

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan):** Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 31 students, Grades 11 and 12 standing, of the Dassel-Cokato High School of Cokato, Minnesota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Peterson.

We also have 30 members of the 4-H Club under the leadership of Miss Doreen Stammen, from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

And we have some 8 members of the Assiniboine Community College, under the leadership of Mr. Van Daele, from Brandon East constituency, the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Peter Martens, praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Peter Martens.

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition of Frances Mumford praying for the passing of an Act for the Relief of Anne Marie Mumford.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the **Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Corporation.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the **Report of the Ombudsman** for the period January 1, 1976 to December 31, 1976.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education.

**HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the **Annual Report 1976-77 of the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower** and the **Eleventh Annual Report of the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Health.

**HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the **Annual Report 1976 of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY, Minister of Labour (Transcona)** introduced **Bill (No. 51), an Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.** (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. STERLING R. LYON (Scuris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health, with respect to Camp Klahanie Wilderness Unit Camp that was established in Manitoba in 1975 I believe it was. Could the Minister advise us if the investigation that he previously advised the House was under way with respect to the operation of this camp in Manitoba, will be available soon and whether or not the investigation will report on whether there were incidents similar to those reported in Saskatchewan, which are under investigation by the RCMP and the Attorney-General in that province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe, if I'm correct, that that camp was operated by the same people that were operating the Saskatchewan camp and we, as soon as we were informed of these problems, we removed the children from that particular camp and we're investigating every single one of them and when the report is finished, I'll table it in the House. I'll make sure that the members see it.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister in the course of his investigation could also advise the House how many Manitoba children were committed to that camp over the period of their operation in Manitoba, and whether or not any incidents similar to those in Saskatchewan took place at the camp.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of either the Minister of Corrective Services Rehabilitation or the Minister of Health. The question is based on the fact that \$116,000 was paid out by Manitoba to the Ranch Erhlo, there was over \$116,000 paid out by Manitoba to this camp in Saskatchewan. My question is: how many boys were sent there? A second question is was the place checked out and how was that check made?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I'll see that all these questions are answered when I bring in the report.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside was asking about problems on the Saskatchewan River and I'm advised that the Churchill Forest Industries complex, the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited is not subjected to Manitoba regulations because the Federal Regulations Environment Canada supersede them insofar as discharge of contaminants from pulp and paper mills. There are some discussions between the mill and Environment Canada with regard to us meeting the standards and they are currently discussing some of the difficulties that have been experienced. I believe that is the answer to my honourable friend's question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. HARRY J. ENNS:** Subject to the answer which I thank him, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, is he aware of any action being undertaken by either the federal authorities or by provincial authorities with respect to compensation for fish lost to the some twenty-five, thirty-five fishermen affected by the contaminants in the water.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there has been any discussion — that has not been brought to my attention.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. Would the Minister consider this question on my part now bring it to his attention, and ask his department officials, I recognize perhaps his colleague, the Minister of Renewable Resources is more appropriately involved, as to whether or not there is a case that can be put forward with respect to compensation for the fish catch lost as a result of this pollution in that stream.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to look at the matter that my honourable friend is referring to.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. HENRY J. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is concerning the loss of thousands and thousands of fish in Pelican and Rock Lake, I believe it's the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I would like to ask if any aeration equipment was placed in those lakes at the beginning of the winter, say last fall?

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, Rock Lake would be a municipal responsibility which the department from time to time has tried to assist the municipality with. I'm not aware of what was done this year, but I will look into it for my honourable friend.

**MR. EINARSON:** Well Mr. Speaker, then is the Minister indicating that he doesn't know whether the equipment was placed in? Is it the the intentions of the department then to do anything about it come next year since there has been so many thousands of fish lost from lack of oxygen this winter?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would look at my previous answer then he will see that I indicated just what my position is in that connection.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I recognize the way in which the Minister of Mines and Resources answers the question, but I am wondering can he assure us or assure the people in that area of Rock Lake and Pelican Lake that any assistance will be forthcoming in regard to aerating the lakes so this doesn't happen again.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I can't assure any group in the Province of Manitoba which has a lake as a municipal responsibility that they will be treated any differently than any other group in the Province of Manitoba which has a lake which is a municipal responsibility.

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

**MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Corrections. I would like to ask the Minister of Corrections if he is making any representation to the Solicitor-General with regard to the location of a federal penitentiary in Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

**HONOURABLE J.R.(Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre):** We have made no representation to the Solicitor-General as to the location. I repeat what I have said earlier, Mr. Speaker, that all we have tried to do is facilitate the communications between those communities in Manitoba and the Solicitor-General's office, to advise them how to present their case and make it easy for them to

communicate. It is the prerogative of the Solicitor-General to determine the location of a federal institution.

**MR. GRAHAM:** A supplementary question then. Is the Minister of Corrections prepared to forward the petition of some 1,800 people of Selkirk to the Solicitor-General for his consideration?

**MR. BOYCE:** I was contacted by a meer of the community of Selkirk last week and I gave him the address to which to forward the petition, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Highways. Can the Minister tell the House if the new road project between Moose Lake and The Pas, being built under the Northlands Agreement, has been assessed and approved by the Manitoba Environmental Assessment and Review Agency?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for highways.

**HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that question probably should be posed of another Minister.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I will address the same question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Should I repeat the question? Can the Minister tell the House if the new road project between Moose Lake and The Pas, being built under the Northlands Agreement, has been assessed and approved by the Manitoba Environmental Assessment and Review Agency?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether that particular road project would be one which would be subject to the Environmental Protection Review Agency. I doubt it.

