

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 p.m., Monday, April 5, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have an up-to-date Flood Forecasting Committee Report.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Thank you. Notices of Motion. The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission to the end of 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; 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 either the Minister of Mines or the First Minister. I wonder if they can indicate whether the problems indicated by the Sherritt-Gordon Mines of the Lynn Lake mine and the stated opinion, at least this morning, by the head of the company that they may have to review continuing operations at the Lynn Lake mine, have led to discussions with the provincial government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there were some discussions some time ago which was previous to the company having tried to continue the life of the mine through the operation of a contracting firm but it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the ore grades are just not sufficient to make it economical. They haven't approached us on it recently.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether their problems being faced at Lynn Lake are also having or will have an impact on the new operations in which they're involved in with the government at Leaf Rapids.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the government is not involved in the Leaf Rapids operation as far as the mining is concerned. The government is involved with Leaf Rapids in the town development. The price of copper has been such that they have not been able to do as much at Leaf Rapids as they wanted to, but there's no indication to us that Leaf Rapids is a problem in the same terms as Lynn Lake which is a mine that has been in operation for many years and may be in the process of being mined out. That's a similar problem that took place in Sherridon many years ago when they stopped mining at Sherridon and moved to Lynn Lake. Eventually mining towns of this kind meet that kind of result, Mr. Speaker. There is some suggestion that there will be some problem keeping the Manibridge operation going as long as they thought they would in the first place.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate since he has alluded to the investment of the provincial government at the second mine at Leaf Rapids in the way of a townsite there, could the First Minister give us any sort of indication as to how much money the provincial government has involved in that particular project.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the amount that is invested in the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation is roughly \$12,500,000; that compares to what I think is \$70 million invested by the Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company. There are also homes that are there and other investments which would include the town services, which are debentured by the Leaf Rapids Local Government District.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister -

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . it's in relation to the conference last week in Ottawa - and ask him if he can advise the House at this time of any summary position that he has drawn from the meetings last week and indicate where we go from here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, there is no final report to give to the House at this time. The intent of the Government of Canada was to formalize and give effect as of today to a revision in the Revenue Guarantee arrangement which has been in place for the past, going on fourth year. But as a result of the meeting last Thursday and Friday we do have an undertaking that this will be held in abeyance, not proceeded with, at least until after the meeting of First Ministers which is expected now to be on the 5th and/or 6th of May. So that is the only interim report I can give, Sir, that there is a desisting by the Government of Canada of implementing a substantially revised Revenue Guarantee arrangement.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, could the First Minister indicate, does the Revenue Guarantee formula, will it effect 76-77 or does it not effect until 77-78.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is a time lag in the payments by Canada of any Revenue Guarantee payment that must be made by it as a consequence of the changes in the tax laws that were made back in 1971. So now if the Government of Canada were to persist after the early part of May, after the First Ministers' Meeting, to go ahead with the revision in the Revenue Guarantee, it would effect adversely all provincial budgets in Canada and, in the case of Manitoba, it would have a negative impact for calendar 76-77 of something in the order of say \$10 million to \$20 million.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General if his department has conducted an investigation into the escape of two prisoners from a sheriff's car on Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, we are presently obtaining information. I've requested a full report on the matter and investigation is presently being conducted.

MR. GRAHAM: I have a supplementary question to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether negotiations are presently under way with the RCMP in Manitoba to renew a contract with the RCMP which expired on the 31st of March?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are negotiations under way presently among all the parties involved, which involves the eight Attorneys-General plus the Solicitor-General of Canada in connection with the renewal of the contract. At the present time there is disagreement as to the renewal of that contract, as to the conditions being imposed by the Federal Government in connection with financing.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary. At the present time are we operating on a 30-day extension of the contract that expired on the 31st of March?

MR. PAWLEY: We're operating under an extension, it's not specified as to time period, it's simply an extension of the existing contract as a result of disagreement on the part of all eight contracting provinces with the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights): My question is to the First Minister. It relates to the Finance Ministers' Conference. I believe at the Conference Ontario tabled a report with respect to the Guaranteed Annual Income Program, the proposed changes in the Federal Income Support Program, and indicated that it was prepared to support the Federal Government's proposal. I wonder if he can indicate whether the Provincial Government will support Ontario in this connection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of items on the agenda which Ontario and Manitoba found themselves in the same basic policy position and there was mutual support. With respect to the specific item however of the proposed changes in income security programs in Canada, it is true that Ontario tabled a document, but it

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . is one which by their own admission was very much preliminary and tentative. Manitoba has not struck a definitive position with regard to the federal proposals as yet; I believe that my colleague the Minister of Health and Social Development may be in a position, although I would be surprised if he were in a position today, but he should be in a position hopefully this month to deal with it more definitively.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, by way of another question. As well, I believe Ontario filed a study and requested that the Canada Pension Plan be increased, indicating that the plan be of no value to the provinces and in effect would be a pay-out as the payments came in within a short period of time. Does Manitoba agree with Ontario's position in connection with its study and its proposal that the Canada Pension Plan be increased?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we have received that report as of Friday morning last. I have not had an opportunity yet to peruse it in full, nor to discuss it with officials of the Department of Finance in Manitoba. I hope to be able to do so in the course of the next ten days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Honourable First Minister. I wonder, when he was in Ottawa, did he discuss the cost-sharing of subsidy to the fishermen in northern Manitoba with the Prime Minister or with other officials, did he discuss this particular item at that time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that problem has to be dealt with by correspondence and/or telex. The Minister of Fisheries was not at the Finance Conference nor was the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance was even loathe to discuss the items that were on the Finance Ministers' agenda, let alone other items.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House if he is aware of any other provinces which provided subsidy on their own without cost-sharing with the Federal Government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any province that is doing so on any significant scale that would be comparable with Manitoba. In any case it is poor constitutional practice. Under Head 12 of Section 91 of the BNA Act it is a matter of federal responsibility, the province is willing to share in the cost even though it is not a matter of provincial jurisdiction, but to be asked to go on a significant scale 100 percent provincial in a matter that is 100 percent federal under the BNA Act is strange to say the least.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question as well for the First Minister related to financial arrangements with the Federal Government. Can the Minister indicate whether there has as yet been any specific proposals from the Federal Government concerning the renewal of agreements on financing proposed secondary education and if that intends to be discussed at the next meeting of the First Ministers or Finance Ministers, and if Manitoba has made any proposals concerning the re-negotiated agreement for financing of higher education?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as it's rather a lengthy question I would prefer to take it as notice if I may. Unless the honourable member is particularly impatient, I would try to respond tomorrow.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then perhaps indicate whether the Province of Manitoba has expressed any agreement with the position taken by the AUCC requesting that the existing arrangement just be extended for two years while the Federal-Provincial Governments and the colleges and universities work out a national policy on higher education.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is perhaps no great harm in continuing the present arrangement provided the present arrangement is not made subject to certain arbitrary ceilings that are not unrealistic. But if there are unrealistic ceilings placed on the present arrangement then it is really not the optimum, therefore we should not be particularly anxious to extend it on that basis. If, however, in the course of negotiations, which I may add for the honourable member's information, it certainly looks as though

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . 1976 will be a year of, oh at least two First Ministers conferences and possibly three conferences of Ministers of Finance because the agenda is already quite heavy with the whole spectrum of Dominion-Provincial fiscal arrangements, in particular the major items of health care and post-secondary - so that I do not want to say anything today that would give an early and premature answer as to just what our preference would be. Clearly our preference is not for a continuation of the present arrangement if it is made subject to certain artificial ceilings.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the First Minister indicate whether there have been continuing or frequent negotiations recently with the universities concerning their projected needs over the next decade and whether this would become part of the projected position of the Provincial Government?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there have been discussions between the Minister and the University Grants Commission and the Universities' Presidents. I have participated in one or two such meetings. I think it's fair to say that we all must look, including universities, at certain guidelines that are more in keeping with present-day constraints. I am not pessimistic about the prospect of the universities agreeing ultimately that there should be no expectation for funding that greatly exceeds or significantly exceeds the growth in the economic means or GNP of any country or society.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister responsible for the Civil Service and relates to the discussion of the past few days with respect to the appointment of new civil servants. Can the Minister advise the House what is meant by his statement outside the House that changes to the Civil Service Act will leave no doubts about ministerial responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister in charge of the Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation and responsible for the C.S. Act) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, they mean just that.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Do they mean that they will leave no doubt that there will be ministerial responsibility or that there will not be ministerial responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is repetitive. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry wish to re-phrase?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect, Sir, the statement is ambiguous, it could mean one of two things.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is debating the issue. If he has a question, I'll tender it.

MR. SHERMAN: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can the Minister advise whether ministerial responsibility in the appointments of new civil servants will take precedence over Civil Service Commission responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should look at the Act and realize the responsibilities that are endowed to the employing authority as noted in the Act.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Then why has the Minister said there will be changes to the Act?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if there are clarifications necessary in the Act they will be to once and for all clearly define the roles of both the Civil Service Commission and the employing authority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Tourism. Would the Minister confirm that his department is building cottages and motel units in Provincial Parks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, there has been a public announcement in regards to the construction of a facility in the Hecla Island Provincial Park, which is shared 50-50 with Ottawa. There has been equally a press release going back to last year I believe in

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . regards to the construction of log cabins intended to be leased to those wanting to avail themselves of, say, a facility for a given period of time, one day, a week, or three weeks, yes.

MR. WILSON: A supplementary. Does this mean that the government are getting into the motel business?

MR. TOUPIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, the policy announcement was made very clear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General indicate to the House if he has received a report from the Law Reform Commission respecting election reform or election changes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister indicate to the House if there'll be any legislation during the Session in respect to election reform?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's a matter that I would be able to reveal at this point. We'll see when we get the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the studies by the Province of Ontario were considered studies only for the benefit of the Ministers and the members of the department, and if in fact they are to be made available to the department, will he consider tabling at least one copy with the Clerk so that it will be available to this side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's rather difficult for me to answer just offhand. I would assume that the working document having been tabled by the Province of Ontario, that it would only be sort of routine courtesy to ascertain first if Ontario has any particular objection if extra copies are made and distributed. Perhaps we could enquire and advise my honourable friend.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways. Statistics have been released by the Province of Ontario concerning the compulsory use of seat belts indicating that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker . . . that deaths have dropped by some 35 percent in the last two months. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether his department has studied those statistics and whether any legislation proposing compulsory use of seat belts will be introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, on the question of seat belts, we have been looking at various statistics in Ontario and the United States and other countries that have mandatory use of seat belts, like New Zealand and Australia for example, and I must say that we did enter into a fairly extensive educational program on this matter this year and once the results of this program are known then the proper action will be taken.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether his department has studied the statistics released by the Province of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: It's immaterial. Order please. The question is out of order. The Honourable Member for Roblin.--(Interjection)--All right, the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether his department has studied the report of the Province of Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: Same thing. Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Health regarding the lotteries. I wonder can the Honourable Minister advise the House regarding the new Lottery called The Express, who is the

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . organization that's mentioned as one of the distributors, Lottery-Manitoba Distributor Incorporated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's it.

