the Interlake, up along Lake Winnipeg.

I suggest within the limits that we have, and I'm the first one to acknowledge the west side doesn't offer quite the same facilities for tourist development that the east side does: the terrain, the geography is not quite the same but we can maximize what we have. The beginning is there in the southern portions of Lake Manitoba; the development of the Parkside Park and beach areas of St. Ambroise are there and are being

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. ENNS cont'd) utilized to a great extent every year. We require some transportation and highway construction to fully maximize that. Somehow or other 30 or 40 miles of dusty gravel road happen to be a pretty rough kind of an obstacle to overcome when you're luring people to a particular area.

But all along the east side of Lake Manitoba and in this case the west side of the Interlake, as we move up from St. Ambroise up through St. Laurent, up through Oak Point, through Lundar, and up into that great north country, that road deserves, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion some added acknowledgement that to date has been found wanting by the Department of Tourism and Recreation.

Mr. Chairman, I tread lightly on the Minister on this particular subject because I am now pleading as a parishioner for consideration for penitence and if somebody will pass me a handkerchief I will wipe the tear that's rolling on my cheek. But I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister with the moneys that he has available to him and if he recognizes the amount of money - and I'm speaking as an Interlaker - recognize the amount of money that has been spent in that region and just simply puts it on an east-west basis for a little while, he has to acknowledge that he has spent a great deal of money, or his government has spent a great deal of money. As I indicated before I spoke much of that money was pre-committed to development on the Lake Winnipeg portion or side of the Interlake. I take no quarrel with that. I may quarrel with him, Mr. Chairman, as I did the other day as to how specific contracts are let and whether or not the contracts are let in the best interests of the public, but that's another matter. I do not quarrel with the concept of what he is doing. All I'm asking him today, Mr. Chairman, is to challenge his department and his staff to look to the development of No. 6 Highway. You know Highway No. 6 moved ahead very quickly as a result of the actions taken by this government and the previous Minister of Highways, namely Mr. Borowski. But it's there, a major north-south artery that we have and it happens to pass through some pretty nice country, Mr. Minister.

We don't have our fair share of the conveniences along the road, whether it's the development of park sites or whether it's the seeking out those specific areas, beach areas along Lake Manitoba further north that could be developed, whether it is the encouragement of having people travel that route by some special designation; such as I mentioned the Yellowhead Route has, such as the 83 road has, some special designation that would indicate to visitors from the south, Canadians passing east-west through this country, would recognize more clearly as they're travelling through east-west on Trans Canada, they hit the perimeter and they move around that perimeter, while that little 8 by 10 sign that says No. 6, zing that's not just zing to nowhere, that happens to be zing to God's country. It happens to be zing to the north country. It happens to be a designation to our future. I would ask the Honourable Minister to take that into consideration from a tourist point of view, from a tourist development point of view, from a point of view of making it a little easier for me to get home every night, too, instead of passing by that sign.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have good news and I have bad news.

A MEMBER: Give us the good news first.

MR. TOUPIN: He wants the good news first. Well the good news is that we're not overlooking the potentials of Highway No. 6. In regards to the signs we'll have to make representation jointly to the Minister of Highways to see that a more appropriate sign designates the beautiful route to the north. We are exploring the potentials of PTH 6 and 391. The honourable member can come to my office and view the photographs that I have on my walls of the scenes that we see on PTH 391, PTH 6 and the potential as reflected to people that come to my office of the great country of the north.

I happen to believe that the north is the future of Canada, not only here but in other provinces in Canada. We're having development in Grand Rapids, Fairford River, Buffalo Lake, Limestone Lake. They're all popular points not only of interest to tourists from other parts of Canada but for Manitobans themselves. I'd say that the bulk of our people here in the south have not explored those areas in the Province of

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) Manitoba. I happen to have explored them because I've travelled a lot in the province. I've travelled well over a quarter of a million miles within Manitoba in a period of five years. So I've explored the province by vehicle. Unfortunately I've burned a lot of non-renewable resource but I had no choice. I couldn't fly, I couldn't walk. I had to go long distances. I had credit unions all over the province including Thompson.

There's no doubt that we could name different areas with more symbolic signs and importance in regards to northern routes. I believe that the suggestions made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside will certainly be taken under advisement. One could be Harry's Ranch, by all means, if they can't see No. 6, why not indicate "Harry's Ranch".

We do have, as the honourable member is aware and I've indicated in my opening remarks, a budget improvement this year for Lundar, Watchorn and Steep Rock. These are the last funds available to us under the FRED agreement so we will be proceeding with those hopefully in 1976-77 weather permitting.

The bad news is that the honourable member is aware that last year I indicated to him - not through the House but privately - that I was wanting to develop St. Laurent and I've hit a financial brick wall in that given area. I've not seen fit to recommend to my colleagues the pursuit of same because of financial problems. We're still holding indirectly some land in the given area but the balance of the land that we feel we need for a major development will not be made feasible in 1976-77. So that's the bad news. But in the whole I believe that the honourable member will see some major improvements in his area in the fiscal year we're now in.

MR. ENNS: . . . the Minister's comments, I would ask just a supplementary to the questions that I raised a little while ago. Is there a possibility or perhaps the department has this available that I'm not aware of. I know the various departments come forward with many different types of brochures as to what the department is involved in and what they're doing but I would ask the Minister to consider such a brochure with respect to the development of No. 6 and indicating indeed, Mr. Chairman, just what has been done. I'm sure the parks officials will be the first ones to know that whenever they're invited to be present either in my constituency in that eastern portion, it's a pretty common complaint that is levelled at the branch, that we're always all that tied up with the Lake Winnipeg side of the Interlake and that we haven't been all that involved on Lake Manitoba. I'm aware, because I've made it my business to be aware, that the department has been making some considerable strides forward in that area. But sometimes a piece of paper or a brochure is worth more than a thousand words. That feeling seems to persist. I think the Minister or his officials will agree with that general statement, there's a tendency, a feeling of neglect. The Minister indicated in his few remarks that there are sites presently under development and I'm aware of them and future sites that he's invited me into his office to view that are proposed for development. I would encourage the Minister, Mr. Chairman, through you, to at least be cognizant of this concern that's expressed all too often to him I'm sure when he's travelled that region, to me as a member or to his officials when they are asked to attend meetings in that area, to perhaps consider the kind of overall program that is being developed for the west side of the Interlake, up No. 6 Highway and just to put it in very plain terms, Mr. Chairman, to let it be known more clearly what in fact is being done to avoid unfair criticism and unfair judgment of the Parks Branch in this particular instance for things that they are doing and not getting sufficient credit for.

I just have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, and I think that was the feeling that most Manitobans through that particular region had, that No. 6 Highway is going to be and will be one of those major routes, the fastest and shortest way, despite my honourable friend here who is an 83 man, but he happens to live a long way west of me. When you draw that line from Minneapolis north or Winnipeg north it has to come through my country. I say that with all due respect to the Highway Association 83 or even the Yellowhead Route which tends to be an east-west route or east-northwest route more so than a north-south route. But No. 6 Highway and its development and the millions of dollars that have gone into the development of that highway deserves proper attention, deserves the passengers, the travellers along that route, the amenities of camping and of facilities that will

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. ENNS cont'd) encourage people to travel that route and to see the north in the shortest route and shortest way possible which is No. 6 Highway.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has a good suggestion pertaining to possibilities of printing brochures in the future. There's one thing that I believe that we'd want to avoid and that is mainly that if we talk of the Interlake as such, the Tourist Association for the Interlake does publish a brochure listing attractions and so on. There's certainly merit to publish on a regional basis happenings by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, certainly the Parks Branch, pertaining to what we now have, what is being contemplated, what is being constructed. I think there's two reasons why this is sound as a policy. One is that it informs the public locally that things are happening and it's a process of a consultation with the local citizens to involve them in the development of facilities so that they too can get involved in helping receive and accommodate tourists from different parts of Canada and the States.

So certainly we'll take the Honourable Member for Lakeside's suggestion under active consideration not only for the Interlake but for other regions in the province because if there's one thing that I can't allow myself to do, Mr. Chairman, is in wanting to promote and create or help create facilities on No. 6, No. 10, No. 83, I certainly don't want to forget No. 1, No. 44, No. 15, you know. I think that we have to attempt to relate to the people on a regional basis what we have, the thought that we have and what is being planned.

I'd like to indicate equally, Mr. Chairman, that in regards to tourists coming from abroad we're attempting to bring out the fact that Manitoba is a port of entry in Canada and this is being done. We're hoping to be able to translate that, especially to countries like England, France, Germany and so on, that once they land in Canada that Winnipeg is the heart of the continent and from here they can go to different parts of North America and stop on their way back and so on. So this is building a momentum that I believe is good for the tourist potential of the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're looking at and I suppose the Minister is looking at different possible tourist attractions, different techniques of developing and marketing tourism in the Province of Manitoba. It was drawn to my attention several months ago by a group of people a book put out by a local writer here. It's called "Gold Rock Gus," the story of a legendary prospector who pioneered the Whiteshell. It's a small brochure or booklet where he describes different things about this legendary hero, how he became the first pilot, how he met a moose, how he started the first pulp and paper mill, and it goes through. It's got a whole bunch of different excerpts. It even indicates why the sky in the Whiteshell area is so blue, because he was baking a blueberry pie one day and it exploded and went up into the stratosphere and now we've got a beautiful blue sky out over the Whiteshell.

I would ask the Minister if maybe some people in his department might have a look at this particular thing and develop this theme. It could be taken further and for instance do something like they did in Duluth with the Paul Bunyan and his Ox, that's a famous example. I know that when tourists are out with their kids and we've got a lot of people out with campers and this type of thing, nowadays, they're looking for different tourist attractions, places where they can take pictures. Maybe if the Minister's department would sit down and have a look at this - I don't know what the cost is, as far as building a big statue of Gold Rock Gus would be - maybe they could do it right at the port of entry, at the facility where we have our Tourist Information Centre setup now on the border of Manitoba and Ontario and have a general promotion of this type for that Whiteshell area. It's another type of attraction, where as I mentioned people would stop who are coming along, take a picture and they take it home and here's something that we had in Manitoba and here are the kids standing beside Gold Rock Gus. Maybe they'd pick up a little brochure on Gold Rock Gus and there's probably all kinds of things that could be sold as far as the tourist attraction is concerned.