**MR. J. G. JOHNSTON:** I ask the same Minister, does he know that the proposed new road project will run right through the Thomas Lamb Wildlife Management area?

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection and Review Agency does not deal with matters other than contaminants to the land, air or water and matters affecting normal land use or land use planning would normally proceed through the Planning Committee. There is, in the Environmental Protection and Review Agency, procedure mechanisms for other departments raising their concerns, but those are only for projects which are under the aegis of the Environmental Protection Review Agency. And, Mr. Speaker, even then are not dealt with by the Environmental Protection Branch but by whatever department deals with those questions. We have limited the Environmental Protection Review Agency to matters affecting contaminants to the air, land or water.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Highways. Can the Minister inform the House as to what steps are being taken to protect the environment on the road that is being constructed through the Thomas Lamb Wildlife Management Area.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Highways.

**MR. BURTONIAK:** Mr. Speaker, again I think that that question, perhaps, should be directed to the appropriate Minister, not the Minister of Highways.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BOB BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation and would ask the Minister if Saunders Aircraft is making any further attempts to recover the one aircraft that is still in Colombia?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I will be looking into that matter. I recollect that both planes were returned but I don't wish to stand corrected, I'll check into it, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. BANMAN:** A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether some of the assets that were held by Saunders, such as some of the aircraft, have been sold or are they still sitting on the tarmac at Gimli.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, some are sold, some are leased, and some are for sale. Some of the other assets are being dealt with by the receiver in a normal way in which a receiver deals with assets.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, the other day, last week I believe, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie had asked some questions with respect to allegations in the newspaper that certain West German firms and principals had been making offers with respect to Flyer. I attempted to explain the matter in as best a way I could under the requirements of being precise under the rules. I have perhaps to answer the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in the best way is to provide to him the file which contains letters from those who were directly alleged, in the newspaper, to have said this, that and the next thing. The letters are, in both cases, from Mr. Leslie, who was quoted in the newspaper, and I may add without exaggeration 180 degrees incorrectly. I offer the file to my honourable friend.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Northern Affairs.

**HONOURABLE RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond further to the question of the Member from Portage la Prairie lest we create some wrong expectations in the

community. There is no formal approval, no financial funding yet formally approved for the construction of an all-weather road to Moose Lake.

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

**MR. GRAHAM:** Thank you. I would also like to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs with regard to Moose Lake. I ask him what actions the government is contemplating to raise the level in the Saskatchewan River to allow proper barging between The Pas and Moose Lake, seeing as how there is no budget for a road.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I said there was no formal approval given yet for the construction of an all-weather road. Last season the Department of Transportation Services were in contact with the Federal Ministry of Transport and some dredging work was done on the river to clear away sand bars. However, with low water levels this year I am not sure if that will be sufficient to provide barge transportation to that community.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, may I then direct my question to the Honourable First Minister, the Minister responsible for Hydro, and ask what efforts will be made to maintain an adequate water level in the Saskatchewan River to ensure the community of Moose Lake will have barging for the summer months.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how one can give an undertaking that there will be an adequate supply or adequate level of water in the lower Saskatchewan River basin to ensure a given level at Moose Lake, or at The Pas, or anywhere else, that will depend upon the extent to which there is rainfall in April and May and June, and the extent to which we have — it's not an insignificant factor, Sir — the extent to which we have sunny days or cloudy days. Because on a sunny day the extent of loss of water level by way of evaporation is indeed very very major.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. ARNOLD BROWN:** My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Will the Minister attempt to have the Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission ready in time for discussion on Estimates in the future?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, by law I must have it at a certain time and as soon as it is ready I am in the process of tabling it. So I can't guarantee that, whenever it is ready it will be tabled.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now proceed with the Second Readings as they appear on the first page of the Order Paper.

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 4, Second Reading, the Honourable Meer for Birtle-Russell.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, will you let Nos. 4 and 5 stand, please.

#### BILL NO. 7 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PROVINCIAL JUDGES ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 7, the Honourable Attorney-General.

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a few words in concluding debate in connection with this bill. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed and saddened by the approach of my honourable colleague from Birtle-Russell. I was frankly surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell did move in the direction which he did in respect to this bill because I had expected that he would deal with it in a very constructive manner and to say that I was amazed at his violent attack with the insertion of many innuendoes within the context of that speech, certainly did catch me surprised. I had not anticipated that response from the honourable member. I think it does call upon me to say a few words.

I had an opportunity to reread the honourable member's address and I was attempting to ascertain just what position the honourable member really was taking in connection with the entire matter which is commonly known as the Pilutik affair. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, just what the honourable member was suggesting that I as Attorney-General should have done, that I did not do. In reading the speech I am at a loss as to exactly what the honourable member was really proposing in his speech. There was a tremendous assortment of misinformation and I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that I correct that misinformation and I, of course, refer to the speech as on Page 1060 of Hansard.

First, the honourable member insinuated that I had prevented or I had not allowed former Judge Pilutik to practice, prohibited him from practising. Of course that is quite untrue. The record is very clear on that and I was rather amazed that the honourable member was not aware of the record in that respect.

Then the reference to "he was removed from the Bench, prohibited from holding sittings." Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not remove the judge in question from the Bench. I did not prohibit the honourable member from holding sittings. What did happen is that a number of complaints, based upon information, were received by those responsible in my department and those allegations were referred to the Judicial Council for their benefit. The Honourable Judge, quite properly I think, under the circumstances quite properly — and I give him credit for this — decided that it would be more fitting if he did not continue to preside and I assume also that he did, at the same time, desire the opportunity to more properly defend himself insofar as the allegations were concerned.