MR. McKENZIE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would advise if he appointed them, were they selected, or how did they become chosen as one of the distributors of the lottery called Express?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that statement was made about seven times in this House so far.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. I wonder can the Minister advise the House regarding the prizes that are offered, and it mentioned that they have to sell two series of \$90,000 each. What happens if they don't sell those two series?

MR. DESJARDINS: I would suggest he ask the corporation.

MR. McKENZIE: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It's very difficult to get any information from the government today, Mr. Speaker. I wonder can the Minister advise the House what's the projected revenue that has been offered to the United Way, the Manitoba Arts Council and to the Manitoba Sports Fitness Council.

MR. DESJARDINS: Same answer. That corporation has a press release, they give all this information. It's an independent corporation - and I don't intend to get involved every day with this - it's a corporation that has to answer to the public and I suggest my honourable friend get the answer from them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has he had any information from his Department of Water Control as to whether or not the Portage Diversion will be put to its normal use this spring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not yet. I think that the flood forecasting reports indicate the Assiniboine River may require that facility, but I haven't had a specific answer as to whether it would be put into use yet.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question then to the Minister. The department, by way of assuring the residents east of Portage, if the conditions are such that it calls for its use it will be put in use?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that the use is in accordance with the schedule that was established when the diversion was created. There has been no interference, no change that I am aware of as to the general instructions concerning the use of that facility.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct another question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he is prepared to consider requesting the Manitoba Milk Marketing Board to refund the \$97,000 collected from the dairy producers of this province by way of a five cent check-off for the proposed facilities now abandoned at Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside should know that that is a matter strictly for the consideration of the Board, they do not function as instruments of the government.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it takes me just a little while to digest that bit of information, but I ask the Honourable Minister or indeed the First Minister the question as to whether or not they would consider suggesting to the Manitoba Milk Marketing Board that the \$97,000 be returned to those who gave it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the answer to that is self evident. The funds having been collected and being held in trust will continue to be held in trust until the Board, being representative of the producers of the province, decide otherwise. That is a matter of board policy to be determined by events.

MR. ENNS: Final question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . Agriculture. I wonder, Sir, if he would now consider if for no other reason than for purposes of educational reading, supplying us with the feasibility study on Crocus Foods so that we may with hindsight concur with the decisions that the government arrived at.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Highways. I'd like to know if the Minister of Highways can confirm that two young people in Manitoba lost their lives last weekend because they were wearing seat belts?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister indicate, in light of the publication of the report by the Commissioner of Official Languages that recommends priority be given to language instruction in the provinces, whether the Province of Manitoba intends to examine the report and provide any kind of response from a provincial point of view to those recommendations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the report is quite new. No doubt my department will be perusing it, and if it deserves a response it will be responded to.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the Minister yet been able to determine whether his department, in company with the City of Winnipeg, made proposals to the Secretary of State for financing for French language instruction in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the response to the specific question posed by the honourable member, but I would like to assure him that whatever assistance there is from the Secretary of State for the funding of instruction, as per Section 258 of the Act which provides for the official languages as being languages of instruction, that is being actively pursued by the province at all times in our negotiations with the Federal Government.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I think from the Minister's answer, can we then accept that there is a proposal that is now pending before the Secretary of State for capital financing for facilities for French language instruction in the city, and if that proposal is pending when does he expect to have some results or can announce some results on it?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, whatever assistance there is from the Secretary of State for instruction for French as a language of instruction, this is to deal with start-up costs or any additional costs that may be incurred in the offering of the program. And that relates to the French program in the entire Province of Manitoba, not only to the City of Winnipeg. So I will repeat again, that in our negotiations and our dealings with the Federal Government we act on behalf of all the public schools in the Province of Manitoba, not only one, but insofar as the offering of instruction to the students of school age, that is the responsibility of the school divisions for instruction to be offered in either official language.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister has . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please?

MR. AXWORTHY: The question is, is there at the present time a specific proposal pending jointly from the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg concerning French language instruction that is either being considered or not being considered by the Secretary of State, and is there a reply to that proposal, and if so when can we expect one?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, for the third time, I would repeat that in our negotiations with the Secretary of State we act on behalf of all the school divisions in the Province of Manitoba and not on behalf of any particular one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture laid on the questions that were posed by my colleague from Lakeside. I'd like to ask the Minister if Crocus Food Limited was not a Crown corporation?

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Rock Lake should appreciate that we had a contractual arrangement with the Milk Producers Marketing Board who are going to be the major shareholders of that company and therefore had it proceeded we would have held a minority position, the government that is would have held a minority position.

MR. EINARSON: I would like to ask again if Crocus Food was not a Crown corporation - I'll probably have questions to follow further.

MR. USKIW: I believe Mr. Speaker, originally, yes.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, then my second question to the Minister would be, under what jurisdiction or what authority within the Department or the Dairy Industry was it authorized to collect five cents per hundredweight on milk produced by the dairy-men of this province?

MR. USKIW: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Rock Lake apprise himself of the Natural Products Marketing Act which governs all marketing boards in the province, and if he did so he would know that the various marketing boards have the facility of the levy to finance their operations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Highways and it arises out of the new regulations for snowmobiles that he introduced earlier this session. Can the Minister advise the House whether it is the intention of his Department or the government to introduce compulsory PL and PD insurance for snowmobiles in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of policy, and if that should be the case, that will be announced in due course.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is that matter of policy under active consideration?

MR. BURTNIAK: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that all policy matters are under active consideration at all times.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I asked the Minister a question on Friday as to whether or not the government was in receipt of a grant from the Federal Government of somewhere in the order of \$80,000 for a solar energy project. In view of the fact the Minister's answer at that time was somewhat circumspect, I now read in the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please . . .

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister whether in fact the grant has been received as indicated in the newspaper on Saturday.

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, I thought I had made it clear that we had received a communication that day or the day before from the Honourable Barney Dansen indicating that his department was willing to partially finance such a project. I did indicate that, and we have a letter indicating that they are prepared to offer \$78,000, but we have not received a grant as such, we have received a letter indicating that that money would be available for such a demonstration project.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister would be good enough to hand out a copy of his press release at a press conference which obviously was made some minutes or hours shortly after the questions were asked of him in the House on Friday, so that we can find out where the project stands and where the funds are to come from.



## COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, with leave I would like to make two changes on our committees. The First Minister will replace the Member for Thompson on Public Utilities and the Member from Emerson will replace the Minister of Health on the Law Amendments, with your leave. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Minister of Mines, House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with the Order Paper, with the second readings that are . . .

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 23 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Minister for Arthur. (Stand)

Bill No. 30 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36 proposed by the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Arthur. (Stand) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself 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 Northern Affairs.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I refer honourable members to page 46 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 99(d) Airport and Airstrip Operation and Maintenance, Section (1) Salaries and Wages \$890,900--pass; (d)(2) Other Expenditures \$472,900. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder, through you to the Honourable Minister, if he would advise us what the travel expenses included under this particular section are as well as the stationary, transportation, telephones, subsistence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, before I deal with those details, the Member for Birtle-Russell raised a point as to the closure of certain northern airstrips to scheduled air carrier service, and I would like to make a few comments on that particular item while I have the opportunity.

The Department has been assisting with the construction of airstrips for some considerable number of years, I believe the first ones began about '67. The program was expanded quite considerably later on, and during the last two years of the Interim Northlands Agreement we have received cost-sharing from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion on Airstrips, there was no indication to ourselves that there was going to be a change or basically an enforcement of federal regulations. I think members will realize that the Ministry of Transport, or Transport Canada I believe is now the official title, has certain responsibilities in terms of airstrips and the regulations relating thereto. That responsibility has also included construction. The Province of Manitoba under the previous administration, under this administration, has taken action on its own for the construction of what we call emergency airstrips. However, over the years the airstrips have changed in their classification or calibre and a number of them reached licenceable standards. Early last spring the Transport Canada officials in Winnipeg came to the department and said there seems to be some problems in terms of their regulations as it relates to scheduled air carriers, but since the problem is always there in the remote settlements of logistics of where construction is going to take place, and since we had already entered into a Grade II program under the Northlands Agreement there was some difficulty in immediately changing emphasis, especially when equipment was not in those

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . communities and the only way equipment could be got into those communities would be over the winter road network.

The decision of Transport Canada to enforce regulations was a little bit difficult to understand, because scheduled air carriers had been flying into those communities since 1970, basically using the Twin Otter aircraft. Their record of performance over that five-year period had been an accident-free record, they had never had an accident on those particular airstrips, so it came as a shock to the communities and a surprise to ourselves that all of a sudden some mix-up in regulations that people had been allowed to operate for five years all of a sudden said they could no longer operate on a regular scheduled service; that they could provide charter service into those particular communities but that they could no longer operate on a regular scheduled service. We were quite concerned as to the immediate effect it would have on the communities that were benefiting from scheduled service, and we were also concerned about the nature of the regulations because the airstrips that we are talking about are good serviceable airstrips, but to reach a Transport Canada licenceable standard there are a number of other restrictions or requirements which relate to the width of the airstrip; which relate to the angle from the runway, there may be any obstructions in the way; relates the end of the runways, whether or not there can be any buildings within so many yards from the airstrip.

The regulations are quite strict. Our hope at that time was, okay, now you have decided to enforce these regulations . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, this is a fairly complex thing, these regulations, because the carrier was given permission to fly that route on a scheduled basis, as I understand it, and had been doing so for five years, and then there was permission granted to land in those specific areas which I believe is another type of permission required - if the Member for Brandon finds that I am saying something incorrect maybe he could correct me on that - but the specific community approvals were based on floats or ski planes' usage of those communities as opposed to wheel landings at those particular communities.

The Member for Birtle-Russell said that we should get along with the Federal Government. My general impression of what happened was that probably some of the other carriers put in complaints that caused the Federal Government to enforce these regulations that had been not used for five years, against the certain scheduled carriers into northern Manitoba. So at that time the province indicated that we were willing to involve ourselves with Transport Canada, to upgrade those air services, and earlier last month the Federal Minister indicated his agreement to cost-share on five particular airstrips that had been affected by the enforcing of regulations, somewhat belatedly. Later the same month the Premier replied to the Minister of Transport indicating our willingness to cost-share with them on the construction of airstrips at Red Sucker Lake and Little Grand Rapids and that that construction had been planned and equipment moved in over the winter road network, and in fact some work was already under way at those two particular airstrips. He also agreed that we would proceed with construction at Oxford House and at Poplar River if Transport Canada agreed to accept a long term lease as opposed to land ownership. Members may or may not be aware that Transport Canada had agreed to cost-share with us when we got to a certain level on a couple of the major strips, Gardenhill and Norway House, but the requirement for that cost-sharing is that the province hold title to the land on which the airstrip is located. The community of Oxford House and Poplar River being reserves, and the airstrips being on reserve land, did not agree to transfer title to the land on which the airstrip was located; however, the community of Oxford House has since agreed that they would be willing to consider a long term lease. We do not have a firm answer from Transport Canada on the acceptability of a long term lease, although preliminary indications are that they will certainly give that serious consideration. So if they do agree to a long term lease and we can reach satisfactory agreement with those two reserves then there will be four airstrips that'll be cost-shared under the Minister of Transport, or the Minister responsible for Transport Canada's recent offer to cost-share on those particular airstrips.