It was brought to my attention and I'd appreciate - it's not that big a thing but it would maybe do a certain amount of tourist attracting in that particular area. Again,

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. BANMAN cont'd) when somebody comes from one of the northern states or something, here are the kids in front of that particular tourist attraction that we saw up in Manitoba. It might just have the effect of doing us a little bit of broadcasting and a little bit more publicity for the Whiteshell and area as a tourist attraction.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Member for La Verendrye for his suggestion. I would suggest to him further that possibly this is something that could be discussed more thoroughly with the Tourist Association of the area of the Eastern Region. We do have copies of the book in question, I thank the honourable member, and it certainly can be pursued. You know blueberry pie is another thing that can be pursued in the sense that it's real. The name of Gold Rock Gus is legendary in the sense that I'm not aware that the individual ever existed. It's always something to get the attention of people, whether it be a great big blueberry pie or the statue or the building of something that's quite visible like the bear that we have in different areas of the province. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the turtle in Boissevain and so on. I would suggest to the honourable member if he gets a chance to discuss this with the Tourist Association of his area. I could do the same when I meet with them. I often get a chance to sit down and discuss a priority with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I just have two more questions, Mr. Chairman, before we move on to the next item and maybe they come under marketing. The one would be, some questions were raised to me if the Minister could give us some idea of what the renovations cost to the Shopping Centre at Falcon Lake and the cost of the neon sign and the fountain.

The other question, Mr. Chairman, was the regional tourist and convention groups. It was brought to me as to how they can operate. Parkland would be a classic example, where Dr. Nesbitt worked, of the tremendous amount of people that end up in Wasagaming. I guess close to a million people patronize it. The problem that they seem to face is to get them to go from there north. Generally they'll go to Wasagaming and then they head back south again. I was just wondering if the department was putting any input into that. They come to Wasagaming just automatically. People know Clear Lake from all parts of the continent, I daresay. Then once they get there, of that million people, very very few of them ever infiltrate farther north. Maybe it's part of this regional group's responsibility. They don't know the answers and asked me if I'd raise it in the Estimates to see maybe the Minister has some suggestions.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, pertaining to the cost of renovation of facilities at Falcon Lake I would suggest that we can discuss this more thoroughly under the Capital Supply Bill because that's where we have the funds for that purpose.

In regards to Wasagaming and other areas, I do believe that it has to be a joint effort on those desirous of receiving tourists further north as an example in that case, and certainly the department has to supply the information to those visitors that are there, are wanting to spend some time in the facilities being offered at Wasagaming, to indicate to them what they can see if they go further out. In a lot of cases the information sought by tourists can be given at border crossings like Saskatchewan and Manitoba, Ontario and Manitoba, the States, North and South Dakota to Manitoba. I agree with the honourable member that there has to be more done pertaining to having tourists remain longer in the province and seeing more while they're here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 110(d)(1) - the Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I have one question in regards to the new Provincial Park which is being developed in the eastern part of the province. I just don't recall the name, but I believe it's Nopiming. I'd like to find out first of all what the meaning is of that word and secondly what type of development is going to take place. Is it all going to be under the Parks Branch or is there going to be provision for people who wish to apply to build a lodge in that area? Can it be privately owned or is it all going to be operated under the Department of Tourism and Recreation?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, we passed the Park Development section but I can inform the honourable member briefly that Nopiming means "into the wilderness."

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) It's an Indian word meaning "into the wilderness." The park itself will be mostly wilderness. There will be some development. It's all Crown land to my knowledge, I don't know of any private land within the approximately 435 square miles of park north of the Whiteshell. There will be some development. Some lakes will be kept completely wilderness because there's a caribou herd in the area that we would not like to disturb.

We will be supplying to the House details pertaining to the ongoing development of the park itself which is actually right next to the Whiteshell Provincial Park and hopefully eventually it will tie in, in a sense to the border crossing of the next Federal Park.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 110 - the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I understand that there has been some discussion and some explanation by the Minister on the subject of the Tourist Reception and Information Centre that was planned for the western boundary of the province where No. 1 Highway crosses into Saskatchewan. I don't want to be repetitious but I do think that this plan is a very important one and I regret very much that for reasons, I believe, of lack of support from Saskatchewan that the joint facility is not being proceeded with at the present time. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest to the Minister that this, in my view, is a most important kind of a development and can do a very great deal for the province in its development of tourist services by having a Reception Centre where travellers on the highway from the west proceeding east, are able to stop and to receive some courtesy treatment in respect to perhaps coffee and conversation on the kinds of things that they might see in Manitoba.

I've had experience with Tourist Reception Centres in some of the southern states of the United States and found them to be most impressive. I'm sure that Manitoba could improve its image greatly by proceeding as rapidly as possible with the construction of such a Reception and Information Centre and with the staffing of such a centre with people who are knowledgeable and able to converse in perhaps several languages with tourists and to guide them in the full knowledge and in the full appreciation of the kinds of tourist attractions which we do have in our province.

To me it's regrettable that this plan has not proceeded. The circumstances which prevent it from having being developed at this point, may be ones that are very difficult to overcome. Nevertheless I do feel that of all the plans that the department has presented, this seemed to me to be a key one and one that would provide great benefits in terms of visitors to our province and to the length of time that they would stay with us.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that I was very specific when I made reference to the lack of intent on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan to participate financially with us in regards to the construction of a Reception Centre at the border of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. It is still our intent to have a facility there for the tourist season. It'll take us possibly another two or three weeks to have the mobile facility close to the Saskatchewan border. It'll be located at the wayside park at Kirkella which is approximately one mile east of the border. We're still pursuing the eventual possibility of having a joint facility. I still believe that the facility that we have at the Ontario border has proven to be very beneficial to tourists that are responsible in a sense to the Governments of Ontario and Manitoba. It has been recognized as one of the best facilities at any border crossing and Saskatchewan-Manitoba is certainly intended to become a similar facility. We're still hoping for Saskatchewan to reconsider their decision not to proceed at this time. We're equally looking at the possibility of having a more adequate facility at the United States border. I believe there's more to be had there that we'll have to pursue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 110(d)(1)--pass; (d)(2) Other Expenditures--pass; (e) Tourist Marketing Services; Salaries--pass - the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Can the Minister give us the breakdown of this item and the next one, if he'd be kind enough, while he's on his feet.

MR. TOUPIN: The objective here, Mr. Chairman, is the provision for necessary public input to maximize the realization of Manitoba's economic potential from tourism

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) through tourism information, reception and marketing and tour development services. Included here are 28 staff man years permanent; two supervisors, four marketing officers, seven travel counsellors, two information writers, 13 support staff and 14.2 term assistants. There's a total increase here, Mr. Chairman, of 31,000 due generally to salary increase and annual increment. This includes general office costs for tourist marketing functions, advertising promotion \$917,000 - and that's for major publications, package tours, convention marketing as well as sport and travel shows. There's printing and stationery for computer time for tourist inquiry program, personal letter response and minor publication \$150,000. Travel for staff to support and travel shows, mail promotion 37.4; specialized equipment, services and supplies for audio-visual equipment 33.7; professional and other fees, provision for custom brokers' fees, shipping of exhibits to the United States, provision of 10,000 for professional fees for development of . . . plans for . . . Park, the total there of 18,000. There's an increase in that section of 116.9 due to price increase. There are grants here to be distributed as follows: Tourist and Convention Association 805,000; Special Attractions to ten Ethnic, Historical or Special Events, Festivals, based on the length of Festival, 35,000; Regional Recreational Offices 10.8; Grey Cup Float 2,000 and that's for a total of 152.8 thousand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, it's hard to take account of everything the Minister said but he mentioned Exhibits in the United States. I wonder if he could elaborate a little more on what he's referring to when he talks about Exhibits.

MR. TOUPIN: There are special shows that happen in different parts of the United States, mainly in North and South Dakota, like fishermen, boat shows and so on where they ask us to have booths and we display. We have a booth in the show itself to promote Manitoba. There's a lot of tourists that come to the province because of that. We tend to have more of these than, say, spend a lot on television promotion or radio. It seems to bring more tourists to our province than spending that much more on the media advertising itself. So we'll be going towards more different types of shows in the future. They do have a lot in Minneapolis and I've assisted at a couple myself while being in Minneapolis, and it tends to reach a lot of people interested in fishing, and so on, in the province.

MR. EINARSON: Well then, Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in the comments the Minister makes about fishing, and I'm aware that many Americans like to come into the northern lakes to fish. I am wondering if the department, do they provide guides, or is this on a private basis?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Chairman, we don't provide guides as such; lodges would provide guides, and that's something that's done directly through them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister raises a question of exhibits in the northern part of the States and in other areas where the Tourist Department feels as though they have an opportunity to attract tourists into this country, and I raise the question then of the kinds of co-operation that exists between the Minister's Department and the Department of Renewable Resources. Last year in particular was a year in which considerable amount of advertising had been done in order to attract tourists to come to this province, and a good many of them getting up into the lakes that were advertised as good fishing spots, found that they couldn't catch any fish. There is a concern - and I raised it during the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Renewable Resources, and I want to raise it with the Minister because it does affect him as well - there is a concern amongst many of the lodge operators that the absence of commercial fishing on many of the lakes makes it very difficult to catch the game fish because they are so well fed by the rough fish that would normally be extracted under commercial fishing, that the fish just do not bother to bite at the lures and tourists who are coming expecting to get limits and expecting to catch game fish, find that the trout will lie on the bottom of the lake and won't even bother to be attracted to a lure.

I think that the lodge operators have on numerous occasions petitioned the Department of Renewable Resources to do something about diminishing the rough fish supply in those lakes which provide the food for the game fish to make them just a little hungrier so that they will be more attracted to the lures that are thrown at them when

SUPPLY - TOURISM

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) the tourists arrive in this country. It would seem to me that to advertise for fishing in a lake where there is no fishing would be misleading advertising and would do more harm than good, because in the final analysis the best kind of advertising is the advertising by the tourist who has been successful catching his limit, or catching a game fish, or enjoying himself while he is fishing, and no amount of advertising is going to bring that tourist back or his friends back if he's had one particularly bad experience. I wonder just what kind of co-operation exists between the two departments to ensure that one is not advertising something that does not exist. It seems to me that the Minister should have some contacts and some discussions with his colleague to ensure that the kind of advertising that is being done is advertising that is in fact borne out by the results experienced by the fisherman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Committee rise.