The honourable member also made reference to, "he was hanging in the air more or less while the Attorney-General decided what he was going to do with him." Mr. Speaker, if this was the truth then that would be a most sad situation indeed. It would be most sad if the Attorney-General could hang a judge in the air, as to speak, until he, the Attorney-General, decided what he was going to do with that judge as a result of complaints filed with the Attorney-General. Now surely, surely the honourable member is not suggesting that I, as the Attorney-General, left this particular judge hanging in mid air not knowing what was going to happen to him until I, as Attorney-General, made up my mind what I was going to do with him. Surely that is not what the honourable member was suggesting to members of this Legislature.

The Provincial Judges Act indicates very very clearly, and passed in 1971, that there is a Judicial Council, a Judicial Council which is made up of Justice Nitikman, in this case, of the Court of Queen's Bench; consisting of representatives that must be members of the Law Society and people who are representative of the public. They are the ones that make that determination after having the opportunity to peruse the allegations' to receive information at that inquiry and then to make a determination. It would be most improper if the Attorney-General was doing as was intimated by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that he was going to make the final decision. The Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell is not that unwise I am sure. Not . . . that he would have made such an erroneous statement in this House. I am left with the conclusion that the honourable member must have made the statement knowing full well it was untrue but hoping that it would catch on somewhere among those that were not as informed as he is, as to the provisions of the Provincial Judges Act.

I am left with no alternative because I know that the honourable member isn't that negligent as to his understanding of the essence of the Provincial Judges Act and how it works, as to have made that statement in the way that he did.

I have heard honourable members again and again refer to government interference and decry government interference in independent bodies within the community. But here is an inference in the honourable member's speech and I quote: "We also know that the Attorney-General is a member of the Law Society of Manitoba and I don't know, he hasn't offered the information, I don't know whether he prevailed upon the Law Society of Manitoba or not, to have them conduct an investigation. However, the Law Society did announce that they were going to conduct an investigation. That was over a year ago and I haven't heard any profound statements coming from the Law Society as to whether they have completed their investigation or what they intend to do with it either."

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell knows full well that I didn't have to prevail, I didn't have to pressure, I didn't have to intimidate the Law Society into dealing with this matter insofar as their realm of responsibility was concerned. He knows that full well, that I didn't have to prevail. The Law Society have undertaken their own inquiry in connection with this matter. I understand that they are in the process now and very shortly they are going to complete their own findings in this respect and they will be made known to us. The information that we had which was important to their subject matter has been made available to them and it is my understanding that they will be making their findings shortly in this respect. If the honourable member would like the telephone number of the Secretary of the Law Society, I could accommodate him by obtaining that telephone number and passing it on to him so that he can make his independent inquiry as to just what the Law Society is doing in this regard. Because I gather that is under an uneasy feeling that the Law Society is covering up, just as he insinuates that the Attorney-General may have been involved in some sort of — although he didn't say it in those words — some sort of covering up, he is now insinuating that maybe the Law Society also was involved in something of that nature. Then he ends up saying "no pronouncements from the Attorney-General. There has been nothing from the Judicial Council. There has been nothing from the Law Society that says that that man has done anything wrong. He has probably been a victim of circumstance."

Now when I read this I remembered the honourable member holding a press conference last year and the press were gathered around him and he held the press conference so that he could comment on the function of the Attorney-General and how the Attorney-General had handled this case and his first comment was that all the information should be released to the public. Now that is what I have been told.

Then I have been told that as the press conference proceeded, the honourable member changed

his position to some extent and said no, it is sufficient if all the information is sent on to the Law Society. I am not really suggesting it all be released to the public. That is the basis of the information that I received, that there was some shifting of ground within the that press conference as to his position.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, what the honourable member ended up suggesting? He said since we had not proven our case, that since the charges had not been clearly specified, there had been no hearing, that we should reappoint the judge who had just resigned, that we should reappoint Judge Pilutik. The honourable member actually publicly — “demanded” might be a very strong word but requested that we reappoint Judge Pilutik to the bench in Manitoba after the the honourable gentleman had seen fit to resign. If I am wrong' member is free to interrupt me but the newspaper accounts may have been incorrect but that is what I read in the newspaper that either that there should be a hearing or Judge Pilutik should be reappointed.

Now the honourable member takes exception to the fact that we are leaving more leeway to the Judicial Council to establish its own procedures, conduct inquiries as it deems fit, and I think in view of our belief in the independence of the judiciary we that we should make the Judicial Council as fully responsible — as I say, it is chaired by a justice of the Court of Queen's Bench but we should make them just as fully responsible as possible for the conduct of their hearings. I don't see room for criticism in this respect if that is in fact what we are doing.

I want to also indicate to the Honourable Member for Portage — and I appreciate very much the fact that the Honourable Member for Portage on behalf of his group disassociated himself from the innuendoes tossed this way by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I appreciate that. But I want to say to the Honourable Member for Portage that basically I agree with the second part of his address that generally hearings such as this should be made public.

I had indicated during introduction of this debate, however, that that type of responsibility should rest with the Judicial Council. I was proposing to make amendments in committee to provide them with the responsibility for determining if there was for some public interest factor any reason that the hearings should not be public, then they could determine it as in many other judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings where there is that discretion resting with a judicial body or quasi-judicial body to exclude the public. And I do not feel that that type of responsibility should rest with the Attorney-General from a distance to determine whether or not the proceedings should be public and then to order them to be public. I think there is too much danger there inherent for many different reasons; the Attorney-General then could insist that something be public which really does not relate to a fair hearing, the ascertaining of all the facts, and I have proposed in committee, though that wasn't included in the bill before us, to request an amendment to the bill to provide for that so that that type of decision is made right at the Judicial Council level and as I say presided over by a Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench rather than that decision rest at a political level.