There was a fifth airstrip mentioned in his letter that he would be willing to cost-share on, and that is the airstrip at Ste. Therese. We are hesitant to proceed with further work at that airstrip at this time for two main reasons. One is that it is a good

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . serviceable airstrip now that can take Twin Otters, and in fact DC3s, and I believe also that the Saunders S27 has used that particular airstrip. The problem there, as I understand it at Ste. Therese, is the angle at which certain rock outcrops appear from the edge of the runway, and the cost of removing those rock outcrops is very considerable. The other reason why we are withholding any final decision on that airstrip is that the community is not satisfied with the location. The location is not on the mainland that most of the people live, but is separated from the people by some water, and therefore they have to be transported across the water to gain accessibility to the airstrip. So for those two reasons we have not made a commitment with the Federal Minister to proceed with the construction of that particular airstrip.

A number of other airstrips have been cost-shared under the Manitoba Northlands Agreement with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and it is our intention to proceed with other airstrips as well in the upcoming year under that Agreement with the Federal Government.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister permit a question at this point?

MR. McBRYDE: I would welcome a question.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I'll ask a question because that gives the Minister a chance to look up what it is he is looking at. I was wondering if the Minister can assure the House, because now the winter roads are closed, is sufficient equipment in place at the four airstrips that are going to be cost-shared so that work can proceed this coming construction season?

MR. McBRYDE: Equipment is in place, Mr. Chairman, at Little Grand Rapids and Red Sucker Lake. In fact we had hoped to proceed with the Red Sucker Lake construction two years ago, but trouble with the winter road between Island Lake and Red Sucker Lake delayed our ability to construct there. Poplar River does have some access by barge, so if we reach agreement over the land there will not be a serious problem at Poplar River. There is some equipment at Oxford House, but not as much as we would need to launch a major reconstruction of that particular strip, although work could begin at Oxford House this upcoming summer. There is only within the last two weeks some indication that the Federal Government would be willing to consider a long term lease, and that still has not been confirmed, as opposed to provincial ownership of the land. And at Oxford House, the case I'm more familiar with, the Band has refused to sell, has refused to trade land for the airstrip purposes, so unless the Federal Government accepts the long-term lease proposal, we will not be able to proceed at Oxford House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of questions for the Minister. He may have answered this before, and if he has I'll probably read it in Hansard. Can he indicate to the House, has the government signed an agreement with the Federal Government respecting the sharing of the cost? Has the government signed an agreement with the Federal Government of sharing of the costs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, we're, as the member is aware, becoming a little bit more skeptical, but we have a letter from the Federal Minister indicating his willingness to cost-share. We have a letter from the Premier to the Federal Minister thanking him for his willingness and saying that we are willing to cost-share with them. The officials of both departments are now talking in terms of how, when and where. I am hopeful that the agreement on the two strips where equipment is in place will be reached very quickly.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister indicate cost-share, at what percentage, is it a 50-50 sharing basis?

MR. McBRYDE: The cost-sharing, Mr. Chairman, that is proposed with Transport Canada is on a 50-50 basis. The cost-sharing that we have had and which appears in the budget is with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, which is 60-40. So it is our hope and it is our understanding with Transport Canada that the

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . agreement for these four specific airstrips or five airstrips is with them and for 50-50; and that we'll still have a separate agreement with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for other airstrips, and that will go on the normal Northlands formula which is 60 percent Federal and 40 percent Provincial.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can ask another question and I thank the Minister for his answer. Can he indicate to the House . . . there was some difficulty and problems with land claims by the local Indian Bands, has that been resolved and finalized or where does it stand at the present time?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the member is right, he did miss some earlier . . . there is a requirement with Transport Canada that the province hold title to the land on which the airstrip is located, if Transport Canada is going to get involved. And this will not be the first instance in which Transport Canada will be involved with the Province of Manitoba, in that when certain airstrips reach a certain licence standard, there has been cost-sharing in the past. For example there is proposed cost-sharing at Norway House and proposed cost-sharing at Island Lake, basically Gardenhill at Island Lake. There is still some problem in actually collecting the dollars from the federal authority, and even though the Bands have signed agreements for the surrender of that land, there is still some holdup with the Federal Government's final approval, Indian Affairs' final approval in Ottawa, with that particular land. In two of the five cases that we have corresponded with the Federal Minister recently, two of those airstrips, there is not an agreement with the Bands in terms of the surrender of those lands, and what we have proposed to do is simply trade with them. You give us X acres of land and we'll give you equivalent land attached to your Reserve which will then become Reserve. But the communities have not reached agreement with us yet. With my meetings with Oxford House - I'm not as sure of Poplar River - I do not believe that they will reach agreement, but they have indicated their willingness to give us a long-term lease. Now we have asked Transport Canada if they would accept a long-term lease, hopefully 40 years, but even less if they would accept that, and their preliminary response has been favourable although we have no firm commitment from them to accept a long-term lease.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Minister correctly, on some strips the sharing with the Federal Government, the 50 percent sharing, there's a condition attached that the province must resolve the land claim with the Indian Bands first before they'll come into the agreement to share and there are still one or two, the Minister indicated, are not resolved at the present time.

MR. McBRYDE: As I indicated, just before the honourable member came in, there were five airstrips mentioned in Mr. Lang's letter, and one of those we have not made a commitment on our part to proceed for problems I outlined in some detail. On two of those equipment is in place and we are ready to proceed, in fact some preliminary work has been done. On two of them the land question is still not settled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the Hickling and Johnson Report dealt with airstrips and the airport operations in remote communities, and whether there were any recommendations that were made, and whether the budgetary items are consistent with it or not. And it's very difficult, Mr. Chairman, to do that without having the Hickling-Johnson Report. Now if the Minister is in a position to put that report on the table of the House, then I think we'd have a way in which to be able to make that analysis ourselves, but at this time without that, I wonder if he can indicate whether the study indicated additional work, further work, a program of activity in connection with the whole air service operation to the north.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, all I could - Sir, I have to apologize to the honourable member - all I could track down on Thursday evening and Friday was the preliminary report and I just don't have in my office a draft of the final report, of course, which was never printed and I still have to see if I can locate that. But the proposal for this year's budget is consistent with that report as far as it goes. However, the report did recommend a further expansion and use of the airport system.

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, but I think there was something pretty basic. There was \$150,000, I understand, spent on that report; that was what was budgeted and I assume it was spent. And if \$150,000 has been spent on the report, regardless of whether the report is considered to be from the government's point of view a comprehensive report or have all the elements of a full comprehensive report, I think there is a value from our point of view and we have a right to question the Minister as to whether his course of action proposed this year is really consistent with the report or whether the report recommends something more and further than what he's proposing and the reason for it. My point being that I think it is very hard to deal with this item, other than to accept the Minister's explanation that these are the things that will be done, without knowing how they fit into a pattern of proper development and evolution of the total air service to the remote communities; and it would seem to me that if we spent \$150,000, and by that I mean provincially and federally, that for that we should have some understanding of what the proposals were. They may be beyond the reach of the government this year or maybe next year, maybe they're not, and I think we should be in a position to have that and be able to make that judgment.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the method of determining where and how much construction takes place was done sometime before the report was brought in. Basically what we have done is broken up the possibilities of level of airport and airstrip construction into five basic levels or categories of service, the first category of service being really non-usable, an airport under construction, where work is going on at the present time. The second level of service is a 3,000 foot emergency airstrip, and that's basically all it is and all it was intended to be. There is no permanent staff at that location and there is no permanent equipment at that location. There are no radios or navigational aids at a level-two service. Level-three service is a 3,000 foot airstrip with minimum terminal facilities. That is, there is a building and there is some maintenance either by a small machine of our own left there or a contract with somebody in that particular community to do clearing. Level-four service is a licensed 3,000 foot. Now the member will notice that they are all the same length, one is basically an emergency, the other is some service and the third one is licensed for that level of service, which means it meets all those weird regulations I was mentioning earlier in my remarks. The fifth level of service is a 4,000 to 5,000 foot runway with full terminal facilities including an isolation area of living quarters, offices, ticket and baggage warehouse areas, water and sewer, lunch room, weather data facilities and air navigational aids. If the member wishes I could list for him our intentions at each location. So the airstrip program is laid out, and then what has happened is, depending on how many dollars are allocated, that much work is done. So it's a long-range or a long-term program. The member will recall that we are dealing here with communities of over 100 people that do not have highway access. There is a separate program under the Department of Industry and Commerce that can assist northern communities that do have road access with the construction of airstrips as well as Transport Canada's program at the major centres in northern Manitoba. But this program is dealing with those communities that do not have highway access.