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: There being a quorum the committee will come to order. I refer honourable members to Page 12 in their Estimate Books, the Department of the Attorney-General. Resolution 23 - Legal Aid (a) Salaries. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Dealing with our last item in the Estimates here, the Attorney-General's Estimates dealing with Legal Aid, first of all, I would like to just ask the Attorney-General, when we're dealing with the Human Rights Commission I notice we had the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission before us, when we deal with Hydro and Utilities we have the Chairman there; the Chairman of most committees usually appears. Can the Attorney-General tell us why the Chairman of the Legal Aid is not with us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Certainly there's no reason that Mr. Penner isn't present. If the honourable member had wished Mr. Penner to be present he certainly could have been asked and I'm sure would have been here. He was out of the city last week. But I would like to correct the honourable member insofar as Mr. Moats is not the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, he is the Executive Director, just as is Mr. Mel Meyers here. Mr. Mel Meyers who is the Chairman of the Human Rights Commission was not present during that Estimate review.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to make a major issue of it, but I just sometimes wonder when we are dealing with commissions and reports - there is an Annual Report here which we notice is signed by the Chairman - I just wondered if there was any particular reason why the Chairman of the Legal Services was not here.

MR. PAWLEY: No, just as Mr. Moats is here for the Human Rights Commission as Executive Director, we had Mr. Ron Meyers present as Executive Director of the Legal Aid.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal now with the report of the Legal Aid Services which, unfortunately, there is only one copy in our caucus anyway. This report now is over a year old, it's dealing with the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975. That is some 15 months ago, and it seems rather strange, Mr. Chairman, that a report that is 15 months old should not be circulated amongst the members of the Legislature. We only have one copy, I believe one copy was provided to each political party and it has certainly created considerable difficulty, maybe not in the Liberal caucus, they can look at it a lot easier than every member in our caucus can. But maybe in the next election we may even help that problem out, if we're only going to provide copies for political parties, we may be able to eliminate one additional copy there. But that's a different matter, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, we've noticed that the Chairman of the Legal Aid Services, Mr. Penner, has in his annual report made several references, and I want to read one of

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) them on dealing on Page 2. "Active consideration is now being given to establishing a family court duty council and conciliation system to supplement our highly successful program in the juvenile court. We anticipate very substantial cost savings from such a program." Then I'll go on to Page 6, says, "Paralegals free our staff lawyers from a variety of low level legal tasks and enable us to extend professional legal services at a considerable saving to the taxpayer." Well, Mr. Chairman, these are very significant and very praiseworthy statements to be made, but then when we go to the final page in the report and we find on Page 35 that the total General and Administrative expenses have more than doubled, from \$232,000 to 484,000 during the year that is under review and this, and I just wonder, maybe the chairman has a different viewpoint on what is considerable cost savings and savings to the taxpayers, but I can't see that a more than doubling of the expenses can be considered to be a very substantial cost savings. Perhaps we could get a few viewpoints here from the Minister on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: If the honourable member will refer to Schedule 2, again with the costs, he'll see that the first item is furniture, equipment and leasehold improvements, an increase from 11,000 to 92,000. That is because of the opening of two additional offices, two additional offices being in Brandon and The Pas. -- (Interjection) -- I see, there were two in Winnipeg that year, the two since this year have been reported, so the two additional offices are the two in the City of Winnipeg including the head office, the addition to the head office. And . . .

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, if he's speaking to us, I wish he'd speak a little louder in the mike because we really aren't hearing you at all.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm sorry. The first is under the item Furniture Equipment and Leasehold Improvements, an increase from 11,000 to 92,000 which is an increase due to the opening of two offices in the City of Winnipeg, one of which is the head office. Then under the section dealing with salaries, honorariums, and benefits, that's the additional staff man years that are involved insofar as the manning of those two offices are concerned. Most of that under salaries, honorariums and benefits increase is head office salaries. So it basically narrows down to two additional offices, one of which was a large office, being the head office.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really want to point out again that when we're finding over a hundred percent increase, all I want to point out is why would the chairman in his annual report on Page 2, say "we anticipate very substantial cost savings," that's on Page 3. On Page 4, he says "with consequent cost savings." On Page 6, he talks again of a "considerable saving to the taxpayer." He's got a very short report and he's constantly, or not constantly but on three different places in his report he talks about significant savings and yet we're finding that the costs here are escalating at an astronomical rate.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, they're two different things that we're dealing with. First, insofar as the additional cost savings from these two programs they would be self obvious. Duty council and the family juvenile court would be a savings as against having to field out that additional family court work to members of the private bar, so there could be no issue that the introduction of a duty council system in the family and juvenile court would be a cost savings, and in fact if such a program was not implemented then certainly the cost to legal aid would be much greater if we were handing out certificates to members of the private bar. The same insofar as paralegals are concerned, the introduction of paralegals involves taking information from clients, taking it down and doing foot work and other work which would be very very expensive if one involved the private bar in. So again there would be very significant savings insofar as the using of paralegals. These are two very separate items from that dealing with the increase in the administration. I should also point out to the honourable member that under administration, 92,000 is a non-recurring item because it is the new head office which was opened up that year. The salaries would include an additional SMY for head office because of an increase in certificates that were issued to the private bar plus two additional community law centres, additional staff and expenses. So that there has been an

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)increase in volume of legal work done through Legal Aid, and in fact the administration cost increase has been kept to a minimum by a number of steps because the chairman is very mindful of the need to minimize costs here, and he is making reference to two programs which the increase in costs have been minimized, and pointed out to me that the administration this year is only 18 percent of the total compared to Ontario where the administration costs are 27 percent, and I believe that was reflected upon favourably in the Osler Commission into Legal Aid in Ontario, that in comparison with Manitoba, Manitoba certainly did come through well in administration comparison.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, then I'll go to Page 4, and in the second paragraph there it says, "with the addition of some professional staff to our community law offices, the number of certificates handled could grow significantly with consequent cost savings." I believe that the tenor and the tone of the report of the Chairman is one of savings and yet the activities of the legal aid services is not one of savings at all, it is one of rapidly mushrooming cost. So all I'm trying to point out is that what the Chairman is saying is in fact the reverse of what is actually happening, that we've got a mushrooming legal aid service in this province and when he tried to talk about economies of scale maybe the school of economics that he went to is not the school of economics that I went to; that I found that when you get a rapidly increasing administration that the economies of scale are not there, that in fact I would suspect that if he gets his way and we do get the additional staff added that he has requested, that we will find the costs have increased rather than decreased.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, leaving aside who has taken what course in economics, and the best course in economics, I think it stands to reason that if the work volume, the workload increases in one year by 33 percent, which in fact is the case under review here, that there would have to be as a result an increase in administrative costs. What the chairman also is trying to point out here, that the additional staff man years for a legal aid office in fact does cut down the cost to legal aid, the work that is done insofar as legal aid community offices are concerned work out to less expense per case file than when that file is referred to a member of the private bar, there is a significant difference between the two costs, so that in fact by the addition of SMYs to the Legal Aid Clinic there is a savings to the province, if there was no increase in SMY to the Legal Aid Clinic the amount of money that was paid out to the private bar would increase much more sharply than any increase which one can witness here.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister talks about the costs when it is handled by the private fraternity, what basis, what figures has he got to substantiate that argument?

MR. PAWLEY: Just when we're digging up this information I would like to relate to a question raised by the Honourable Member for Wolseley the other day, because the honourable member was referring to a frivolous action being brought to bear for political reasons in which a legal aid clinic was involved in, and, Mr. Chairman, we have checked that and I believe the honourable member referred to the metropolitan case, dealing with contributions that were made for municipal campaign purposes, in which in that case the plaintiff was successful. So that certainly wasn't a frivolous action, because the plaintiff was successful, the Legal Aid lawyer on behalf of their client was successful in that case in which they did illustrate that on basis of the legislation that there ought not to have been any payment of contributions by the housing industry or land developers or anyone else to a candidate running for municipal office between the date of the issuance of the writ and the date of the election. So it was not frivolous because the judge ruled in favour of the client for legal aid. If I could just indicate to honourable members that the amount of certificates issued to the private bar last year was 5,100, which a total of 1,586,000 was paid out to the private bar, and that contrasts with certificates issued in the Legal Aid Clinic was 2,331, at a cost . . . we'll get that cost. It will be worked out.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister any information or any facts dealing with the costs of cases which have not been handled by Legal Aid at all but have

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) been handled entirely by the legal profession and clients who choose not to go under the legal aid system? I suspect . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Insofar as costs are concerned?

MR. GRAHAM: Insofar as costs are concerned.

MR. PAWLEY: Well the costs would be considerably higher than they would be here, because the legal aid tariff, in fact, if there is one issue of some controversy within the private bar is that the legal aid tariff restricts the level of fees paid to a level which is less than what they customarily receive outside of Legal Aid.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us specific items in that respect, because my information is that you can get legal service in many cases at considerably less cost to the client than is the case under Legal Aid.

MR. PAWLEY: That certainly is wrong, because the tariff would certainly indicate that of fees charged by the private bar under non-legal aid as compared to the tariff under legal aid. . . Here is a comparison in figures that has been worked out by staff. That an average of 230 is being paid out per certificate insofar as the private bar is concerned, in contrast to \$170 per average certificate with the public lawyers of the Legal Aid Clinic.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, a final question then, at this time. Can the Minister indicate how many members of the legal profession are on staff with Legal Aid Services in Manitoba?

MR. PAWLEY: Twenty-five.

MR. GRAHAM: You have 25 full-time members on your . . . How many . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Lawyers, we're talking about lawyers.

MR. GRAHAM: You have 25 lawyers, how many of those are involved in active cases and how many are tied up entirely behind the desk?

MR. PAWLEY: They're all involved in cases, Mr. Chairman, except Mr. Meyers and Mr. Larson, I guess . . . Mrs. Hone and Mr. Meyers. But they're not included in the 25.