I think there are some instances where parties who are completely innocent to the circumstances, totally innocent, but become involved in the web of circumstance, could as a result of publicity through the media find their own family lives, their own careers, embarrassed due to no fault on their own part but simply because they happened according to the circumstances to be in the-wrong-place-at-the-wrong-time type of thing. And I think that we have to provide some room, some discretion there that the Judicial Council has some freedom to determine in circumstances such as that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up any more time but to say that I am saddened, I am surprised, however, I suppose I will cheer up and I will go on with my duties with the comments from my friend, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, and I appreciate very much the constructive comments that have been made.

**QUESTION put and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 8, proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Could I also have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

**BILL (NO. 18) — THE RETAIL BUSINESSES HOLIDAY CLOSING ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 18, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

**MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly interested in this bill before us. Whether we are deeply religious or not, I am sure most of us appreciate Sunday as a day of rest. All of us, I am sure, appreciate one day one day free from shopping and the hurly-burly of commercialism.

I think we all know that store hours have never been determined by the needs and the convenience of the people. This has always been dictated by the desires of the supermarket operators for maximum profits. The operators of these supermarkets have always had a false idea that the longer they keep open, the more money they will make. The supermarket merchants hate to see families at

home on Sundays enjoying themselves instead of pushing shopping carts around. They hate to see people going to church on Sunday, putting money in the collection plate instead of spending it in the supermarkets.

Supermarket operators seem to believe that for every hour their store is closed they are losing money. We know of course this is nonsense, this is not the case, Mr. Speaker. People's need for groceries and their incomes do not increase with longer shopping hours. Most people have only a limited amount of money to spend at the supermarkets and they can buy all they need or can afford during reasonable store hours.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if stores are open 24 hours a day and all day Sunday, a lot of people won't bother shopping during more reasonable hours. Some will put off their shopping 'till Sunday. Some will go to the store at midnight or even 2 o'clock in the morning if the stores are open. But this does not mean anyone will suffer greater inconvenience if supermarkets are closed Sunday and are open only during reasonable hours during the week.

I'm more than sure, Mr. Speaker, if you change the whole schedule and if you add one hour so instead of twenty-four you will have twenty-five a day, it would be not enough. If you even add one day, instead of seven have eight days, it still will be not enough. It never will be enough.

Mr. Speaker, in the bill before us the supermarkets are given the option of closing either Saturday or Sunday. In my humble opinion, I think it is wrong to force the supermarkets to make that choice. I believe the bill ought to be amended. I believe we should stipulate in the bill Sunday as the closing day for all supermarkets. I favour Sunday closing.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, not only on religious grounds but because Sunday has always been the traditional day of rest. Sunday has always been the day for the family to be together. It has always been the day when families go to church, or go to the picnics, or to the beach in summer, whatever, but they are together. Because of this Sunday would be the most suitable closing day for the great majority of people in Manitoba. If all supermarkets remain closed on Sunday it will enable the employees of those shops to be off on the same day. It will enable these workers to spend their free time with their friends in other occupations where they don't work on Sunday. While the smaller stores are exempted from the provisions of this bill I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should give serious consideration to the question of whether any store, big or small, needs to stay open twenty-four hours a day.

All of us are aware of the Complaints of people living near these stores that keep open all night. We are also familiar with the complaints of the Winnipeg Police Department for whom these stores are causing a lot of extra work. They call some of the shops convenient stores but they seem to be most convenient for hold-up men. Almost every night one or two are getting robbed with those potential robbers, when there is no need for it. Why have people sitting up all night taking the risk of being held up, just to serve a few stray customers.

One of the old-timers in my constituency reminded me what shopping used to be like about sixty years ago. Few families had any refrigeration in those days but still they managed to do their shopping without the stores being open twenty-four hours a day. Today the majority of homes have refrigerators. Every community has a store and supermarkets. You can drive around in any direction in Winnipeg and you will pass a supermarket or shopping centre every five or ten minutes. In some places they have two or even three of these big super- markets in one place.

Most honourable members will remember the Royal Commission set up in 1967 to investigate the high cost of food. It discovered that one reason the cost of food is so high is because we have too many stores and supermarkets. In its report this Royal Commission said in 1967 we have twice as many shopping facilities as are needed to take care of all reasonable shopping needs.

We not only have shopping centres above ground but we now have one underground at Portage and Main. Right now they are digging still another hole under Main Street and Portage Avenue, so maybe we will get still more shops underground. I don't know what to call them, maybe we should change and call them "Gorilla Shopping Centres."

The building, maintaining and keeping these shops open all hours of the day and night is bound to add to the cost of goods. It is also bound to result in the waste of energy.

In the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with store closing hours. I am not prepared to suggest a rigid opening and closing time for corner grocery stores and so-called convenience stores but surely if these stores stayed open no later than ten or eleven at night it would give the people in the community plenty of time to do their shopping. As for the shopkeepers, they could go home and sleep at night instead of worrying about being robbed at the store.

Mr. Speaker, the people who live near the shops might also sleep better without the noise and disturbance around the stores all night.

This is a good bill and I commend the Minister for submitting it. I am sure this measure will meet with approval among the general public. I have only one strong reservation' Mr. Speaker; I feel very strongly we should stipulate in the bill that all supermarkets remain closed one day, which means Sunday. I believe it would be unwise and maybe even unfair to the supermarket operators if we

leave it up to them to decide whether to stay open on Saturday or Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, in ending my few remarks I'm pleading that Sunday remain the day of rest. Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns wish to proceed on this bill?