So the level of service in the guidelines is set down and the present level of service in each community is listed. The various aspects of that community, the population of that community, the present and the potential usage by aircraft of that community, what we call an isolation factor - that is how dependent is that community on that particular airstrip - is built into the decision as to who gets what and when, and the level of service that we would expect to move to or would like to move to is indicated. Any analysis external to the department that has been done on transportation has not been inconsistent with the original guidelines and program that the department has laid out.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's remarks, but I think we're getting to a point now where a very valid question can be put to him, and that's this: Somewhere within the government a final report must exist, the final report of Hickling and Johnson must exist, and somewhere there must be some capability of at least duplicating it so that we can take a look at it. Then I think we would be in a position to have some external evaluation, albeit the Minister's determination is that it's not very

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . good; but at least some determination, and be external from the government with respect to the staging of the things that have to happen and the reasons for it and the data that supports their position. That would not only I think be very valuable for us, it would be very valuable I think for many people in the north, just to be in a position to have some understanding of the research that's been done. And there has been a substantial sum of money that's been paid for that study. So I wonder if he can give us an undertaking now to produce that report so that we have an opportunity of reviewing it and reviewing it in the light of the statements that have been made. I don't quarrel with his statements, I'm sure that what he's saying is correct, but at the same time I'd like that opportunity of being able to review it. I think it would be important because it was done for the purpose of evaluating northern transportation, part of which was the air service and air service requirements and the construction required for the remote communities.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, as soon as I track one of those down I intend to make a copy available to the Conservative caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back and ask the Minister about the question of the five communities that suffered some reduction or cessation of air service as a result of the Transport Canada having enforced certain regulations that were presumably in effect all the time, but for one reason or another it was considered necessary by the Minister of Transport to enforce this regulation or these regulations in these communities. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know the specific defect that was brought to the attention of the Minister in the case of each of the five airstrips that were in use. It may be one single condition that was considered to be substandard in each of the five airstrips, or on the other hand it may have been for a variety of reasons in each case. The Minister suggested that he doesn't know why the Minister of Transport chose to enforce the regulations at this time and indicated that it might have been that there was a complaint filed, either by a carrier or by a passenger or some other person involved. I think that's probably a fairly good assumption, that these airstrips have been in service for some considerable time without any accident, at least reported accident, and then with very little notice the Minister of Transport decided that they were substandard and couldn't be used until certain changes were made. Mr. Chairman, my question is, can the Minister tell me in each case, in the five cases which he mentioned, what the defect or defects were that caused the cessation of service?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: My understanding of it is, Mr. Chairman, that there were other strips that were affected by the enforcing of that regulation, and that there were also strips in the Northwest Territories affected by the strict application of that particular regulation. I think the member would understand that the position we took was that because these airstrips had been safely used for that period of time, that could not Transport Canada consider a temporary licence on the understanding that work would be completed by a certain date. Now in answer to the member's specific question, I know that at Ste. Theresa Point the problem is the width and angles from the airstrip and that there are rock outcroppings that go above the allowable angles, and that although it's an effective airstrip, it is not up to their licenceable standards. I thought that I had some specific information on all of these airstrips but it's a little bit more general than I thought. I think the problem at Oxford House is the length of the airstrip. This is a very long airstrip. In winter it's good, but there has to be a complete reconstruction because the very middle section of the airstrip can be unserviceable at break-up times. I think that the problem related mostly to the reconstruction and total levelling, the airstrip is not flat all the way along.

The Red Sucker Lake airstrip was hardly more than a cleared emergency strip, so a complete construction - we really hadn't got under way. It had been brushed and there had been a bulldozer over it but it was not in any way near a licenceable airstrip, so basically we're constructing it for the first time. That's Red Sucker Lake.

Little Grand Rapids, there was considerable work done at Little Grand Rapids,

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . but the site is a very rocky one. I'm not sure which of those problems at Little Grand Rapids led to the decision, whether it was the length and rock outcrops at one end or whether it was the side-angle outcrops, but my officials informed me that that work on Red Sucker Lake and Little Grand Rapids can be done this construction season to bring them to licenceable standard.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I take it from the explanations that the Minister doesn't have a letter of termination of service for each of the individual strips from the Minister stating specifically the problem that has caused the ruling. But I gather from the generalities that he has related, that it is a matter of clearances and grade elevations, either on the sides of the boundaries of the airstrips or on the overshoot areas. Would that, Mr. Chairman, be a reasonable summation of what the Minister has told us?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, there was a large listing of airstrips that didn't meet the licensing requirements, but some, as the member implied in his first question, there were some very minor changes, such as moving a building back or providing an apron or clearing brush to a greater distance, and those things were done where feasible.

The Red Sucker and Little Grand were planned in any regard for this upcoming construction season in the past. But the Estimates - maybe I made it sound a little simpler now that I have the figures in front of me, to bring Poplar River to the licensing standard, besides the land acquisition problem that we discussed, it appears it would be about \$400,000 to bring it to licenceable standard.

The Oxford House airstrip besides the land acquisition, it would cost about \$700,000 to bring it to licenceable standards. So that's a major reconstruction project, to bring that airstrip to licenceable standards, although we had allocated funds for the last two years for the Oxford House airstrip but because of the inability to settle the land question no work was proceeded with.

At Ste. Therese it would be about \$300,000 to bring that airstrip to licenceable standard. But there are some other concerns that we have there besides the fact that the community is not happy with the location, besides the fact that the airstrip is very good now, but it's the sidecrops that are the problem. The other factor at Ste. Therese that I forgot to mention earlier was that they're only 10 miles away from one of our level-five airstrips at Gardenhill. So those are the reasons why we've postponed a decision at Ste. Therese.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his explanations. There's just one observation that probably should be made at this stage. I presume that in the Department of Northern Affairs the Minister has someone who is reasonably informed on the regulations in respect to airstrip construction and the licensing of airstrips and airports, and I'm wondering how it was that all of these defects were allowed to remain and for the service to continue until they were brought to the attention of the department, to the surprise of the department, at one particular time. Is there not someone in the department who has the responsibility of ensuring that the facilities for air service in northern Manitoba are being conducted according to the regulations laid down by the Minister of Transport?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the program as entered into by the Province of Manitoba and initially begun, as the Leader of the Opposition stated the other day, under the previous administration, was basically to get an emergency strip into those communities. In fact, initially engineering work was not done in any detail on the various strips. And when the Member for Birtle-Russell and I discussed through the Chairman, of course, the matter of engineering services and what level of engineering is required, this is one area where I think it cost the people of Manitoba money because they didn't do the engineering services first. That is, strips were located and money was spent in areas that in fact could not be licenceable or that would only be licenceable with a considerable expenditure. Now decisions were made as to which airstrips would be brought to licenceable standards - and at that time there was no inkling from the Federal Government that they intended to change the status quo - that is, maybe some of the airstrips of this five wouldn't have been done right yet because others would have been upgraded first. When they did change the status quo by enforcing, yes, an existing regulation but one they had

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . ignored for five years, then there were some work changes, that is, the priorities had to be changed around. And we indicated that we would change those priorities around if the Transport Canada, which has responsibility in this area, would in fact cost-share in the reconstruction of those airstrips.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister then, were there any preliminary requests from the Minister of Transport over the, say, past 18 months or two years, pointing out that some of the strips being used were below standard and that it was important for the Province of Manitoba to bring them up to standard otherwise some action would have to be taken? Did you have any advance warning of that?

MR. McBRYDE: The advance warning was shortly before the closures and was basically a plea by local officials of Transport Canada who realized the regulations were going to be brought into effect, "Gee you guys, can't you do something? We're going to have to bring these regulations into effect." I don't believe it was any longer than two months and it was already after breakup, or I believe it was after the winter road season had been completed.

MR. MCGILL: Well then, Mr. Chairman, a final question. Did you as Minister then advise the Transport Canada that you were prepared to make the changes in order to continue the service if you were given the time? Or was there no communication between the department and Transport Canada until the edict came down that they were to cease operations?

MR. McBRYDE: The original discussion took place at the officials' level. My initial response to the federal authorities was that, "You guys certainly do have a problem, there is scheduled service in now that you've been allowing for five years and you should hurry up and get busy and do something if you want those airstrips to meet your standards." And after that response the First Minister indicated that we would cost-share on that upgrading if the Transport Canada would cost-share with us 50/50.

MR. MCGILL: Well then, at first, there was no offer of cost-sharing by Manitoba, then the decision came from the Ministry of Transport that the service would cease, then Manitoba decided to go 50/50. Is that essentially what happened?

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if it was not correct - and I'm going by memory now, I thought I had documentation, I couldn't seem to find it - was Ilford not one of the five that was listed originally?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I do have documentation, I'll just figure out which document it is. It was not one of the five that we're recently discussing. The original list was longer than five, but Ilford was not on that original list. I cannot recall offhand whether Ilford has a scheduled service in there at this time. I know that LamAir at one time did run a schedule through there. But I think the Member for Brandon West might appreciate there was such a thing that airlines carry out, and I don't understand why sometimes they get away with it, sometimes they don't, but sometimes they carry out a non-scheduled schedule. That is, it's basically a charter flight that arrives at 4 o'clock every day, and that's how they get around the regulations. So that might have been the kind of operation that went into Ilford, I'm not sure, but it was not on the original list that the Minister of Transport said, that these airstrips are no longer open to scheduled service.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised the question, I believe I was caught at the airfield in Ilford when the cancellation went in and I sat most of the day in there and finally had to catch the train out at night. But I was under the impression that Ilford was one of the five that were listed in that initial order, it was a scheduled service.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, the member could be correct. All I have here is the list of those communities served by Midwest, and those communities the Ministry of Transport advised on April 21, 1975 that the following airstrips do not meet standards for scheduled service: Berens River, Poplar River, Oxford House, God's Lake Narrows, Gardenhill, Red Sucker Lake, Little Grand Rapids, Cross Lake and God's River. But this was the notification to Midwest and Midwest did not serve Ilford. There



## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . were other strips that were affected that were serviced by other carriers, and the member could be in fact right.

MR. GRAHAM: Well then can I ask the Minister another question. Is it the intention of the government to upgrade the standards at those air fields that are only served by Midwest?

MR. McBRYDE: No. We had set, Mr. Chairman, the priorities of what work should be done in the various communities, and the federal enforcement of regulation caused us to adjust those priorities I am not sure exactly where - the Ilford airstrip has presently a level-2 service and we had hoped to take it up to a level-3 service which is still not a licenceable standard, that a scheduled air carrier would still not be able to land at Ilford. That was done by a listing of priorities, and that is that Ilford 1 has a small population and Ilford 2 has railway access, whereas some of the other communities have a larger population and no railway access and so they are higher on the priority list than Ilford.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister then indicate what would be required to bring the Ilford airfield to the level that is required under MOT regulations so it would qualify and be acceptable for regular scheduled service?

MR. McBRYDE: Not offhand, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRAHAM: Then I would like to ask another question. Has the Minister in his list of work made, or does he intend to make any attempt to ascertain what would be required to bring it up to a scheduled service field?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, that's information that has already been gathered and is part of the setting of what airstrips are going to be done next. I just do not have that information with me, and I can get it for the honourable member if he'll exercise a little bit of patience.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. In the Public Accounts ending 1975, March 31, there's \$441,000 for equipment. I'm wondering if the Minister could advise what this primarily covered, and as well what amount does he have in this year's budget for equipment and what it will cover?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable amount of equipment located at the various airstrips. I don't believe we brought our Public Accounts book with us, if you have one around we'd certainly appreciate it. And I'm not positive that those are expenditures on new equipment or repairs and maintenance of existing equipment that you're referring to there.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. Would the Minister have the amount that he has included in this year's Estimates for equipment and what it would cover?

MR. McBRYDE: I'm sorry I didn't get the question.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House how many dollars he has in this year's Estimates for equipment and any major items that might be covered under that particular expenditure?

MR. McBRYDE: The figures I can give the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, and I'm advised that the figures in Public Accounts are probably mostly for equipment rentals, not for equipment purchases - that is, the department will in fact lease equipment or hire local equipment that's available to do the maintenance work on airstrips. The member asked an earlier question, I didn't give him the answer to it yet, so I'll give him the answer to that and then give the breakdown of expenditures for each airstrip. Within those figures are the equipment costs and equipment rentals, if any, but I don't have it broken down between the maintenance of the building and the maintenance of the airstrip or exactly which of those costs are equipment costs. But the biggest part of the cost would be in fact the equipment costs of these locations.