MR. GRAHAM: They're not included?

MR. PAWLEY: No.

MR. GRAHAM: Could the Attorney-General tell me how many Crown prosecutors the Province of Manitoba has?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, 34 Crown Prosecutors.

MR. GRAHAM: So the Province of Manitoba has a total of 34 Crown Prosecutors and Legal Aid has 25 full-time staff lawyers, not including Mr. Meyers and . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mrs. Hone, and Mr. Larson is doing research, so . . .

MR. GRAHAM: So you have a total of 28?

MR. PAWLEY: Twenty-eight then including Mr. Larson . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Is Mr. Penner included in that?

MR. PAWLEY: No.

MR. GRAHAM: Does Mr. Penner draw any remuneration for serving as Chairman?

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, yes, he receives remuneration as Chairman of the Board.

MR. GRAHAM: So you have a total of 29 then?

MR. PAWLEY: No, he's not receiving remuneration as a staff man year, he receives remuneration as Chairman of the Legal Aid Services Board in the same way as chairman of any other board receives remuneration, but not as a staff employee. He's not doing Legal Aid case work.

MR. GRAHAM: He is a lawyer in his own right, is he not?

MR. PAWLEY: He is a professor of Criminal Law at the Manitoba Law School, so that's his principal occupation.

MR. GRAHAM: So you have 29 lawyers.

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Penner would not be a lawyer employed . . .

MR. GRAHAM: He's not associated with Legal Aid Services at all.

MR. PAWLEY: No, he is Chairman of the Board.

MR. GRAHAM: Oh, he is Chairman. So you have 29 then?

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with staff man years and Mr. Penner is a Chairman of the Legal Aid Services Board, just as we have a chairman for any board that has a function to perform for government, he receives remuneration as chairman of that board but not as a staff man year or as a lawyer doing legal work on behalf of Legal Aid Manitoba. I just might mention to the honourable member that besides Mr. Penner there are four other lawyers on the board representing the Law Society of Manitoba.

MR. GRAHAM: So then we have four plus Mr. Penner, plus three who are not practicing, who are associated with Legal Aid Services. Is that correct?

MR. PAWLEY: In what respect?

MR. GRAHAM: Well you have Mr. Meyers here - I'm trying to find out how many members of the legal profession are drawing remuneration under Legal Aid Services that are not handling any cases for Legal Aid.

MR. PAWLEY: That are not handling any cases for Legal Aid?

MR. GRAHAM: Well you have four members, you have a total of five on the Board and do they receive some stipend or another, or are they all serving . . .

MR. PAWLEY: They receive remuneration as board members, yes.

MR. GRAHAM: So you have five there, you have three more, Mr. Meyers, your research . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Meyers and Mrs. Hone are certainly, though they're not involved in actual case work, they're heavily involved in administrative work.

MR. GRAHAM: This is what I'm attempting to establish. So you have a total then of eight who are tied up purely in administration.

MR. PAWLEY: Well it's not fair, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that Mr. Penner and the other four members of the Board that are lawyers are tied up with Legal Aid, it is only a matter which is incidental to the principal work in each case. Mr. Penner, as I indicated is a Professor of Criminal Law at the Manitoba Law School . . .

MR. GRAHAM: That has already been stated, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, but I don't think the Member for Birtle-Russell heard, and the other four members are receiving per diems on a very very secondary role in relationship to their principal work as private lawyers.

MR. GRAHAM: This is quite correct, Mr. Chairman, I'm just trying to establish how many members of the legal profession there are that are involved in the Legal Aid Services who are not handling any cases on behalf of Legal Aid. Am I correct then in stating there are eight, or are there more?

MR. PAWLEY: The full-time staff that are lawyers working with Legal Aid in addition to the 25 are Mr. Meyers, Mr. Larson, Mrs. Hone. The members of the board that are lawyers are Richard Scott, George Lockwood, Lawrence Greenberg, Robert Meyer and Roland Penner, Jeff Oliphant. There is one other who is an area director, Mr. Daniel Williams who is also a lawyer.

MR. GRAHAM: So we have two additional ones? So we then have 10 that are tied up purely in administration?

MR. PAWLEY: No, no, they're not tied up in administration, Mr. Chairman. The Legal Aid Services Act which was passed back in 1970-71 required that there be lawyers appointed by the Law Society to sit on the Board. Most of those which I have referred to are lawyers appointed by the Law Society.

MR. GRAHAM: That is quite correct, Mr. Chairman. What I am attempting to establish is the number of members of the legal fraternity who are doing some work for the Legal Aid Services of Manitoba without practicing on behalf of the Legal Aid Services of Manitoba or the clients, that are drawing remuneration purely for administrative purposes.

MR. PAWLEY: But they're not in administration, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Well what is the Board, is that administrative or is it just a figurehead?

MR. PAWLEY: The Board sets the policy for Legal Aid Societies Limited, we certainly don't expect those members to involve themselves in administration.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. GRAHAM: Is that part and parcel of administration?

MR. PAWLEY: No, they set the policy, they expect the staff members to administer their policy.

MR. GRAHAM: Then it has nothing to do with administration, you might as well forget it, is that what the Minister is trying to say? I suspect that setting a policy is part and parcel of administration.

MR. PAWLEY: No, they're two separate roles, in fact, Mr. Chairman, the poorest Boards that function are those that try to take over the responsibility of administration from those that they chose to administer. The Boards establish policy and they expect the administrators to carry out their policy effectively in a sound administrative way.

MR. GRAHAM: Well what do you pay them for?

MR. PAWLEY: To establish policy.

MR. GRAHAM: So they are receiving money then for doing some work on behalf of the Legal Aid Services of Manitoba?

MR. PAWLEY: To establish policy, but they're not tied up as the honourable member indicated in administrative work.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as case work is concerned, it's non-productive work.

MR. PAWLEY: Well I don't know what the member suggests is case work, I have indicated to him those that are involved in administrative work, that are expected to administer Legal Aid Services Board, also those that are establishing policy, and most of those that I indicated are those that are required to sit as a result of being nominated by the Law Society of Manitoba as representatives from the Law Society on the Board itself to establish policy. It's an independent Board of Government.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, this goes back to the old story of Topsy, it just happened to grow, and this is what I suggest is happening in the Legal Aid Services. I think that we have created a monster here that is growing, I suspect that there is very little control on it. We have had the Chairman of that Board on three separate places during his short presentation in the annual report talk about consequent costs savings, substantial savings, savings to the taxpayer and yet we're finding the exact opposite is happening, that the costs are mushrooming, it is a constantly growing factor, the total Estimates here we find, for instance, for salaries this year alone has gone from \$778,000 to over a million dollars; our Other Expenditures have gone from \$1,471,000 to \$1,636,000. We are constantly adding more and more money every year to our Lexicare Program which I suggest will be a larger factor in the coming years than Denticare and Pharmacare combined; and unless there is some restraint and some control and some checks and balance built into this program, it is going to continue to grow at this rate. And I suggest to the Minister that the entire Legal Aid Program should be brought under review and carefully scrutinized, otherwise we're letting it run rampant, and where the costs are going to stop, I have no way of knowing.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, it just fails to strike me on the basis of the case presented by the honourable member as to how this has grown like Topsy. He has requested the number of lawyers that are on the Legal Aid Board, the number of those lawyers who are involved in Legal Aid in administrative function, we've given him the list, which includes here 10 lawyers altogether in the year under study. Growth like Topsy. If we go back to the year 1972 we'll find also there were 10 lawyers that were involved in these positions in 1972. So if it's growth like Topsy, it's growth from 10 to 10. Despite the fact, Mr. Chairman, there has been an increase in the caseload due to natural growth taking place which is from 12,000 to 47,000 cases during that same period, so that, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with a statute which back in 1971-72, and I suspect if we trace back the votes of the journals we will find that all members supported the mixed Board, made of lawyers appointed by the Law Society as well as lay members, and we would find that those members plus, I know that Mr. Williams, Mr. Meyers, Mr. Larson and I think Mrs. Hone all worked for Legal Aid back in 1971-72, not Mrs. Hone, it's probably from nine to ten in four years - nine to ten. So I would fail to understand how the honourable member could suggest on the basis of a

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) presentation based upon these factors has been growth like Topsy. There's been growth, very significant growth insofar as the load of Legal Aid is concerned, as I said from 12,000 right up to 47,000 in cases, in people, that Legal Aid has had to work for. There is no way that you're going to deal with 47,000 cases in one year rather than 12,000 and not require a great deal of additional administrative dollars in order to deal with that.

The program is relatively new, there is still a considerable degree of natural growth taking place which must be accepted unless less services are to be denied to some new client, which is exactly the situation, that we can certainly start cutting back on certain services presently provided if it can be shown where those services should be cut back. But to suggest that the Legal Aid caseload could quadruple in one year, and in fact we're only dealing with increase here of one lawyer in the non-practicing staff, either in policy or in administration, and suggest it's growth like Topsy, I fail to see it can be suggested that is the case.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the original principle of Legal Aid is not something that was new to this government, it was fact before. Legal Aid was a very modest factor, but we have found through active promotion, through advertising, through expanding the parameters that have been enunciated by the Board and approval I imagine by the Cabinet, that we have found Legal Aid is getting involved where it was originally intended to serve the person, the individual in society who was unable to meet some of the costs that legal advice required, from that very simple principle we found it growing to the point where today Legal Aid is now involved in Corporate Law as well. Now, I suggest in the field of Corporate Law that perhaps Legal Aid is expanding a little too far, but I'll ask the Attorney-General whether he feels that Legal Aid should be involved in Corporate Law and Acts of Incorporation, etc.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know just what the honourable member is referring to. The only areas where Legal Aid would be involved in incorporating would be in the incorporation of non-profit organizations such as Day Care Centres, but certainly not involved in incorporating profit-making economic organizations.