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some comments. I've just almost, not quite, finished reading the contribution made by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry on this bill. May I digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to tell you that my wife reads Hansard fairly frequently and she often gets stuck by one word that she admits she doesn't know and took her a while to admit it to me, and that is the word "meers" which appears very frequently, which I discovered is supposed to mean members. But very often you see reference to the honourable meer, and the Member for Fort Garry is credited with saying "Our caucus meers are assessing, etc." I thought for a moment it meant distinguished and very clever and intelligent people but I see it applies on all sides of the House and in Hansard applies to all sides of the House so I assume we are all honourable meers.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry seemed to take the Minister introducing the bill to task for bringing in any question of dealing and recognizing religious diversity, and I haven't read nor did I hear the Honourable Minister so I'm not sure just what he said, but it is clear that the Member for Fort Garry disassociates himself from any approach to the religious aspects of Sunday being a day when business should be restricted. As I read his statement he speaks of the value of one day of economic rest and suggests that it ought to be Sunday because the one day would be natural to be that day which is already least busy in an economic sense. I think I'm right in this interpretation. I do think that he just disassociates his consideration from the religious one. And I, too, Mr. Speaker, am inclined to disassociate my consideration from any religious consideration. So, to those who think it is necessary to impose a restraint on business or anyone else in order to favour religious thought and religious beliefs, then I have to point out that our Constitution and our consideration of laws and the way of life does not recognize that religion is one which controls the state and the way it operates.

The one point made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge which had some . . . Fort Garry, I'm sorry, the Member for Fort Garry, which brought to mind some doubt —(Interjection)— Yes, the Member for Minnedosa says there's quite a difference. I'm not sure in what way he means it but there is quite a difference, I agree. The Member for Fort Garry does speak of the problem that may occur when both partners to the marriage are working, and you have to take into account the effect on that family life when one partner in that marriage has and has always had Sunday as a day off and the other partner suddenly finds himself or herself confronted with working.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I can just think about most of the industries that are open Sundays are service industries and many of them, I believe, are industries where the second earner of the family works. And I'm speaking of restaurants and hotels where one finds many people there who are the second earners in a family, that probably today there has to be an adjustment in the family life where one member may not be working on Sunday and the other is. And indeed it seems peculiar to me that this Legislature in its wisdom in the past has recognized that the one economic day of rest should be intruded on by the recreational parts of life; the movies, the restaurants . . . Are horse races on Sunday?

**A MEMBER:** Yes, they sure are.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I am told that people are betting money on Sunday. Horse races are on, and I guess this Legislature did it and I hope I voted against it, because I usually vote against all gambling and horse racing, to me, is a very unattractive feature in our life. So we find that not only do we have recreational facilities we also have gambling go on on Sundays. The Member for Swan River says "Bingo", I think he said. So we find that we have accepted certain intrusions on the economic day of rest.

Well, Mr. Speaker, for me I think that people should not be denied the opportunity to do their shopping on a day which is of their choosing or a time of their choosing.

The Member for Point Douglas complained rather strongly about twenty-four hour shops. Actually, Mr. Speaker, they are called convenience shops and indeed they are a convenience, so there must be people who find it convenient to drop in at any time in the twenty-four hours to do their shopping. May I say, since he spoke at some length about them, that I find it convenient very often when I'm leaving this Chamber after ten o'clock to be able to drop into a convenience shop and pick up some article that we may be short of in the house, and I don't resent the additional price I pay because their mark-ups are exorbitant, and yet I feel well if they're going to be open for my convenience they have a right to charge me for it. Frankly, what I resent most is the fact that many people are so unknowledgable in their shopping that you see people buying their regular grocery needs in a convenience store when a supermarket or many corner stores would produce a much better price for large marketing. Having said that, I do believe that firstly, people find hang-outs whether they're in convenience stores or in cafes, or others, and they must be policed. And if they



**Thursday, March 31, 1977**

intrude on residential areas they should be properly zoned. And sometimes I think the City Council is a little too free and easy with its permission to change zoning to create zoning variations to permit a convenience store to be placed right in the middle of a residential area. I don't think it should be necessary.

Having said that, I do believe that I would not like to interfere too much in permitting people to have a choice as to when they shop and where they shop. " The concern that I have is the ones who are the employees and the workers, and the shop-owners, and the shopkeepers, who would now be having to work on Sunday because the competition forces them to do so. And that we have seen. Really, I think it was last November-December when we saw the supermarkets, the big chains, protesting vigourously that they didn't really want to stay open, except for one or two, and that because one or two did stay open Sunday the others felt compelled to open in competition, not for the loss of business of that day but rather because they felt that shoppers would acquire new shopping habits and start frequenting the competition store.

That's not bad, Mr. Speaker. People who believe in the free enterprise system should make it possible for competition to take place where you could entice shoppers from another customer for competition, I hope on prices but even in the matter of convenience.

So I come to concern myself with the persons who must operate and work possibly seven days a week, or indeterminate days a week, where they may be called upon to work on days which should be days of family meeting, days when the family can be together. Now that does not mean that families shopping together are not sharing in their lives together, and many times one can see a family group going to a department store looking after the needs of all members of the family. It's probably pretty healthy for the kids to be involved with their parents and shopping and looking for what they want and what prices are, and it's often very good for the husband and wife together to do the shopping rather than as often takes place, one or the other makes the decisions in the family. But, I really do express concern as does the Trade Union movement to the possibility that people will be required to work to an extent where the days of work will make it difficult for the family to be together at least one day a week and sometimes they could take advantage of two days a week because so many people are on a five day week.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, since we are not really, when I say we, some of us and I guess the Member for Fort Garry and I are not looking at this legislation from the standpoint of catering to any religious concerns, then I would like to think that a day of the week need not be Sunday, it could be Saturday, it could be Sunday, and I think that the argument one reads by the Member for Fort Garry, would apply to Saturday as well as to Sunday except for past practice. I think that's a pretty fair statement, that is, most businesses have been closed in the past on Sunday, why break up that pattern and create Saturday as the day rather than Sunday. The reason I confine myself to Saturday or Sunday is only because of the children, because the children are required to go to school the other five days a week, so it wouldn't be very sensible to have stores close on other days.