For the figure, Mr. Chairman, Other Expenditures, the \$472,900 - within that figure are the general administration costs of that particular section of the operation which includes \$37,400 for fees; \$10,000 for printing and stationery; \$5,000 for postage and

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . telephone; \$66,200 for travel; \$7,000 for miscellaneous. Does the Member want that individual airstrip breakdown?

MR. MINAKER: I didn't quite hear what the Honourable Minister had indicated the \$37,400 were for, that was for fees, professional fees or what?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, that would be consultant fees for services and installations including standards requirements under Ministry of Transport, Department of Health, etc., continuing licencing fees, permits, association dues related to installation and associations in connection with operating requirements.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, in the Public Accounts there was an item of \$12,800 approximately for automobiles. I wonder if the Minister could advise whether this would be a capital expenditure or operating costs or where these automobiles would be utilized on supposedly remote located strips?

MR. McBRYDE: It is probable that that figure was for things such as half-tons and vehicles that were required in connection with the airport operation and maintenance.

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was of the understanding that that's what equipment was covered under, would be leased vehicles or operation of vehicles related to the operation of the airport. Maybe the Minister can comment on that.

The other area I was wondering about is that there is a figure of some \$71,000 approximately for freight and express in cartage. I was wondering how this cost is incurred and how much is in this year's Estimates for the similar?

MR. McBRYDE: On the first question. My understanding of the difference in those figures is that one would be for vehicles leased or rented from people in the community and the other figure would be for vehicles purchased by us. So that is why there is two different figures.

The costs, what are listed as freight in there and others - I think there was a couple of other items - are shown in the Estimates only in the general figure here and then in my book they are shown in terms of each airport as to what its expenditures are. But the cost there would be to the movement of goods in and out of the community. If there is something new coming in, radio equipment or even in some cases I suppose minor construction material, etc., or replacement parts, those would be shipped in and that would have to be paid for.

There is also the other problem that you have in these remote airstrips. If you have equipment or radio breakdown, especially with the radio services, you usually have to send it out. It's not simple enough that it can be done on the spot. Some of the equipment maintenance work has to be sent out as well.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can advise since 1975 how many airport strips, how many have been increased in number as far as the number of airstrips that Northern Affairs are now responsible for?

MR. McBRYDE: Most of the work being done now is to take an airstrip from an emergency stage or change of levels of that airstrip. I outlined five levels of service. If we took an airstrip from an emergency strip up to the next level of service or from the level-two to level-three service - Red Sucker Lake is the closest to new construction I believe that we were involved in last year. Most of it is continuing work on the airstrips to improve the service on those communities.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the Honourable Minister correctly there hasn't been an increase in number of strips as such or any great noticeable increase in numbers of strips in the last two years. I would ask the Minister why under Travelling that is \$30,345.85 as of March 31, 1975, and in his Estimates for this year he has a total of \$66,200 for travelling, why there is more than a double increase in this particular part of the Estimates?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the change is a bookkeeping or an accounting change. Some of the travel last year was charged to specific construction projects rather than broken out into separate items. Also what would have appeared under equipment costs when we sent somebody in to repair equipment, that would have been included in the cost of repairs as an item for travel. This year we have broken out Travel. But the level of expected travel is about the same.

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. Would this primarily be obviously air travel expenses? Also would the Manitoba Air Services Division be the prime benefit of that spending?

MR. McBRYDE: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MINAKER: Could the Honourable Minister advise the House would there be a similar figure for revenue from the Northern Affairs in the Air Division's Estimates for this year?

MR. McBRYDE: There would be a similar figure in the Air Division figures. As we have talked about with the other section of the Department the figures will appear in our budget as expenses and will also appear in their budget.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, under the Airport and Airstrip Operation and Maintenance we find we have here an estimated \$60,000 recoverable from the Federal Government of Canada. Can the Minister indicate if that is all that they anticipate to receive in the coming construction year from the federal-provincial cost-sharing agreements on airport construction?

MR. McBRYDE: That is an estimate only and the figure will increase it if more work is done. In the past season my understanding is that we recovered \$125,000 from the Federal Government.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate, is the construction program - will it be based on a 50-50 cost-sharing agreement or what is the exact breakdown or does it vary from airport to airport?

MR. McBRYDE: The five airstrips that Transport Canada has agreed to cost-share in, if they are proceeded with - two of them will be for sure, there is some question on the other three - that would be on a 50-50 cost-sharing. Under the Manitoba Northlands Agreement the cost-sharing is on a 60 percent federal, 40 percent provincial figure. At the time these Estimates were prepared we did not have the firm offer from the Federal Government Ministry of Transport to cost-share on those particular airstrips.

MR. GRAHAM: So in essence then the \$60,000 could increase significantly if we had a favourable construction period this summer?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Honourable Minister correctly on his explanation of the increase in travel costs, the \$66,200, from the recorded of somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$30,000, that prior to that in the accounting system it would have been any travel expenses incurred to try and say repair equipment, etc. would be shown under that cost. Then is the Minister suggesting at the March 31 year-end Public Accounts that possibly in the equipment of \$441,000 there could be \$10,000 - \$20,000 worth of travel in there? Or in the other sections under expenditures to make an area of somewhere around \$60,000 for travel expenses two years ago?

MR. McBRYDE: It is a little bit difficult to match up. Under equipment certain travel costs have been switched out this year and identified separately as travel costs. It's a little bit difficult to compare the Public Accounts figures and the figures that we use on a regular operational basis. What I will try and do, for the other section of the department is attempt to get my officials to review those Public Accounts with these and see if we can explain the Public Accounts figures if the member would like that, as we proceed.

The Member for Birtle-Russell has left now. I mis-explained the revenue recoveries as they appear in the Budget Book. These Other Expenditures are not revenue recoveries, I'm sorry, for construction. They are revenue recoveries because on the two airstrips, Norway House and Gardenhill, we received federal cost-sharing on the operations and maintenance of those two airstrips. That's the 60,000 item, not a construction item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BIAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to the Minister. I am interested in his remarks earlier in relation to equipment and vehicles. Is there any way

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) . . . .that he could provide us with a reasonably good breakdown on what type of vehicles and what type of equipment this covers?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, if the member could wait until we get to Equipment Repair and Maintenance. I can't tell him exactly which pieces but I can tell him how many and where they are. I don't know whether it is a (d)(6) or a (d)(7) but it is . . . .

MR. BLAKE: I wonder if you can tell us what were trucks or half-tons or what were passenger vehicles or . . . .

MR. McBRYDE: Maybe by the time we get to that section I will be able to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 99(d)(2) - the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Chairman, I want to go back again to the airstrip problem and the five airstrips that the Minister mentioned that had difficulties and the airstrips that he was dealing with at the moment. Now there are some more airstrips in Northern Manitoba that have had to cancel out on sched-service. One that is a fairly important one I think, prior to the edict from Ottawa cancelling the service was Oxford House. I am wondering what the Manitoba Government is doing about bringing Oxford House airstrip up to standard. Is there a project under way to enable the carrier to resume sched-service to Oxford House?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, Oxford House is one that I've mentioned three or four times. Oxford House is one of the communities where we have no agreement on land transfer. Transport Canada requires that if they are going to be involved in any cost-sharing we have to hold title to the land. For example Norway House and Gardenhill, which we just touched upon, they consider us - well we almost hold title. It's quite close that we'll have title. It has been agreed to with the Band themselves. They cost-share now operation and maintenance, or they have in the past, on those two level five services that we have.

But it is our policy, it is my policy as Minister that because of that federal policy I have set a policy that we will not proceed with construction until we have title. The reason for that is that we have got ourselves, at least on one occasion, in a serious bind where we have proceeded with the work - over a million dollars - were eligible for about \$400,000 of federal cost-sharing which they would not pay to us because we didn't hold title. We held title to most of the airstrip but part of it was on reserve. The community knew that we were going to lose \$400,000 if we didn't get title and they took every advantage of that in negotiation and it cost us three or four times what the land was worth to purchase. So now, since these communities are there to serve the community, we will not proceed with construction unless we hold title. The Federal Government will not cost-share unless we hold title. We are attempting to get them to approve a lease, a long-term lease arrangement, as opposed to title. They have indicated an interest but not a confirmation that they would accept a long term lease.

Oxford House was intended for construction last year; the equipment was moved to God's Narrows and construction work was carried on at God's Narrows because we had no agreement with the Oxford Band on land title. Until we do get that confirmation, either a long-term lease approval by Transport Canada or title, we will not proceed with construction.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand that at Oxford House, one of the difficulties is that the terminal building is too close to the runway. The clearance is not adequate and that this could be corrected by moving the building back 50 or 60 feet. Is there some other difficulty other than just this particular proximity of the terminal building to the edge of the runway?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, maybe the member got his communities mixed up. That was one of the few problems that existed at Gardenhill and we couldn't just move it back because it would have been in the water so we had to move the strip right across to the other side which now means that people are going to be walking back and forth across the airstrip to get there. But it meets federal licencing requirements.

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd)

At Oxford House there needs to be, and the estimate I read earlier to one of the members at that time was \$700,000 worth of work - that's last year's estimate, it's probably \$800,000 worth of work at Oxford House to bring it to a licenceable standard.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I understand that at Ilford and Split Lake, there was also a sched-service being provided until last fall. Ilford and Split Lake. Could the Minister tell us what the difficulties are there specifically and has he any proposal or is there any project under way in order to bring them up to standard?

MR. McBRYDE: The long-term plans of the department were to bring Ilford to a level three service. I'm just double checking here on if we intended to spend dollars in this upcoming season. Of course what we did in airstrips is said, if we have a so many million dollar program, here's what we intend to do. But now we have a little bit lesser program than that. We had to, of course, cut off the ones lower down the priority. I do not believe that Ilford was scheduled for work this upcoming year but I'm not positive.

Split Lake is a different situation. My recollection of Split Lake is that there is a problem there in terms of land as well and we have not reached agreement with the Band yet. Members might be well aware that there is a road heading in that direction that is up to the Odei River at this time and there is some discussion of the possibility, for the upcoming season, of a barge service into Split Lake and in the next two or three years a completion of the road to the community of Split Lake. Therefore that would put it in my mind lower down the priority list because if they have road access then the need for an airstrip is not as great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 99(d)(2)--pass? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: We have on this side sat patiently listening to the Minister giving us his explanation of what seems to be the problem with the various airstrips in the northern communities in Manitoba. We have asked and other members on this side of the House have asked questions on numerous occasions asking for specifics of the problems that existed with the regulations of the Ministry of Transport. Quite frankly, sir, at this time I cannot in all sincerity accept the words of the Minister. I don't believe that he has given the House the full facts and I would hope that at some time, some members of the House would be given the facts as they exist.