I should mention to the honourable member, when he refers to those good old days, that in the last year of the old program there were only 3,000 people assisted in Manitoba, and if he wishes a discussion as to the days prior to Legal Aid and the lack of application of the law to all within the community, the inequitable treatment, then we could discuss that, but in the good old days, there certainly wasn't anything like suitable legal aid in the Province of Manitoba for those without the means to obtain it.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, be that as it may, the whole principle that has evolved in the operation of Legal Aid Services, I think is one that bears very close scrutiny and I would like the Minister to give us the justification for the entry into the field of Corporate Law by the Legal Aid, whether it be for Day Care Centres or any other groups in society. I always felt that Legal Aid was a system that was primarily for the individual . . .

MR. ENNS: The individual in need.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . who could not afford and for the individual is perhaps in need. Now, when you start getting into the field of Corporate Law I think you're extending it perhaps a little too far.

MR. PAWLEY: I wish the honourable member would identify those areas he continues to refer to the field of Corporate Law as though Legal Aid is acting on behalf of Banks, Trust Companies, etc. They're involved in incorporating non-profit charitable organizations. Let me say to the honourable member that if Legal Aid was not doing some of this incorporating, I know what would happen, because most of these organizations are funded by government, and if a Legal Aid lawyer to a clinic was not doing this work then that work would have to be referred to a member of the private bar and the taxpayers as a whole would be paying that by reason of the fact there had to be additional grants to cover the legal expenses, and this is certainly one way that we've been able to minimize, I think, costs to the taxpayers in Manitoba.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have been involved in many corporate

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) non-profit organizations, and I would say this, that at any time we have always found the means to dig into our pockets to provide the legal services and quite frankly, Sir, I have to say that in many cases, those legal services were also provided at a very nominal fee or a non-existent fee as the contributions made by the member of the legal fraternity who is a member of that non-profit organization. So I feel that it is unnecessary that Legal Aid be involved in that type of operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolesley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): The other day I felt that I was running out of time and apologized to the Minister for using a shot gun approach, but I tried to cover the waterfront in a short period of time and I missed many points and have not received adequate answers to some of my concerns. I did want to respond to his charge that the role of Legal Aid in politically motivated cases are not frivolous, or what have you, because many activists who spend their entire life, regardless of their incomes, do search out and attempt to use the courts to get their messages across. In that particular case my name was unfairly dragged through the muds of the media despite the fact that the Free Press knew that I had not accepted the money, and I became extremely annoyed at the fact that I had nowhere to turn because I could not afford to hire a lawyer and had to sit there while these political activists were able to have the use of the Society, and I must congratulate the director because he was one that shared my concern, that Mr. Ternette and company should not be given Legal Aid and I was very dissatisfied the way things went. However, that's in response to the Minister saying that the case was not frivolous. The case was frivolous in the fact that many names were mentioned that were unjustly dragged through the newspapers, so on that situation . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if I could just ask the honourable member if he would acknowledge the case must not have been frivolous due to the fact that the judge did rule in favour of the plaintiffs in that case.

MR. WILSON: Possibly you may have your opinion there, but I was not referring to that case alone, I was referring to the case, and I don't like to mention names but you mentioned . . . I had mentioned that all the City Councillors received a great deal of pressure from activist groups pertaining to granting of the cost of living for welfare recipients and they were all subject to lobbying and letters from Legal Aid, or a letter, at least I only received one letter, which indicated that Legal Aid Manitoba, was supporting the cause of these particular groups. I have yet to see Legal Aid send out a pamphlet saying they support me. So this is what I was trying to draw the criteria, is that if they can't write a letter in support of what I'm doing, they should not write a letter supporting these political activist groups.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do have to ask the honourable member, because he's raised a very, I think a very serious accusation, and if true, certainly we should try to deal with it. Is he suggesting that Legal Aid has sent out a pamphlet supporting some political activist engaged in a political campaign?

MR. WILSON: No, I was mentioned that the particular letter that I referred to in my Friday address to you, Mr. Minister, was a case that I had received a letter from Mr. Larson indicating the support for the cost-of-living index to be given to welfare recipients over and above what they were getting. Needless to say, I shared Mr. Larson's concern and voted that way, but I thought it was slightly improper that this autonomous group which is identified with government should be getting involved in this, and this is what I sort of object to.

MR. PAWLEY: Did you bring this complaint of yours to the attention of the Legal Aid Board?

MR. WILSON: I can't recall, I'll have to check. I did want to deal with what I thought, if I could get down to the serious aspect of dealing with this item which I say, I urged some restraint because I felt that \$2.68 million was a rather substantial indication that growth was taking place at a spiralling rate, and the Minister himself referred to the increase in cases from 12,000 to 47,000. May I suggest that maybe a think tank should take place between the Crown Prosecutors on one side, which is 34, and 25 lawyers on the other side. It seems to me we've got a squash game going on between two different departments of government and they're all getting paid a very reasonable salary and I think

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. WILSON cont'd) that they should be offering some advice as to how we can cut down from the 47,000 cases, because why handle all the 47,000 cases in the first place. It seems to me, you could cut back in areas. May I give you a suggestion of one of the areas that I think you could cut back in, because one shouldn't offer a slight criticism if he doesn't have an alternative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm interrupting the proceedings in accordance with Rule 19(2) for Private Members' Hour and return to the Chair at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 22

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Private Members' Hour. The first item is Resolution 22. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, before presenting the resolution I would ask leave of the House to make a small amendment, and that is within the body of the Resolution before the word "declaration of principles of the conference", the word "draft" be introduced, so that it would read "draft declaration of the principles of the conference".

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member may proceed.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, moved by myself and seconded by the Member from Assiniboia that:

WHEREAS Canada is hosting Habitat United Nations Conference on Human Settlements in year 1976; and

WHEREAS there is need to endorse the principles and objectives of Habitat Conference, and where there is a need for Manitobans to be aware of their common concern with other people around the world on matters concerning such issues as urbanization, land use, housing, and the management of human settlements;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House recommend that a statement be sent to the Federal Government expressing the full support of the people of Manitoba for the Habitat Conference and a draft declaration of principles of the Conference; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government declare May 31, 1976 to be Habitat Day in Manitoba and the schools, media and other community organizations be asked to undertake special programs of information and discussion about the Habitat Conference, and the Provincial Government offer all assistance for such activities.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose in introducing this particular resolution was to at least provide one hour in the many thousands of hours we spent discussing the conference that will take place in Vancouver two weeks from today. . . I think that Manitobans, like most Canadians have been preoccupied in part with that other international event taking place to the east of us, which will cost, as we are told, close to a billion and a half dollars, and yet I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps of the two events, of the two international events taking place in Canada this summer, the far more important one is taking place to the west of us in Vancouver, that while one has some athletic merit and certainly a great deal of entertainment merit, the other one may in fact become a vehicle within which a number of the pressing issues that concern people from all walks of life and all continents have an opportunity to come together and not only discuss them but exchange the solutions that they have individually discovered in the hope that they can be shared by different people, and also that we will be able to debate some of the really fundamental and critical questions of values and principles that are still lacking in any discussion of matter of human settlements.

Let me just explain, Mr. Speaker, first that I do acknowledge, or I guess, confess if you like, a certain vested interest I have in the National Committee for Habitat for the past two years, which has been the organizing advisory body that's been set up, and we would like to say to the members that I began on that committee with my own real skepticism about the value of holding such conferences of this kind and only undertook to do because I felt that it would provide some opportunity in our own country to become a little bit more aware and conscious of settlement issues as they are experienced in Canada, but perhaps through the exposure, but certainly through the arguments and debates that I've heard since then, have become a convert to the value and use of the Habitat Conference. I suppose if I needed any convincing it certainly occurred about a month ago when Barbara Ward spoke in this city. Barbara Ward as we all know is one of the fine economists in this world, one of those who I suppose if she had followed the practice of most economists would now be making a very healthy living advising governments on how to make the economy go wrong, instead, Mr. Speaker, back at the Stockholm Conference when the world itself first became somewhat aware of its interdependency in the field of environment, Barbara Ward gave up her, what could have been I suppose a lucrative consulting role in the world and decided to dedicate herself to the

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . objectives and goals of achieving some form of international rules and regulations concerning environmental matters, and became one of the great spokesmen for Habitat and spent time crossing this country trying to interest Canadians in the fact.

I was interested, and when she came to Winnipeg she made some interesting comments about what I suppose was a reflection upon us as well as upon the reflection of the way in which we approach a thing like a Habitat Conference. And she pointed out one small fact, which I guess needed to be pointed out, and that is that the national corporation that provides for the so-called melding of communities and cultures in Canada called the CBC, was spending close to \$15 million to broadcast the Olympics and they were going to have a staff of 120, and we were hearing advertisements on the radio and television of how we can get six hours of teleprogramming every day, and so on, from the Olympics, that the only gesture the CBC was making towards informing Canadians about what was going on at Habitat was a half an hour a day on an FM radio network that would not reach anywhere near all Canadians in the same kind of visual way. And she said, what's wrong with you people, what's gone wrong with you, that somehow you would put running, jumping and weight-lifting above problems of where you're going to live and how you're going to get the means to do so. And I think that was a --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not knocking one to promote the other, I'm just saying though, that in a question of relative priorities that we have placed upon one and the other, I guess that's the case I'm trying to make, but in terms of the eventual history and development of our society that it may be that what happens in Vancouver may in the long run end up to be more important than what happens in Montreal, and yet the priority that we put in terms over the attention span and the dollars is far more directed towards Montreal than in Habitat.

Now what is it? I guess that is probably to discuss what is going to go on in Vancouver. Well in part I suppose is the coming together of some 140 governments, or delegations from governments, to discuss a number of critical issues dealing with the problems of housing and land use and transportation energy uses, all directed towards a focus that while we talk about the environment the one thing that is uniquely distinctive about human beings is that we live in man-made environments, that we are not part of a species that sort of go around using natural materials to feather our nests, we create them artificially and use our own technology. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we do things which are sometimes extraordinarily brilliant and eventful and other times extremely damaging and harmful. One of the recognitions that the Habitat Conference is designed to make is to recognize that you can no longer treat the problems of the man-made environment on a national basis or on a local neighbourhood or community basis, it must create internationally. To give one prime example that they point out, that close to a billion people in the world don't have clean water to drink: that they simply do not have the ability to get decent sort of potable water, and that is something that should concern all society, because it is out of that kind of experience that comes the communicable diseases that become world-wide in scope and nature: if we can't control the spread of diseases in places like Calcutta or Bogota, and so on, then we are not immune from those kinds of problems.