Having said that, I recognize that to some people Sunday is important not to work, and to other people Saturday is important not to work, and therefore, it seems to me that there should be a choice. Let there be the option for the people who have to work, as to whether they wish not to work Saturday or Sunday, and many choose not to work on both of the days. And therefore, I can accept the fact that if we are going to in the interests of the people who do the work, see to it that they do have one week-end day off, that the option should be, of course it has to be with the employer first, as to whether or not the shop is open, but once the employer has made the decision, then there could be a shuffle in the work force to enable them to adjust to a place that is closed on Saturday or closed on Sunday. Therefore it seems to me that it is logical to do it the way it's being done so that it enables the choice to take place, so that no one could take advantage of being open on the two week-end days, but at the same time, if it is felt that there is a sufficient number of people who would take advantage of an open shop to go there and shop, then it recognizes their right so to do, and I see nothing wrong, and I would challenge anybody to say that someone is irreligious if that person chooses to shop on either of those two days' either of those two days. Every person has his own way of serving his own beliefs and of serving in whatever way that person wants to, and to attempt to tell them how to do so, I think is wrong. And to attempt to tell them that they may not do what they wish to do on such a day is wrong. Therefore to some extent I'm debating with the comments by the Member for Point Douglas to whom Sunday is "the day" because it's a religious day, but I'm really directing my remarks to the Member for Fort Garry or anyone else in this House to whom the religious aspect is not the paramount one that should make the decision in determining whether it shall be Sunday only, or Saturday or Sunday.

If there are persons who wish to impose their religious beliefs on others in this province, then let them say so, and you know, I would respect their wish so to do. I would not agree with it but I can understand their wish so to do, although I would find it difficult to understand why they would wish to tell me that I may not do certain things on either of those two days, each of which is recognized as a religious day amongst one or other of the peoples of this province. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that if an

attempt is made to confine this enforced economic day of rest, it shall be left so that there will be an option on Saturday or Sunday. If there is an attempt made to reduce it to one day, then I for one, will oppose it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. BROWN:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 22. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 26. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. JAMES H. BILTON:** Stand if you please, Mr. Speaker.

## **GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING**

### **BILL (NO. 30) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT**

**MR. BURTNIAK presented Bill No. 30, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act (2) for second reading.**

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. BURTNIAK:** Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill, Bill (No. 30) deals with mopeds. For some time now as honourable members will remember, there has been a number of requests to make the mopeds legal in the Province of Manitoba. We gave that assurance last year that there will be some legislation making mopeds legal in the province and here it is.

**A MEMBER:** What is a moped?

**MR. BURTNIAK:** A moped is a bicycle with a motor.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. BURTNIAK:** This Bill contains all of the amendments necessary to permit the safe operation of mopeds on our highways. The main feature of the Bill include a definition of a moped. As defined, it will be deemed to be a motor vehicle and as such will have to be registered before it could be operated upon a highway. It will also have to be insured. To deal with a problem where a vehicle of this kind may not strictly comply with the definition, a provision is contained in the Bill which would provide for the inspection of the vehicle for purposes of classifying it as a moped or otherwise. The Bill contains a series of amendments of technical nature making the provisions of the Act applicable to motorcycles also applicable to this type of vehicle.

Operators of mopeds will be required to hold a drivers licence. Amendments are contained in the Bill which will permit a person holding any class of licence to operate a moped. If he does not hold a licence of any class, he would then have to apply for a learner's licence similar to a motorcycle learner's permit. The applicant will be required to pass special examinations for this class of vehicle and the licence will be restricted to the operation of mopeds only. A series of amendments are necessary to the various lighting provisions of the Act, principally because the lighting of mopeds cannot meet the minimum standards. The retractable power is generated by magneto. At low r.p.m.s the power generated is not sufficient to maintain the brightness of the lights at the required level. In attempt to compensate for this feature of mopeds, a provision is contained in the Bill which will require all mopeds to be equipped with a large reflector which will be visible from a distance of at least five hundred feet.

In this connection, I should inform the honourable members that the federal Ministry of Transport are developing standards under the Motor Vehicle Safety Act for Mopeds; we are advised that these standards will likely come into force sometime this year. Because of the small size of the moped, and the fact that they can not travel at speeds over thirty miles per hour, in order to make them as visible as possible to other traffic, mopeds will be required to have their headlamps lighted at all times when being operated on a highway. This provision is similar to the present federal standards with respect to motorcycles where headlamps are required to be so designed that they are lighted whenever the vehicle is in motion. Power of the brakes on mopeds will have to be sufficient to stop the vehicle within thirty feet from a speed of twenty miles an hour. This is the same requirement as is for motorcycles.

Further provisions are contained in the Bill exempting mopeds from being equipped with an odometer, windshield and certain other equipment which is not appropriate or necessary for this type of vehicle. The Bill also contains a provision which will require operators of mopeds to ride as closely as is practical to the right hand edge or curb of the roadway, except when passing or

overtaking another vehicle and also to ride in a single line with other mopeds, bicycle or motorcycle. These provisions are similar to those that are applicable to bicycles. Because of the small size and the low speed of the mopeds, they are extremely vulnerable to accidents if permitted to be operated upon speed highways with high volume traffic. The speed differential between mopeds and the other high speed traffic will expose them to a much greater risk of collision particularly from the rear.