What we have heard from the Minister has been many words. In his recollection this is what the problem is and in his estimation this is what it is. He has the staff; he is supposed to be prepared to bring us facts and everything into this Chamber and so far, sir, he has not done it. It is regrettable that this has not occurred. I would hope that he would be very open in his Estimates and give us all the facts as they pertain to the problems that have existed with the Ministry of Transport and the Province of Manitoba. So far he has given us nothing. Sir, I at this time register that regret because I think that it is important that any Minister of the Crown know what he is doing and know what the problems are in this province. I cannot see any material progress being made to assist communities in northern Manitoba and to improve the air service if we have an attitude such as this occurring in this province. So I would hope that the Minister would put a little more effort into what he is doing and report to the House so that we can see concrete evidence that there is a sincere effort being made on his behalf.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, first of all I have to take issue with the first point made by the member. The Member for Birtle-Russell has never sat patiently under any circumstances that I can recall. If we were to anticipate every question that was to be asked and brought all the information necessary, we would have had to have wheelbarrows to bring it in here. I'm sorry we don't bring in here every single detail of every possible question that could be asked. But if the member would like a further breakdown on the individual airstrips then within the time left today I will attempt to begin to give him that.

And Berens River, which is anticipated to be a class D airstrip 2,999 feet in length. The funds expended to date on that airstrip have been - the total to last fall on the Berens River airstrip was \$250,000. Another \$8,000 has been expended this year.

## SUPPLY - NORTHERN AFFAIRS

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . It was anticipated when the list was made out for \$258,000. The estimated cost to bring that airstrip to a class D airstrip is \$135,500 and the estimated cost if the desire was to bring it to a class C airstrip of 4,000 feet would be \$898,000.

The Bissett airstrip, further expenditures to bring it to a class D qualification would be \$636,000 to bring it to a class D.

The next one is Brochet, class D. The funds required to complete Brochet to a class D would be \$231,000.

Cormorant is only an emergency strip and there are no estimates of the cost to bring it to a different standard because Cormorant is now served by a road. When it was constructed it was not served by a road.

Cross Lake is a licenceable class D and to be a licenceable class D it must have 2,999 feet. Now some of these strips will have more but that other section may not be licensed. It might not meet the width or something but they'll have more usable length than indicated. Cross Lake, class D - we have expended to date approximately \$800,000 and we need to complete Cross Lake, and I imagine this is on the schedule, \$36,000.

The Easterville strip which is an emergency strip now as they now have road access.

The Island Lake is a class C, 4,000 feet. The amount required to bring that to a licenceable standard is \$60,798. The amount expended on that strip to date however, Mr. Chairman, to bring it to that level has been over a million dollars.

The God's Lake Narrows strip, to bring it to class D would require \$500,000. To upgrade the God's Lake Narrows strip to a class C would require \$1.1 million.

Granville Lake, to bring it to a class D would require a further \$350,000.

Iford, to bring it to a class D would require a further \$350,000.

Little Grand Rapids, to bring it to class D would require a further \$600,000.

Matheson Island, to bring it to a class D would require nearly \$300,000.

Moose Lake, to bring it to a class D would require \$450,000.

Nelson House is an emergency strip as they now have road access.

Norway House, to bring it to a class C would require a further \$833,000.

Oxford House, to bring it to a class D would require, as I said earlier, approximately \$700,000.

The Paungassi, to bring it to a class D, a rough estimate of \$600,000.

Pikwitonei, to bring it to a class D, also about \$600,000.

Poplar River, to bring it to a class D about \$400,000.

Pukatawagan, to bring it to a class D, \$78,000 and I believe that work is anticipated.

Red Sucker Lake, to bring it to a class D, it's about \$600,000.

Shamattawa, to bring it to a class D, would be \$125,000.

Sherridon, to bring that to a class D strip would be about \$800,000.

Split Lake, to bring it to a class D would be \$230,000.

St. Theresa Point, to bring it to a class D would be \$422,000.

Thicket Portage is an emergency strip.

Wasagamow, to bring it to a class D of 2,000 feet would be \$400,000.

York Landing, to bring it to a class D would be \$71,000.

Tadoule Lake, no construction at all, would be \$300,000 to put in an emergency strip.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being Private Members' Hour, in accordance with our Rule 19(2), I'm leaving the Committee and Committee will resume at 8 p.m. this evening with the Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The first item Monday on Private Members' Hour is resolutions. We are on Resolution 10. The Honourable Minister for the Public Insurance Corporation has three minutes left on this resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I had an amendment to present to the House but one of my colleagues will present it. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave for a couple of minutes to get the amendment that I have to present to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Public Insurance Corporation.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I finished my remarks last week, primarily I had indicated that the removal of serial numbers was not only impractical but highly improbable. Most vehicles as I indicated have two serial plates on there, one of them is an affixed serial number, the other is a hidden serial number which still could be traced.

Secondly, we tried to sell the salvage vehicles to the salvors and as a result our return for salvaged vehicles dropped. The honourable member in his arguments wanted us to remove serial numbers and also he wanted a larger return brought back to the claimants or to the motoring public of Manitoba for parts. He cannot have it both ways. If we are to remove serial numbers then we must recognize that the return for the salvage vehicle if it is to be wrecked has to be changed, the method has to be changed.

In this way, Mr. Speaker, I propose to present an amendment and I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that all the words in the second WHEREAS be removed after the word "Corporation" and the following substituted:

"Settles its claims for vehicles which have been written off either on an actual cash basis with the Corporation retaining the salvaged vehicle or having the insured retain the salvaged vehicle."

No. 2. Remove the third and fourth paragraphs and substitute the following:

"AND WHEREAS the vehicle claim settled on an actual cash basis are either auctioned, tendered or sold on a quoted price basis by the Corporation, as has been the practice prior to the concept of public insurance."

No. 3. Remove all the words in the last paragraph after the word "Government" and substitute the following:

"Consider the advisability of expanding its vehicle inspection program which would enable the province to inspect the road worthiness of such vehicles that are reconditioned."

MOTION on the amendment presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to have a copy of that amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Roblin wish to speak on the amendment?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a very timely one and while I haven't had a chance to look at the amendment, the debate and the quality of standards that we're arguing about reminds me of our experience here of some three or four evenings ago with the Honourable Minister of Labour when we were debating the safety standards of mobile and recreational trailers. The standard of safety that we feel should be included in especially the recreational trailer concept of the Minister's department, and the concept of the Minister is again two different ball parks.

I would say in our suggestions to the Minister of Labour, what's the sense of putting a trailer out on the road and guaranteeing all the possible safety when you haven't checked the vehicle that's pulling the trailer, and it's that simple. Certainly we support the concept of all possible safety with regard to recreational trailers. Certainly they're going to check the trailer. Check the car because it's the vehicle. This is something similar in the arguments that have been going on regarding the resolution of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

## RESOLUTION 10

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

I suppose, Mr. Speaker - the Member for Wolseley in his resolution mentioned the fact that there's a need to ensure that all vehicles are roadworthy and safe and there's no quarrel with that. Certainly I understand that. The other points of the resolution, while they were maybe not correctly paraphrased to the wishes of the Minister, I think the intent was a good one and one that certainly deserves the attention of this House regarding these derelict cars, Mr. Speaker. The Highways Minister in his remarks mentioned the fact that these vehicles were called in for a safety test and provided with a roadworthy certificate but he still wasn't able to guarantee us that they were all called in. Are they called in - a car that's been in an accident, a severe accident - are they called in on a regular basis, on an annual basis or twice a year? Because naturally if they've been in an accident or rather a serious accident or been rolled they are more susceptible to be less safe than a car that's a new vehicle.

One of the things of safety standards that I'm wondering while we're dealing with them, and maybe it can be brought into this debate, is the matter of headlights. I drive quite a bit and I don't know whether these are wrecked cars that's on the road but the number of cars that have headlights with one, when they put them on bright one will go up and one will come down. It's amazing in this province and I know the Minister has got his mobile unit testing this. I don't think - especially on a corner, there's a more dangerous aspect when you're coming around a curve in the road and here's a guy supposed to be dimming his lights and instead of that he's flashing them and instead of you getting the one you get the other one and especially if you're on the outside lane trying to feel your way around there, where's the curb. So there certainly is room for a safety check.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the debate of this resolution the thing that has interested me and quite a number of people in the province is the fact that the government is going into the salvage business. In reading the latest issue of the Dauphin Herald that's come across my desk, I find that a chap in Dauphin is not very happy about the - in fact he says in his article here that he rejects the province's intervention into the salvage business and he said that he basically belonged to a group of some 29 dealers that call themselves the Manitoba Auto and Truck Salvage Association. They had proposed what they thought was a fairly legitimate deal to the Minister to establish a central clearing house about a year ago and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that the fact of the matter is, that system was proposed by the Corporation to the salvagers over a year ago, not as has been stated by the honourable member quoting from the paper.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, possibly that is correct. I have no way - I wasn't at the meetings or the hearings or the discussions that were held. But apparently, as the article goes, the Honourable Minister blamed the private salvage dealers for not establishing such a clearing house and used that as a sort of a vehicle for the government to get into the business within a couple of years. This group, this Manitoba Auto and Truck Salvagers Association, say that the proposal that they set up called apparently for the University of Manitoba to set up a sort of a computerized system using the university's computer with the cost to be borne by the government and operated by Autopac with the co-operation of the private dealers. Apparently the evidence that they had showed that this would offer some \$5 million in savings, if my information is correct, from the listing of the parts of wrecked automobiles and listing where they were and what condition they were in. Naturally these people were hopeful that the government and the Minister would accept their proposal and they could jointly enter into this business together and maybe the Minister is looking at that possibility for a future development to handle the used parts. Because there certainly is a lot of need and use for them in the province. I hope that when the meetings are terminated that the establishment of that type of a system will make use of the parts.

It's an interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, that with the matter of used cars there's certainly some people that are quite capable of taking a used vehicle and repairing it and



## RESOLUTION 10

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd) . . . . putting it in excellent roadworthy condition and certainly he wouldn't put it on the road unless it was safe. But on the other hand there are others - and I don't know if there's any records that we have or access to figures - of those unsafe vehicles, if in fact they are the cause of some of the serious accidents in the province or not, because I don't suppose those figures are available at this time.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do think that it is a very timely resolution and while the member that presented it did have some problems with some of the phrases I haven't had a chance to study the amendment that's offered by the Minister. But I think it's a timely one and I hope that it gets more discussion in the ensuing weeks of the session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the amendment and I would hope that, from a point of clarification, would I get an opportunity to close debate on the motion? --(Interjection)-- All right.