Nor are we immune really from the moral responsibilities of saying that we, I suppose, spend enough of our time exploiting large numbers of people around the world, it's about time they began to ask for something back. I think that that's what these conferences have been all about in Stockholm is a way of redressing some of the imbalances.

But in addition to that particular minuet that the diplomats and the politicians and the officials will go through, there is also another side to Habitat which may even be more exciting and certainly more stimulating and that is what they call . . . of the Habitat Forum, which is the coming together of a wide variety of people from different parts of the world, private citizens primarily, people representing non-government organizations all the way from the Girl Guides to the churches to the planners and architects, who will be presenting their own exhibits, holding their own discussions and debates, providing their own demonstrations of what they've done in their own country, what they have tried to do. Just to give you one example, Mr. Speaker, when I was in Vancouver

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) two weeks ago I visited the urban Forum site, and that was some of the people from some of the Latin American countries who were already there to begin putting their exhibits together. One of the interesting things that we discovered as we began exchanging some of our mutual interests is that we talked about housing and they were describing how in some Latin American countries they have recognized that the highly organized, centralized organizational approach, you know big housing corporations, putting large scale low income housing on the ground wasn't working very well, and what they had really adopted was a whole way of doing self-help housing and showing you that the people moving in from the rural areas who had a piece of land, some building materials, some training, so that they would create their own housing, and that these were becoming in many cases a wide-spread application of a housing policy which, Mr. Speaker, we've ignored. We've become almost too sophisticated and too fancy for our own good, and that as a result I think we're obviously going to be able to learn something from some of the Latin American and African countries who have realized that old adage about small being beautiful and redefining it to mean that small is useful, and that to get away from the massive interventions of government and using government as a facilitator, as a stimulator of housing production, enabling people to do and solve their own problems in their own way rather than doing it for them, is a lesson that I think could certainly be learned in our own country. So it is that kind of exchange of opinion and discussion that will go on at the Forum for a two-week period.

And so, Mr. Speaker, this is what will take place, and I'm told that there will be some 28,000 - 30,000 visitors there and they would be able to provide, . . . ideas and discussion, and hopefully out of it there'll come some commitments by all national governments to join in common efforts to solve the problems of housing and land use, and at the same time will also come I hope a mutual exchange of ideas so that we will all become certainly more enlightened in terms of solving our own problems. Now that is the purpose of it.

I think that the additional purpose, Mr. Speaker, would be to use the occasion of the Habitat Conference in Vancouver to examine our own communities and our own problems towards human settlement so that oftentimes, Mr. Speaker, the way that we discuss problems of land use and housing and sewage systems and design of cities is treated with a great deal more mythology than it is with realization and with the facts and data to support it. One reason for that is that Canada is relatively new as an urbanized country; we still have many of our institutions and customs and practices that are inherited from a time when we were a rural society or a small town society, which we are not any longer, we are now a country where 70 or 80 percent of the people live in larger communities and the large metropolitan agglomerations, such as Montreal and Vancouver and Toronto will dominate this country in a matter of years. I think of the estimated population of Canada some 40 percent will live in four or five major urban concentrations. Now that may or may not be a good thing but it is certainly something that we should come to grips with, and it should be that the occasion of a conference like this would provide a mirror on ourselves, allow us to look a little bit at our own problems and our own issues.

And then, Mr. Speaker, is something that I hope is the point of the resolution, would be to say that . . . this government the declaration of principles, the draft declaration that was sent out, and I should explain, Mr. Speaker, that I would have included the draft declaration in my resolution except that it amounts to about 15 pages, but I did send copies around to the other individual caucuses so they have copies of those draft declarations if they wanted to look at them, but the draft declaration simply sets out the basic objectives for Habitat and I think the support that our own government as it goes into that conference would be usefully expressed by the elected members of our House.

Now I wouldn't say that the Provincial Government of the Province of Manitoba like every other Provincial Government has been involved in the planning and preparation for Habitat on the governmental level and has been party to the committees and advisory groups that have been set up. So there's no question that the government per se has been involved in the planning and I believe the Attorney-General will be one of the delegates at

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) that conference I believe, and perhaps the Minister of Urban Affairs, I'm not sure. I know that the Attorney-General will be attending.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be important though to broaden that out to show that it is not simply a Government of Manitoba project but something that represents the full interest of the people of Manitoba as their elected representatives would speak for them, from all parties and from all walks of life and from different perspectives. I think that in this House as we have noticed in the past we disagree about some of the problems and certainly many of the solutions, but I don't think there should be any disagreement about the urgency of the issues themselves and the necessity to come to grips with them.

Further than that, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that through this resolution if the government would see to it that we could declare that the opening day of the conference May 31st would be Habitat Day, it would provide some stimulation in our schools and our community organizations to bring the discussion forward. There has been a non-governmental committee working in the Province of Manitoba, there's a small Secretariat, but as a member of the National Committee, Mr. Speaker, I would simply have to say that I think if you surveyed 95 percent of Manitobans and said what do you think about Habitat, they would think you're talking about that funny building that we built at Expo six years ago; they're simply not aware of the conference nor of its meaning or its implications, aside from the vested interests of the various groups that have been working on it.

I think that therefore as the focus comes down to May 31st it would be very useful to draw the attention of the private activity, of private organizations, schools, about the importance of this conference, and see if they could build up a small program in their own way. I know that the Provincial Secretariat here has lots of material and lots of literature and lots of exhibits that they would be glad to pass out. The question is, who's going to use them? And the fact that the conference will come and go and everyone will still wonder what's going on because, as I say, unless they happen to tune into the CBC FM Network at 6 in the morning they won't know whether the Habitat is happening or not. They have no idea how the journals or the newspapers will be treating it but I expect that if the past is any indication of how they'll be treated in the future there won't be all that much attention paid to it either.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point of the resolution is to use in part the leadership of the government, not to undertake any expenditures of what it's doing but simply to say, we declare days, you know, we declare Fruit Salad Days, and we declare days on behalf of animal growers and on the part of athletic events, it may be useful, because of the occasion of this international conference, to draw attention to our own community about the conference itself, its international implications, and certainly what it means in terms of our own community and our own self-initiatives.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot more that could obviously be said about the conference. There's a number of issues that it raises. There's a number of, I think, important debates that it will conjure up, and I would welcome other members to perhaps use this occasion of the resolution to comment upon some of them, because I don't think that we spend nearly enough time in this House discussing some of the fundamental issues dealing with the way that we're organizing our human settlements.

We argue amongst ourselves about the price of natural gas or oil but we very rarely talk about whether we are using far too much energy in our human settlements than we should be using it and should be working to ways of very rapidly coming back into a conserving type of society.

We argue about whether we should build more public housing or less public housing, but we don't talk about the way we build housing or the way that that housing in fact comes together to form communities which are oftentimes destructive for the people who live in them.

So that it may be, Mr. Speaker, that one of the points of this resolution would be to use it as an opportunity to raise some of those larger term issues which the Habitat Conference itself would hope to address.

So I would simply close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the purpose of the resolution

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) is to draw attention to the conference itself, to draw attention to what we in our own province might be doing to use the conference as a way of examining our own concerns, and to perhaps provide some further insight and examination of the many issues that are related to the way that man is going about building settlements for himself and the problem that, as Barbara Ward said, if we're not careful we're simply going to build us settlements that will engulf us and swamp us and suffocate us so that we may not have much future to think about at all.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is proposing his resolution as a means of drawing attention to the Habitat Conference, I'm afraid he may be disappointed by the results because judging by the interest that's displayed up in the press gallery and anticipating the usual treatment of Private Members' Resolutions by the media, I'm afraid that the amount of publicity that the average Manitoban will get out of this debate will be very very minimal.

If 95 percent of the Manitobans don't know about Habitat now I would think that probably 94 percent won't know after the debate, or perhaps more.

Now I agree with the honourable member in his contrast between this conference and the Olympics. I think that Habitat is more important than the Olympics in terms of the subject matter that's being discussed. What long-term effects it will have on the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada, we have yet to see? The honourable member will be attending I understand as a Member of the National Committee. Well, I'm not quite so fortunate. I would like to attend the conference, too, but I assume I'll probably have to pay my own way. If the House is not in session when the conference is on I would certainly like to go there. --(Interjection)-- No, the Province of Manitoba has only two delegates to the conference, to the National Delegation. One is the Attorney-General and the other is a member of the Planning Secretariat and MLAs are not having their way paid. That is at least not the government MLAs.

The honourable member did point out something about the nature of the conference. There are actually two conferences going on. The first is the Formal United Nations Conference, which is limited only to accredited official delegations of UN member countries, and of course Canada will have a delegation there. There will be 70 people in the Canadian delegation, including 50 from the National Delegation, or 50 chosen by the National Government, and two by each province.

The second conference, of course, is the Habitat Forum which is an international gathering of non-governmental organizations and will include representatives of local government. There will be no representatives of the Provincial Government at that particular conference.

The honourable member pointed out some of the topics that will be discussed and there are topics of immense importance and of great interest being discussed.

The resolution that the honourable member proposes implies certain things and one gets the impression, from reading the resolution at least, that the Government of Manitoba has not already expressed support for the conference. --(Interjection)-- Well, in your remarks, yes, but the resolution itself seems to imply that we haven't already expressed support, but he did clarify that when he talked about that.

I would question whether designating a day as Habitat Day, will achieve anything. I don't like that particular kind of method of advertising. I think it's an example of American boosterism that the honourable members of the Tory party may enjoy because --(Interjection)-- No. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is wrong. There are a good many things I admire about the United States. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JOHANNSON: . . . but there are a good many things I don't, and I feel quite free to express my dislikes. I dislike some things that the honourable members like. They're good carbon copies, as I have said, of the midwest Republicans. That kind of mentality turns me off, but it turns the honourable members on, the honourable members opposite, so we have our differences.

I think that the designation of days for various things, like Apple Festival Day and

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) this sort of thing is silly, and I don't really think it achieves very much. --(Interjection)-- I think that's silly, too.

MR. SPEAKER: . Order please. Order please.