Speaking to the amendment, and I would hope I would be able to speak to the motion later on, I would like to congratulate the Minister because I consider it a victory. If nothing else, the resolution has brought forward some of the serious problems in the particular recycling, if you want to call it that, or the written-off vehicle area. I think the fact that these written-off or severely damaged vehicles are now going to have an inspection has been long overdue and if nothing else we feel very gratified on this side of the House that we've prompted the members opposite to respond.

I see nothing wrong with clause 2 and 3 in the amendment. But I would have to very strongly, based on common sense and a gut feeling, have to oppose No. 1. I say that because human nature being what it is and trying to be helpful to the Minister I really think that he should consider the giving back, I call it, of the written-off vehicles to their original owners as a practice that should be discontinued, discontinued because in my opinion it discriminates against the good drivers. When I think of the fact that the Autopac has the gall to sue the Free Press I would think that - and worried about their damaged reputation or the harm that it has done to the Corporation - I would like somebody to start a class action against Autopac because what they are doing is they are allowing people to buy back their automobiles. They are buying back their own automobiles for zero after receiving full payment from Autopac.

Let me give you the example of two young 23-year-olds that both paid \$700 each for a 1969 Pontiac. Both financed that car at the bank. One of them runs into a tree; he collects \$700 from Autopac and gets his car back. The other poor fellow has to continue his payments to the finance company or the credit union. The other fellow has received a nice big fat cheque. Sure he has a creased side on his car and maybe his car doesn't quite look the same, but he's now driving a free automobile, a free automobile, and he may take a hammer and bang out the dents. That's why you see so many of these old wrecks on the highway today with dents all over them and you wonder when is this dodgem car situation all going to end.

The Free Press talked about a certain amount of money. Well I have a paper here that talks about \$68.1 million in revenue and I'm part of that car pool and I think that I have a right as a taxpayer to demand that that money, that some of that money, that a maximum amount of that money come back to the pot. I can't see you giving back the car to the person who has insured the car. It just doesn't make sense; it's discriminating against the good drivers.

But I'm only speaking to the amendment and I really think that Autopac has become big business because when you get in a central province in the west here of \$68.1 million in revenues, that's a lot of dented fenders. --(Interjection)-- Yes, Mr. Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Would the honourable member permit a question? Does the honourable member realize that if a motorist decides to receive the actual value of the car as a settlement he does not keep the car?

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, speaking through you, it would seem to me that the very amendment says that, having the insured retain the salvaged vehicle. So I would indicate by those words that the Minister is intending to not only give the insured person back full value, written-off value for his car, but also to give him the vehicle besides.

## RESOLUTION 10

(MR. WILSON cont'd) . . . . If I'm wrong then maybe the Minister would like to interject and stand up and give me some clarification or maybe later on when he's finishing off or closing debate on his resolution.

I really think that some day the inefficiency that has led to the 19.3 deficit, that a lot of these truisms are going to come home and some day that organization's going to be found out and this is one example of discrimination against good drivers. Seven thousand vehicles written off is not a record to be proud of, it's not a record to be proud of. I don't know if the appraisers need a re-education but I think there should be closer scrutiny of what is written off.

Well, what it says to the driver and to the Minister opposite is the fact that maybe we should be looking at a premium for people with bad records more so than what you're doing now because in my opinion the good drivers are certainly paying for the bad ones more so than they did under the private insurance.

A MEMBER: That's the whole principle of insurance.

MR. WILSON: Well I can't see how members opposite can justify - I call them Mac's Milk Stores - but an Autopac Store on every corner where people have to go in lineups and where they seem to encourage people coming in. I remember in the old days people had a deductible so they would be more careful of walking in and getting their car repaired because their insurance rates would go up and there would be a certain factor involved and --(Interjection)-- Well I don't think it's anything to be proud of because what you're doing to the good drivers is - because automatically that repair is a cost - it would seem to me that that cost is being passed on to the good drivers.

Again I just can't see how you fellows can justify a 19.3 deficit with all the sand-bagging and I call it overstaffing and waste, questionable ads that you put in the paper. It seems that this year you had a surplus, so what did you do? You went on an advertising binge. It seems that rather than give it back in a premium reduction or give it back to reduce the debt you seem to advertise everywhere saying how wonderful it is. You even put in a huge Christmas ad which I had somewhere here on my desk which all the Autopac agents didn't have any choice, they had to pay their \$10 or \$12 to put in a Christmas greeting. In my opinion, it was a form of pressure that was unwarranted.

MR. ENNS: Ask them about the ad in Time Magazine, Bob.

MR. WILSON: The Member from Lakeside says to ask about the ad in Time Magazine and maybe the Minister would like to comment on that a little later. I'll have a chance to close debate, I just wanted to say that this amendment in itself is the type of thing that I thought my resolution would prompt. I still feel that we have a duty as part of that \$68.1 million pot to get all the money we can back to help reduce premiums and to make the Autopac plant more efficient.

I'm surprised and I can't honestly feel that if we're going to go into seat belt legislation; if we're going to go into a safety program of finally getting around to safety checking some of these cars; if we're going to remove a lot of these pre-70 wrecks off the highway and give them to the salvage operators, give them to the wrecking yards and get some money back for scrap metal - why down south of the border you get as high as \$121 a ton for scrap metal and every car weighs a ton and a quarter. Now why aren't we approaching the Manitoba Rolling Mills or Mandak or whatever they call themselves and getting the better price. I was reading an article in the paper where the Minister was criticized by the wreckers and the Minister came back and said that the wreckers weren't paying enough for it. Well obviously he did not have the communication with them because I can assure them that if they didn't buy the parts, I would have put the pressure on them by saying all right - to the parts people - if you don't want to buy these cars, I'll send them straight to General Shredders and they'll be crushed for scrap metal and then there'll be a shortage of parts. But you still would have got your \$70 a car which in my opinion is a lot fairer to the good drivers of this province than to auction them off for \$5.00 to the body shops or \$25 like I've seen some of those sales, and have that car doctored up and back on the road without a safety certificate. So therefore your amendment, by making sure these cars have a safety certificate, is long long overdue.

I also think that when you come to sell them, some of those '74s that you've

## RESOLUTION 10

(MR. WILSON cont'd) . . . . written off, I think you have a duty to the taxpayers to put a reserve bid on them. Six or eight hundred dollars. There's a demand for them. Don't be in such a hurry. If the reserve bid isn't met it can be laid over until the next sale. If it happens to be raining the Saturday you're selling those cars, have the better ones if they've got a reserved tag, laid over until the next auction sale. Don't be in such a hurry to politicize the cars to your friends or whatever it is you're doing.

--(Interjection)--

Yes I'm also talking about the body shops. They sure had a sweet deal under your operation. You're talking about giving them a raise. They already get \$12.56 an hour with goodness knows how many padded time slots in there. I don't know what controls you have over the time element involved in some of these. --(Interjection)-- Well I just wish that we'd get to the stage where political donations are made public and we'd see how many of these body shops do donate to the party.

And a question to the House. I asked the Minister the other day what type of raise? Was it going to fall within the Anti-Inflation guidelines? You're shocked at \$12.56 an hour. Have the Minister stand up and tell you what he's going to give his friends an hour and that's going to be at a cost to the good drivers. It's going to increase the cost of repairing the car.

Well as I say I wanted to save something to close debate on my own motion because I felt it had a lot of merit. I will support 2 and 3 but I'm against giving the car back to the insured person. I believe you have a duty to put those cars up for public tender. In the private sector if I sold a car other than at a public auction sale, we could be sued. But you people get away with it. You give it back to the insured. That car belongs to the taxpayers and you have a duty to give us a maximum return and there must be a chance - and the Minister of Mines has gone but he could probably comment on whether there was grounds for a class action because you're turning around and taking part of that \$68.1 million and you are not getting the maximum return for the taxpayers.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION carried.

QUESTION put on the Resolution as amended, MOTION carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 8

MR. SPEAKER: Next resolution is Resolution 8. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, when the resolution that's before us at the present time was last before this House there were a number of interesting comments that were made by members on either side of the House and I would like to deal with some of those comments from perhaps a somewhat different perspective.

It seems to me that in listening particularly the Member for Fort Rouge, he seemed to have the impression that the problem that was outlined by the Member for Point Douglas was one of poverty and the effects of poverty. I will not try to underestimate the problem that is created in the core area, primarily as a result of poverty, but on the other hand I think we make a mistake if we assume that all delinquents, juvenile delinquents, in this country are the product of poverty. I have been in some of the better areas of the city as well and we have from time to time had numerous reports; Fort Garry, River Heights, Charleswood, other areas of the city where the problem of juvenile delinquency certainly cannot be attributed to the poverty stricken people of River Heights.

It seems to me that there is a far more fundamental problem facing society than just the infusion of greater and greater amounts of capital and money in order to solve problems. It seems to be predominant thinking on the part of certain types of people at least that all the problems of the world can be solved by simply spending more money. We've ever had examples of the futility of that kind of experiment. We have them all around us. We have them in many respects in the core area; we have them in the north; we have them in other areas of Canada as well. It seems to me that if the problem of juvenile delinquency is to be attacked then we must examine some of the methods that we've attempted to use in solving those problems in the past.

## RESOLUTION 8

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

It seems to me that politicians as a general rule, and I don't attempt to exclude myself from that group, have taken very shortsighted approaches to the solving of problems. As a matter of fact I'd go so far as to say that if we hadn't taken such shortsighted views in the initial instance we wouldn't have created all the problems. I venture to suggest that 90 percent of the problems that are being faced today by society have been created by shortsighted policies initiated by governments, the inability to think beyond the next election, the inability to examine the long-range implications of decisions taken by governments and their impact and their effect on lifestyles and the future of this country.

We have a pretty good example of that sort of thing before us right now in Law Amendments. Some of the recommendations that are being made before this Committee now are beginning to reveal to us what the real impact of that legislation will be, notwithstanding all of its good intentions. But I don't want to get into that subject, I simply use it as an illustration to demonstrate the point that I'm making, that all too often we are the authors of our own difficulties by shortsighted legislation created in haste without any consideration to its long-term implications.

It seems that the modern parent, having been unable to instill something of the challenges that the youth of generations ago had before them - I know that on the farms of this country during the early pioneering years there was no problem with juvenile delinquency and largely not because the parents of those children did not have the love and the affection or did not want to administer the discipline that was necessary, but simply because every one of those children were made to feel an important part of that family. They were a part of the economic life of that family because each one of them contributed; each one had a responsibility and each one carried out that responsibility or he knew the reason why. Today the modern home is equipped with so many labour-saving devices that there really is no responsibility for the child other than a turning up of the thermostat which is about the hardest work there is to do in the modern home.