MR. JOHANNSSON: No, the honourable member is wrong. The honourable member is wrong. The one thing I like about May Day is the medieval --(Interjection)-- it is not what he is talking about, but I like the medieval idea, it is a celebration of the coming of spring. That I do like. But that's not celebrating some particular local community concern, it's kind of a universal celebration.

The resolution also implies that schools and community organizations haven't been asked by the Government of Manitoba already to become involved in the Habitat Conference. That is not really true. Manitoba and the Government of Manitoba have been involved from a pretty early stage in the development of Canada's participation in this conference, and Manitoba I think I can say has given full support to the conference.

We have participated in the National Delegation. Our delegates have participated in the drafting of the Canadian position on the declaration of principles. Of course, the final Canadian position has not been seen by delegates yet. The final Canadian position will not be available to delegates until just before the conference, so it's a bit premature to start endorsing a position which our delegates have not yet seen.

We have said that we endorse the general intention of the Declaration of Principles that has been put forward, but the declaration of the Canadian position is, of course, a responsibility of the Canadian delegation rather than the Legislature of Manitoba.

I'd like to review some of the things that the province has already done in connection with this conference. We have had specialists from the areas of urban settlements' policy and planning co-ordinating Manitoba's efforts. Manitoba has organized and hosted a number of meetings for a variety of groups within the province and these meetings have been held in Brandon, Dauphin, Morris, Selkirk, Thompson and Winnipeg. The objective of these meetings was to develop community interest in Manitoba's participation and to develop interest among non-government organizations.

As I said, Manitoba has been attempting to bring about interest in the conference, and even though this may not be much the news letters have been sent out; at least four have been sent out this year to a variety of about 2,000 schools and community organizations. From reading through the news letters there has been an attempt I see to interest schools, teachers and students in the conference and what is going on at the conference, and there has been an attempt to get classes in the schools working on projects, working on themes, that will be dealt with at Habitat.

So that kind of activity makes much more sense to me than designating one day as Habitat Day. If you can get classes, for example, in Canadian studies or classes on civics working on these kinds of topics on a long-term basis, the children, the students in those classes will benefit a great deal more than any kind of activity that would occur on one day of the year. So if there have been projects that have developed as a result of this, perhaps there's been some meaningful participation by students.

Manitoba as I say, has helped in drafting the preliminary position on the Declaration of Principles and one of the most important things is that Manitoba has contributed papers and a variety of documentary materials for three thematic areas in the National Exhibition, and Manitoba's particular contributions are the stay option, Unicity, and Leaf Rapids. Mind you, members opposite, in the Conservative Party at least, may not consider Unicity any great contribution to the development of human settlements. However, this is one of three Manitoba contributions to the National Exhibition.

Manitoba will also be participating with the Government of Canada in bringing to Manitoba the National Exhibition which is being exhibited in Vancouver, and this will be exhibited in Winnipeg August 7th to 13th in Memorial Park. I would invite members if they're in the city to have a look at the exhibition, and hopefully some of the schools - well they'll be on summer holidays, but at least the teachers could inform their students that the exhibition will be in Winnipeg.

Manitoba will also be hosting a great number of foreign visitors from the Foreign Delegations who will be in the country. Early in August there will be a post-Habitat

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) Conference organized by CPAC with provincial and federal support. This conference will take place at the same time as the Exhibition, the National Exhibition that's being shown in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I want to move an amendment to the resolution, and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that proposed Resolution No. 22 be amended by deleting all words after 1976 in the second line of the first Whereas and inserting the following:

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba continue its present arrangements with the Government of Canada to participate in the activities associated with the United National Conference on Human Settlements."

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by . . . Where did the honourable member go? I am presenting a motion. Until I have the member that is presenting the motion, I can't do a thing.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's not all that often that I agree with the members opposite, that is the members of the government, when they move an amendment to a resolution in a manner and fashion that they are all too prone to doing in most instance, but I find myself speaking for myself as the Member for Lakeside, having to agree with the proposed amendment made to this resolution, which I think most of us would like to support, except that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has put a few extras into his final resolve, that I find myself in agreement with, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. We have difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in this country, in remembering Dominion Day never mind Salad Bowl Days, or Apple Days, or what have you, and to add another Habitat Day is just another one which I don't really think will add a great deal to its observance or to its recognition, and for that reason I find myself in difficulty in supporting the full nature of the resolution that's put forward by the Member for Fort Rouge.

I acknowledge, I support the position that the government has taken in this instance that they have, they have acknowledged the conference, the Habitat Conference to take place in Vancouver, and from the remarks made and others that we were aware of from time to time in the media, that they have made specific contributions with respect to briefs, the three cited by the Honourable Member, Leaf Rapids, Unicity, about debating the virtues of Unicity, but nonetheless this government felt compelled to forward them as some documentation of their concerns with respect to human habitation in this country, in this province, and I really can't take issue or can't quarrel with the government or ask them to do anything more, other than being aware of the conference, having sent representation down to that conference and participating in that conference, and I think that, Mr. Speaker, is doing pretty well what one would expect the government to do.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that I feel compelled to remark upon at this stage: they spring largely from the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that we have an overall, a global responsibility about hosting conferences of this nature. They do add, even if the actual progress steps are infinitely small, but they add to the total sum of human knowledge, and in this particular case, involved a very wide spectrum of human concern, far too wide in my judgment. If it would be confined to a more, you know, definable area of human concern, perhaps there would have been greater concern. I reject, and I'm not an apologist for the Olympics at Montreal, but the simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of politicians in this country are quite prepared to pay, even the exorbitant dollars that the Olympics cost, than pay for the Habitat Conference, at an equal level. That's no secret. That's the way we govern ourselves. The fact of the matter is, the people of Quebec supported their mayor, democratically elected, the Legislative Assembly of Quebec has accepted the onerous responsibility of carrying on the Olympics, and the CBC as the servant of the people, as they should be, correctly note that 9 out of 10 Canadians will be watching their television sets during the Olympic coverage that it will receive. The CBC has also correctly assumed that 1 out of 1,000 will be tuning into CBC-FM to listen to what's happening on Habitat in Vancouver.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's not, you know, be all that hard on ourselves about how misplaced our priorities are. You know, there are certain things that happen to be, and

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. ENNS cont'd) if those things want to be changed, then, Mr. Speaker, it's the responsibility of these people to be drawing that to our attention. And I take that as issue No. 1 that I make with the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge's presentation. The gist of the resolution, the purpose of the resolution, is to have our attention as legislators drawn to the conference, the Habitat Conference.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm always prepared to acknowledge that that fuzzy world of academics that meets every once in awhile in different communities, usually supported by taxpayers' money, has every reason to seek our attention, you know, to want some attention from time to time, but Mr. Speaker, we pass the laws in Chambers like this, across this country, and at least one third, or maybe a little more, equally democratically elected people meet from time to time from all walks of life to pass the laws, passes the zoning regulations, pass the building regulations, and pass the kind of national or provincial budgets that can make or do certain things, make certain things happen.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, while I take no objection at all, in fact my support is there, I suspect though that the very nature of the conference and the nature for their feeling and putting pressure on the individual members, like the Member from Fort Rouge, to pass resolutions like this, is belatedly indicating that they have a responsibility on bringing some of their concerns after their . . . to Houses like this.

And secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have to . . . Again I think I can appreciate, and I'll accept the responsibility for being concerned in a global way about our Habitat, but our country and our world and our planet is so diverse, Mr. Speaker, that aside from having a great week and a lot of people presenting different briefs, it's difficult to imagine the specific input that African or South American, you know, delegations will have in solving settlement and habitat problems here in the northern temperate zones of North America.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge seems to have made a startling revelation in reading some of the South American briefs, that indicates that they have moved into this, or have not been that affected by the sophisticated, organized approach that we have towards settlement, that they have stumbled on the fact that self-help and self-housing, self-settlement, is something that we should be taking a second look at. Well, Mr. Speaker, most of our forefathers, when they stumbled on this bald prairie, you know, they dug sod, self-helped themselves into an earthen sod hut and lived that way for a decade, and if need be, will do it again. But, you know, to me, Mr. Speaker, there is a degree of an academic exercise going on here, which if it deserves, you know, if something meaningful comes out of it, fine, I want the merits of it, but forgive me, Mr. Speaker, if I don't get that super excited about the event, if I don't get that super concerned about having somebody indicate to me that maybe I shouldn't be relying on Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation, or this Provincial Manitoba Housing Corporation to build me my home, I should be perhaps taking a leaf out of the delegation from South America and building my own home with bamboo shoots, except that I haven't got bamboo shoots around, so I'll have to use sod. But I assure the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that many many people in the Prairies did precisely that, without the benefit, with the verbiage, and without the expense of a Habitat Conference in Vancouver.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm doing what I did not intend to do. I really didn't want to rise to speak against the resolution. You know, I have been at, not that kind of a conference, Mr. Speaker, that's never been my privilege, I've just been even at National Conferences. You know, Mr. Speaker, if we have a concern about the use of our resources. I can just imagine the mounds of paper that's going to be drifting through that conference; the mounds of trees that we've chopped down to provide the briefs and the documents, in triplicate and in quadruplet, and in multi-forms, and I know where they are all going to end up. You know, we have probably chopped down the equivalent of 30,000 acres of trees to provide just the vehicle for all the 75 delegations - that's the one conference, and then you have unofficial conference on the other side, to present their briefs. Now, with those 30,000 acres of trees, you probably could have built quite a few settlements. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

RESOLUTION 22

MR. ENNS: We could have built quite a few settlements of whatever description. But, Mr. Speaker, that's our way. That's our sophisticated, particularly our United Nations way, we have conferences. We have a great deal of conferences.

I of course have another objection to that particular conference, when participants in that conference don't believe that certain people in this country, in this planet, should live at all, anywhere in this planet, then I object to them being part of that conference. I'll leave them nameless.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's an exercise where a great deal of verbosity will take place, a great deal of discussion will take place, and I suppose, you know, I think whenever mankind gets together and talks, it's better than fighting or shooting at each other, and we may even get, with the benefit of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge's contribution at that conference, some specific suggestions that we can apply to our situation here, and not to be parochial, but to the situation of mankind in general, we support the interest shown by the Manitoba Government in the Habitat Conferences in Vancouver. But, Mr. Speaker, to be chastised, particularly for not showing a similar degree of interest in that conference as we are in the Olympics in Montreal, or for not showing quite as much awareness of the event taking place in Vancouver by the public service vehicle such as the CBC, as they are prepared to show to the Olympics in Montreal, I think that's being a little out of touch, a little escaping from reality of this situation that exists that we are all too familiar with.

MR. SPEAKER: It's the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendments. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make some closing comments. I think that it's obviously not a resolution . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member will not be closing the debate, because we are on an amendment.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's on an amendment so I can make . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that it is your responsibility to help the honourable member, if he wishes to make what he thinks are closing comments he should continue.

MR. SPEAKER: It's a matter of procedure, that it is not a closing comment.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I frankly can do without the House Leader's help. If there is an amendment on the floor, I have a right to speak on an amendment. I would also be able to speak on the resolution if the amendment didn't pass, so I propose to speak if it's all right with him.

MR. GREEN: Sure, go ahead. We want you to.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, then, I'm glad to hear it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that if the concern of this House is about how much pulp and paper that we're pouring in, then I simply say that two parties at least, have a vested interest in keeping a thing called Man for alive and . . . and it may be the best thing that's ever happened to them is the Habitat Conference, because it may keep that dead duck sort of economically viable for another year or so, but otherwise it has no business being in business.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to in fact respond to some of the comments that were made. First, because I think that there is an interesting philosophical difference that emerged when the Member from St. Matthews spoke in the amendment he proposes that I am now discussing. He is talking about "Be it therefore resolved that the Province of Manitoba continue its present arrangements with the Government of Canada to participate." He knows, Mr. Speaker, what he's talking about, is one government to another. That's the way this group likes to work. They're always talking about this government doing that with that other government. The point that I'm making, Mr. Speaker, about the resolution is I think that habitat should be for people of all kinds, private and public, it should not be one government dealing with another government, getting together and sort of presenting briefs back and forth, it should be a conference which provides for an

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) opening of the eyesight and the awarenesses of a whole range of people throughout the community.

It has not been that, Mr. Speaker, and frankly the kind of efforts undertaken in this province and others has not reached many people. The little newsletter that goes out has not reached that many, it has not stimulated much activity in the schools, there is not much discussion going on in the province, there is not much awareness of what the implications are, and I would simply say, one reason is because it has been a government operation. It hasn't been a people-type of operation, because I don't accept the government is the people, as they're always saying. I think government acts for people, it's elected by people, but it is not the people. I think this is our basic problem, we don't deal with it in the sense of saying that there is so many kinds of meetings where governments themselves become so myopic and embroiled that they know what's going on, they forget that there's an awful lot of individuals outside there, who don't have the awareness but should have it because if they are eventually going to support government action and government proposals and government initiatives, then it is based upon some form of education, of keeping up with the changes that are taking place in the world, of understanding those changes. It's that I guess which is the disappointment that I personally feel about the Habitat Conference, is that it has not been the stimulant that it might have been.

It may be that the Member from Lakeside is right, maybe we've just reached the point of saturation in our Canadian consciousness where we're much happier being spectators at an athletic event than sort of putting our minds and our intellects and our feelings to work to try to come to grips with problems, and I know it. It's much easier, it's certainly the easier way of doing things to lie down in front of a TV set and watch a group of young people sort of running and jumping, and I will do it too, but I think that that is part of the problem we're facing, is we've become a spectator society, we're always on the sidelines watching people do it for us. We sit on the sidelines too often, and let government do things for us, and we sit on the sidelines and let other athletes perform for us, and we sit on the sidelines and let entertainers perform for us, and we have lost in many cases the capacity of doing things for ourselves. And one of the points is that we have often lost the ability to discuss and debate and exchange. I frankly don't get all that concerned about how much paper is used up, because if the amount of paper that is used up will succeed in moving a sense of a good idea one inch further towards realization, then I think, Mr. Speaker, the amount of money spent on a piece of paper, or the paper spent on Habitat will be very minute compared to the amount of money spent on bricks and mortar to build that \$800 million stadium in Montreal, frankly. I think that that by comparison of values is something that we can well afford in comparison to the kind of waste that we normally make in order to keep people sort of happy and entertained and satisfied, but probably not participating and not thinking. And I think that is the point about the Habitat itself is that it is not simply a conference of governments it is also a conference of people, thousands of people from across the world coming together in a variety of organizations, trying to get together with their problems, and I think that the Member from Lakeside I think is . . . that was a . . . response, that when I rise to my feet it's automatic that you have to oppose it, and he keeps trying to fight it, I know, at times when he knows we might have a good idea, but I know that it's that ingrained habit of mind that comes so easily --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry no doubt he was taking his instructions from the Member from Morris, who said, on no account, would I agree with him on anything.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the thing that can happen at a conference like this if you look at the past, that one of the more useful things the United Nations has supplied, beginning with Stockholm Conference and going to the Rome Conference and the Bucharest Conference and the Mexican Conference is that very specific tangible benefits have come as a result, and the Member for Lakeside should know it more than anybody because the . . . conference in Rome dealing with the International obligations of food supply is something where it has involved this government deeply, very specific commitments were made which will affect the agricultural community of this country

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) in a very direct way. No question about it. Now that is the kind of very meaningful, tangible direct kind of decisions that were being made at these so-called frivolous U.N. Conferences, and they're going to affect the Member from Lakeside probably more than anybody in this Chamber, or certainly many others, because they're directly involved in the production and supply and distribution of food. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that the supply of food is totally and inextricably bound up with the questions of how we build human settlements. While the Member from Lakeside was rhapsodizing about his forefathers digging a sod cabin and how he's prepared to duplicate that feat, I would remind him that it is very difficult to dig and built a sod cabin in close proximity to a million other people, because that's what we're talking about, we're not talking about sod-busters coming to the Canadian Prairies in the 1890s, we're talking about millions of people living cheek to jowl with one another and finding some way of organizing their lives and themselves, so that when they do come together they're not going to end up sort of at the point where it simply becomes a cesspool. That is the problem we're facing, not in the romantic age of the opening of the prairies or the frontiers, the frontiers have closed. The new frontier is in the downtown streets of cities, and it is there where the kind of imagination and initiative must be shown, and so if someone from Latin America can come and show us how in a sense we have become captured or captive to our own technological achievements, and have become so mesmerized by our fondness for over-organizing things that there is a simpler way of breaking out of that, then I am prepared to listen. I want to learn, to see if it is possible that within a city of 600,000 to in effect try to develop some ability for low income people to help in the creation of their own housing. We do not do it now. We are much happier, at least in this government, to do things for them, not to do things with them, or help them to do things for themselves. If we can learn from that, then my God we have made a major step forward.

But, Mr. Speaker, the conference goes much further than that, it goes into the question of how do you deal with the organizing and planning of land around urban areas, something that Winnipeg, you know we're chewing up 3,000 acres of land in the periphery of Winnipeg every year, and our planning is a mismatch, we don't have any control of it, so we can be looking at the examples of what the French are doing to decamp populations from urban areas. Other countries are trying, and I think, Mr. Speaker, if we follow the advice of the Member from Lakeside and say, we have nothing to learn from other people, nothing to learn from other societies or cultures in what they have tried, then, Mr. Speaker, we have closed the shades upon the outside world and we will become like vegetables after a while. If we can't learn what's going around us, then we have no capacity to learn at all.

I'm simply saying that aside from the tangible decisions that would be made on the parts of government, which I think are going to affect this country in terms of the amount of money we're prepared to commit, in terms of housing, and water supplies to other countries, and in the development of new technologies in the housing field, it has also got to do something about raising the level of our own unawareness in reaching out in as open a way that we possibly can to find out how other people are trying to do things, because the problems are similar, the fact that we have thousands of people moving into Winnipeg on a yearly basis, coming in with very few skills, with no jobs, coming from a culture which often makes them dependent upon other people is very similar to what's happening in countries all around the world.

We haven't solved our problem with native people, frankly, and so maybe they can give us some ideas of how we're doing it. We are walking away from it. You only have to look at the placement of 30,000 or 40,000 native people in the core area of Winnipeg, and the lack of attention and the lack of activity, and our only answer so far has been, as I said, is to build three or four office buildings. That's been our answer to the core area problem.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can learn from other people as to what they're doing as well, and maybe we can teach them something about what we're doing here. I think we can take a look at the Leaf Rapids Project and Unicity because they are examples, flawed

RESOLUTION 22

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) ones perhaps but still examples of initiatives we have taken in our own country. And to dispute the fact that an exchange of ideas, a marketplace of discussion is no longer of use and we should be getting down to hard practicalities of things, I think, Mr. Speaker, really ignores how public policy is made. The public policy is not just made because of the debates in this House. Debates in this House are often informed by many debates that have gone on before that have set a climate and a mood and an attitude, that an idea that was considered to be sort of eccentric and radical and freakish, today is perfectly accepted and is customary and conventional. Maybe because a lot of men and women over a number of years got together in small groups to discuss it and talk about it in those fuzzy-headed academic rooms, and wrote some papers about it, and talked to civil servants about it, and trained people about it, and have even conferences about it. That's how you create ideas, that's how you create awareness, and that's how ultimately how you start creating new policy.

So I'm not saying, I'm not predicting that the United Nations Habitat Conference is going to be the place where all solutions to all problems are going to be decided, but I will say that a lot of them will be debated. The point of this resolution and while I suppose I have to support it, I regret the emasculation of the Minister is that I think, while I don't have any fondness for gimmicks, I would simply say that we are losing an opportunity to bring home the lessons and the ideas that will be contained in Habitat by not focusing something directly, bringing it to the people's attention. It has not been brought to the people's attention in this province heretofore; it has been a minimal effort, with minimal results, there isn't any awareness, and if you're using a gimmick, we've debated about doing something on bi-centennials and everything else, well that's one way that we can at least choose the opening day of Habitat, one day of one year in the next two or three decades to ask people to think about it, and focus on it, and bring their resources to bear on it, that I think there would be some value to it, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that was the point of the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene in Committee of Supply at 8 p.m. with the Deputy Speaker in the Chair.