A lot of parents seem to think that they can replace that kind of challenge and that kind of responsibility in children by simply shovelling them off to the nearest recreation centre and we in this House place a great deal of emphasis on the need for increased recreational facilities. We send them out to the hockey rink at six o'clock in the morning thinking that we've contributed or at least that we have fulfilled our responsibility to those children by shovelling them off to somebody else to look after. Well it is not, in my opinion, instilling one iota of responsibility on the part of that child. As a matter of fact it's probably, in the way that hockey today is being taught to children, it's probably doing that child a great deal more damage than it's doing him good; the accent on violence and the accent on the need to win at all cost.

Although I do not attempt to suggest that recreation is not an important part of a child's life, I do not think that we can replace challenges, economic challenges if you will, with recreation in the hope that it's going to do the kind of job, that it's going to instill within that child that sense of responsibility it would get if he was doing something with which he could take a considerable amount of pride in knowing that he's contributing something to society and something to the maintenance of his own family.

It seems to me that unless we are able to do a better job and surely now we have had a great deal of evidence before us - in the '60s and perhaps even before that we had, I suppose maybe justifiably, the feeling that the creation of wealth in this country would never end and that the measure of success of any nation was the increase in the gross national product and so we set that up as our idol and worshipped at it. We now have come to realize that there are other goals and there are other objectives and that the never-ending supply of money that we felt was there is not there after all.

The result of those policies, the result of the government involvement in so many areas has created the greatest problem that this country has ever faced and that's the problem of inflation and we have found no way of now stopping this monster that we've created. It has misshapen our characters; it has developed in many of our people the feeling that the answer to all problems is simply the creation of more and more wealth - I shouldn't say wealth because I make a distinction between wealth and money.

## RESOLUTION 8

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

I feel that unless we recognize the mistakes of the past and make some effort to correct them - now I've heard it said by a good many people that the youth of today would not stand for any reduction in our standards of living, would not stand for any effort on the part of government to retrace its steps somewhat and to get back to a style of living that we can really afford and to do the things that are necessary to ensure that future generations are not going to be deprived of much of the wealth of this nation. I do not believe that that is true because I believe that the youth of this nation, if they're looking for anything, they're looking for challenges and they're not receiving any from us because we're attempting more and more to ensure that nothing is placed in their way in their security.

It's the very creation of that kind of security on the part of the individual by governments that has created attitudes that are detrimental to the well-being of this country. I think it's important that we recognize that if we're to provide for society a generation of people that can act responsibly and assume responsibilities for the maintenance of their own families rather than depending upon governments to do it, if we're to recognize the importance of doing that and if we're to ensure that the future will indeed belong to Canada, then we've got to change some of those attitudes. The changing of those attitudes is the first step in solving a good many of the problems that were outlined by various speakers in this particular resolution.

I would hope that we could learn from the lessons of the past, not with a blind eye but with open minds; not with a partisan viewpoint but with the recognition of how the problems were created in the first place and how they can best be dealt with. It is only when we're able to do that that we're able to legislate effectively and properly for the future.

The introduction of this resolution, and I know that I have strayed somewhat from it but I'm not unusual because I think that others have done the same thing, the introduction of this resolution as well-intentioned as it may have been, I rather suspect will have the impact that was outlined by the Member for Flin Flon and the Member for St. Matthews and others. I don't want to make the mistake that some of my colleagues have made in suggesting that the sounding of the sirens in the City of Winnipeg is going to have the same kind of impact it will have in the rural communities.

In the small towns we are accustomed to that siren going at twelve o'clock, at one o'clock and at six o'clock and we know what time of the day it is just simply by listening to the sirens. It is not necessarily a curfew, it is not intended to be a curfew. It is simply an indication to a lot of youngsters who are on the streets that it is time either to get home, get back to school or get home from school. And it works. As the Member for Pembina pointed out it's not regarded as a curfew but it does have an impact on the minds of a good many young people in the rural areas because they recognize that it is nothing more than an indication that it's time for them to do something.

We don't have the nine o'clock curfew or the nine o'clock siren and so I can't tell you just what kind of an impact it has insofar as bringing kids home at night. We have the same problem in the rural towns in my area as they do in any other area. Children being what they are have an inclination to want to stay out. I think largely, again, the reason they want to stay out is because there's nothing really better for them to do, in spite of the fact that we have provided all sorts of recreational facilities for them. The people of that community and many other communities have mortgaged themselves for many years ahead in order to provide adequate recreational facilities and if that isn't proof that that does not solve the problem then I don't know what proof we need. There are other things that need to be done and I think bringing a sense of responsibility, sense of achievement to young minds today is the best way of dealing with the present problems of poverty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas will be closing debate on this resolution. The Honourable Member.

REV. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the fact that a number of honourable members have spoken on this resolution

## RESOLUTION 8

(REV. MALINOWSKI cont'd) . . . . . which I had introduced.

It is clear from their remarks that there is common agreement on all sides about the seriousness of the trend toward the wrong behaviour among youth in present day society.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley thought we might be over-reacting in considering a curfew for children under 14 years of age.

But the statistics I quoted when I introduced this resolution and what you can read in the papers almost daily does not leave any room for complacency on our part.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley, and other honourable members have stressed the cost that would be involved in our attempts to enforce a curfew.

The costs, Mr. Speaker, is also my greatest concern. But I am thinking of the other costs. I would like to point out the far greater costs that are involved in building, maintaining and enlarging facilities to detain juvenile delinquents once they have gone wrong and the far greater costs of maintaining the juvenile delinquents when they have become hardened adult criminals. But up to this point I haven't even mentioned the greatest cost of all - the cost of wrecked human lives; the cost in unhappiness for youngsters who end up behind bars and the unhappiness of their parents who may have had such great hopes for them.

It is impossible to measure the costs of human happiness, anguish and suffering over youngsters that went wrong. For us in this Chamber there must be the agonizing feeling that with proper parental guidance and the proper conditions in society, many of the youngsters who ended up in a life of crime might have become respected citizens, citizens that would be making their contributions to society instead of being a burden to society.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the establishment of a curfew in our cities will turn all potential delinquent youngsters into angels. I consider it simply one important step in the right direction. It is one of many steps that must be taken to cope with complex human problems.

Other honourable members have stressed the point that parents, the church and the schools must assume greater responsibility for the behaviour and character development of children. I agree it would be a happy situation if parents, the church and school had greater influence in shaping the characters of the young. But I must face the fact that times have changed since I was a little boy.

I ask all honourable members in my own age bracket, and those a little older, to think back to the time when they were about ten years old. What a different world it was! Our characters were shaped to a much greater extent by our parents, the church and the school. But not any more.

Whether you went to a small country school, or a school in the city, proper respect for the teacher and a certain standard of behaviour was insisted upon. Teachers then didn't have the same discipline problem they have today.

Years ago a far greater proportion of youngsters came under the influence of some church. A greater number of young people became involved in activities sponsored by, or centered around the church. But not any more. Unfortunately, in my view, and I hate to admit it, the church today does not exert the same influence on the youth as it once did.

A most potent influence on children is the television set and what appears on it. Then there are the movies, the comic books, magazines and the incredible garbage appearing in the magazine racks in every drug store. Those of us in my age group were not subjected to any of these influences in our youth. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that much of what children are subjected to nowadays on TV, the movies, the bad literary garbage and so on is bound to have a had influence on immature minds of children.

When I look at the youngest members in this House I sometimes wonder how they grew up to become such respected members of the community despite these bad influences and the many temptations facing youngsters today.

A curfew alone will not free children from the many bad influences in present-day society but I sincerely believe it will help keep them from getting involved in serious

## RESOLUTION 8

(REV. MALINOWSKI cont'd) . . . . mischief because of such influences. It will keep them from many temptations towards wrong behaviour. It will help to restore a little more authority to the parents. When they ask their children to be home at a certain hour in the evening they will know they also have the law on their side. Now they are without anything. I believe a curfew would also help those youngsters who have little or no parental guidance or control.

Some honourable members have raised the question of freedom. Mr. Speaker, no one loves freedom more than I do, I fought for it. I would not wish to deny legitimate freedoms to anyone of any age but legitimate freedom means acting in a way that we do not harm our fellow men.

No one in the name of freedom can break windows, slash tires, snatch purses, hurt or kill or commit mischief of every sort. In the name of freedom you don't let a five-year-old child walk around town unguarded.

Most honourable members in this House are parents or grandparents. I don't have to lecture you that children need guidance until they are able to make mature judgments.

Love for our own children, love and concern for all children growing up in our troubled society should prompt us to do everything in our power to save them from the many pitfalls that lead to juvenile delinquency and a life of crime.

All my resolution asks is to give the city the power to establish a curfew. Such a curfew will not mean doubling the size of the police force. It will not mean taking police officers away from dealing with serious crimes to chase after kids on the street. But a curfew law would give the police the power, when needed, to cope with potential juvenile offenders before they commit crimes.

As I said when I introduced this resolution: prevention of crime is better than any cure. In my view not nearly enough is being done to help children to stay on the right course in life.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my plea for the adoption of this motion I will not repeat the statistics I gave in my speech before; I will not repeat the facts about the large number of juvenile delinquents in our midst.

There is no point in reminding you of the vandalism, crimes and rowdiness in many neighborhoods. You know all about it. You read all about it in the press every day.

In all these cases, Mr. Speaker, I see youngsters who once were sweet, innocent babies in the arms of a loving mother. I can picture them growing up. I can see mothers taking them by the hand on their first day to kindergarten. They move up to grade one, two, three and so on. But at some point some of them, far too many of them, go wrong.

Why did they go wrong? Whose fault is it? Who must shoulder the blame? I think all of us do, on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, in these very critical changing times youngsters are confronted with far greater temptations to go wrong than ever before. I want to help them.

My aim in this resolution is a very modest one. I believe a curfew would be at least one small step to protect children from the many temptations and opportunities to go wrong. Even if this measure would reduce juvenile delinquency by only one percentage point it would be very worthwhile. For the love of our children and young people I plead with you to support this motion. Thank you.

MOTION presented and lost.

REV. MALINOWSKI: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support? (Agreed) Call in the members.

Order please. The Resolution before the House is Resolution No. 8.

RESOLUTION 8

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs.	Adam	McKenzie
	Brown	Malinowski
	Derewianchuk	Paulley
	Dillen	Pawley
	Enns	Petursson
	Gottfried	Schreyer
	Henderson	Walding
	Jorgenson	

NAYS

Messrs.	Axworthy	Jenkins
	Banman	Johannson
	Barrow	Johnston (P. la P.)
	Bostrom	McBryde
	Boyce	McGill
	Burtniak	Miller
	Craik	Patrick
	Desjardins	Shafransky
	Doern	Toupin
	Einarson	Turnbull
	Evans	Uruski
	Graham	Uskiw
	Green	Wilson
	Hanuschak	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 15, Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Nays have it, declare the motion lost.

The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair. The House will resume in Committee of Supply with the Deputy Speaker in the Chair at 8 p.m.