Other provinces who have enacted moped legislation, such as Ontario and the Province of Quebec, have prohibited the operation of mopeds from freeways and other limited access highways. Accordingly, a provision is contained in this Bill which will prohibit the operation of mopeds on provincial trunk highways on which the maximum speed limit is more than fifty miles per hour. However, they will be permitted to cross such highways. They will also be permitted to be operated upon all provincial and municipal roads.

The Bill contains a provision which will permit mopeds to be equipped with seats designed to carry infants; the provisions are similar to those enacted three years ago in respect to bicycles. Carrying objects in the front of a moped will be strictly prohibited, however, objects may be carried on the rear of the moped, providing that it is not of such size or so placed that it may interfere with the proper operation control of the moped or which may constitute a hazard to other traffic.

Mopeds, if properly used can be a safe and a very economical mode of transportation. In this day of dwindling supply of oil reserves and the consequent increase in the price of the use of mopeds both for transportation and recreational purposes is highly desirable. At the same time, care must be exercised to ensure that the safety of moped operators and other persons is not endangered. We believe that the enactment of the provisions contained in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, will go a long way toward the achievement of the objectives that I have just mentioned. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and Carried.**

### **BILL NO. (35) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT (3).**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Highways.

**MR. BURTNIAK:** Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill consists of many housekeeping changes, however, there are three or four more substantive changes. The Bill for example, contains a definition of a motor home. The need for such a definition arises from problems encountered in registering and insuring large campers which are mounted on a truck chassis and the traditional motor home. As campers are not covered under the basic insurance policy, owners have to secure a separate insurance policy. As a result, some owners have sought to register and insure such campers as motor homes. As there exists important differences between the two classes of vehicles, it was concluded that a definition of a motor home would resolve the uncertainties which presently exist with respect to these types of vehicles.

Historically the vehicle registration provisions of the Act were interpreted to mean that only vehicles owned by residents of the province were or could be registered. The Act contained no specific provision which says that the motor vehicles owned by a non-resident cannot be registered in Manitoba. Because of this and because of the low insurance premiums prevailing in the Province of Manitoba a number of non-residents have registered and insured their cars in our province. One such case amongst many, was a resident from Alberta; he registered and insured his private car in Manitoba, subsequently, the car was involved in an accident in the Province of Alberta, and the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation had to pay the claim. There have been dozens of cases involving residents of Ontario or similar cases from Ontario.

As a consequence, amendments to the Highway Traffic Act are introduced in this Bill which will prohibit the registration of motor vehicles owned by non-residents. An exception is provided in the case of persons or corporations who are engaged in a business in the province and have vehicles stationed in the province used in connection with that particular business. Such vehicles will continue to be registered in Manitoba as they are at the present time. The amendment will provide that where a non-resident does register and insure a vehicle in Manitoba, and it is subsequently discovered that at the time of his application for registration and insurance, he was not a resident of the province, the registration becomes null and void from the date the registration was issued. This bill also contains an amendment which will raise the property damage which is required to be reported to the police from \$200 to \$300.00. The last such increase occurred back in 1970 when the property damage which requires the accident to be reported, was increased from \$100 to \$200.00. Since then as we all know, the cost of repairs and replacement parts have more than doubled due to the increase in cost of materials and labour. Consequently, an accident causing \$200 damage today is one which is a rather minor accident, which in terms of 1970 costs would amount to less than \$100 today. A number of other provinces, I might add, have also increased the amount of reportable damages to \$300.00

For many years the Act prohibited persons under age 18 from driving trucks having a gross weight in excess of 24,000 pounds. Such legislation was enacted because it was felt that persons under age 18 did not have the strength or sufficient experience and maturity to operate such large vehicles in areas having a high traffic density. Because of the shortage of farm laborers, the farming community has been requesting for some relief from this provision, to allow persons under age 18 to operate larger trucks. As most of these vehicles are driven in local areas, having low traffic densities and with which the drivers would be familiar, allowing young drivers to operate such vehicles would not, in our view, increase risks of accidents. Accordingly an amendment is proposed which will permit persons between the ages of 16 to 18 to operate larger trucks, but not semi-trailers, providing that such vehicles are registered as farm trucks.

The Act currently provides for the suspension of a driver's license for life upon a third conviction under the Criminal Code. The Law Reform Commission, by the way, recommended the repeal of life suspensions and a substitution of a suspension for five years upon a second or subsequent conviction. It concluded that a suspension for life was unnecessarily harsh, particularly when the driver who may have had a drinking problem has succeeded in bringing that problem under control and has maintained sobriety for a period of time. The only relief available to persons whose licenses have been suspended for life, is to appeal to the License Suspension Appeal Board. However, they can only appeal on the grounds that the suspension is causing exceptional hardship.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other minor amendments but as I say, they are mostly of housekeeping or ideas. Perhaps they could be debated in Law Amendments.

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

**MR. McKENZIE:** I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister for Health and Social Development, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. BURTONIAK:** Mr. Speaker, by leave, I am wondering if it be possible to distribute the Highway program now in the House when all the members are here, rather than having to distribute it in Room 254 and again here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Very well. The suggestion is agreed to. The motion is to go into Committee of Supply. Before I call in the Member for Logan, I am reminded that there is a vote in the Committee of Supply immediately upon the member taking the Chair.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair for Labour and Co-operative Development and the Honourable Member for St. Vital in the Chair for Highways.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY  
ESTIMATES - HIGHWAYS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Order please. We have a quorum gentlemen. The committee will come to order. I would direct the attention of honourable members to Page 35 in their Estimates Books, the Department of Highways. Resolution 66 General Administration (a) the Minister's Compensation. The Honourable Minister.

**HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, before I begin the Estimates of the department I would just like to once again commend my Deputy Minister, Mr. Brako, for his unstinting and diligent performance in the past year. Also the department's Chief Engineer, Jack Peacock, for his usual conscientious efforts, and all members of the Department of Highways for a job well done.

As you may know the Department of Highways is broken down into two main sections, Mr. Chairman each with subsections or divisions. One is the Highways Branch and of course the other is the Motor Vehicle Branch.

This past year was one of the biggest construction years in the history of the department. What led to this achievement was largely due to the good weather that allowed one of the longest construction periods in memory. As a matter of fact for the first time since I have become responsible for this Ministry the department has over-extended its budget. I am not apologizing for this because many more projects were completed than were anticipated and this over expenditure I feel was money well spent.

We will be investing \$10 million on the program that will soon bring 224 miles of four-lane Trans Canada Highway between Brandon and Falcon Lake into service. Since this government took office over \$40 million has been spent on this particular project. Adding this year's \$10 million expenditure will bring a total of approximately \$50,544,000 spent on this project.

This year will see the introduction of metrication on our highways. This is not solely a Manitoba project, but rather a co-operative project with other sister provinces. Research mainly from the United States has proven that reducing highway speeds reduces highway accident deaths. Couple this with the fact that the metrication throughout Canada is inevitable, the government has decided to lower Manitoba's speed limits the same time we convert our speed limit signs to metric, thereby saving the cost of producing and erecting two sets of signs within a short period of time.

The proposed Federal Government metric conversion program affecting the Manitoba Highway Traffic Act is tentatively scheduled to be implemented in the month of September, 1977.

Speed limit signs showing 70 miles per hour as seen on divided highways will be posted 100 kilometers per hour or converted to 62.14 miles per hour, a reduction of approximately eight miles per hour. Similarly, present speed limit signs which show 60 miles per hour and 65 miles per hour will both be converted to 90 kilometers per hour which is equivalent to 55.92 miles per hour, a reduction of approximately four miles and approximately nine miles, respectively.

The department will provide an advertising and public relations campaign to inform and educate all Manitoba motorists regarding these particular changes. Our Grant and Aid Program has been extended to Indian Reservations similar to that enjoyed by Manitoba towns and villages. This Grant and Aid Program is very demanding on the department's total budget.

I made a comment approximately five years ago, Mr. Chairman, to all Manitoba road contractors, that a high priority would be given to a method of levelling out our highway construction program. Previously there were peaks one year and valleys the next. The private contractor was hesitant to invest thousands of dollars of which most, if not all, had to be borrowed and pay high interest rates on the purchase of new and bigger equipment without having some assurance that there would be no highway construction cutback.

The stable budgeting procedure we have employed with increases allowing for inflation has produced a very healthy and stable construction industry.

Another stabilizing factor is the department's three-year planning program. This allows for advanced land purchases, surveys and engineering design which allows the department to proceed on a project without being held up for too long a period of time. This type of planning was also a contributing factor in our over-expended budget this past construction season. Construction stabilization has

also been achieved by pre-advertising and tendering some twelve millions of dollars each fall allowing the contractor to stockpile gravel and make all necessary plans and movement of the equipment. This ensures an early start the following spring, thereby contractors can complete more projects in our relatively short construction season. Approximate mileages for various types of work done by contract and completed during the past fiscal year were as follows:

Grading, 172 miles; gravelling, 417 miles; paving, 252 miles. That was for the year 1976-77.

Turning to the Motor Vehicle Branch I want to commend the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Mr. Peter Dygala, and the rest of the staff in achieving their excellent departmental record, the successful programs of which are the envy of most other provincial Motor Vehicle Branches.

Licensed drivers in Manitoba again increased in 1976 by approximately 10,000 persons. The numbers increased from 536,000 drivers to 546,000 or an increase of two percent.

The number of vehicles registered in Manitoba during 1976 also increased from 532,000 to 560,000 vehicles or an increase of some six percent in the year 1976-77.

In 1976 snowmobile registrations declined to 29,333 or a decrease of 35 percent. As the honourable members are aware each snowmobile had a unique method of identification this year, that being two permanent reflective decals mounted on each side of the cowling and a small licence plate which was issued to the owner at the time of registration revealing that the snowmobile was registered for the current year. With the unusual lack of snow this year it has been difficult to assist the effectiveness of the new registration system. However indications from law enforcement agencies appear very favourable.

Accident statistics unfortunately have increased in Manitoba during 1976. Preliminary figures reveal a total of 37,523 accidents were reported which reflects an approximate increase of three percent. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly not happy to report that. Injury accidents increased from 7,184 to 7,342 reflecting just a little over a two percent increase. A total of 210 lives were lost on Manitoba highways during 1976, compared to 203 in 1975, or an increase of seven more people, or an increase of 3.44 percent.

History has revealed that one of our greatest problems on the roadway is the drinking driver. As reported last year a pilot project was organized in co-operation with the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba to rehabilitate the drivers who are suspected of having or have a drinking problem. The persons who are convicted of second offences are referred to this program where they are exposed to lectures, films and personal counselling by members of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, following which an assessment is made as to whether or not the person has had a drinking problem. This program appears to be achieving some measure of success. During 1976 preliminary figures reveal a total of 6,958 convictions under the Criminal Code of Canada relating to the operation of a motor vehicle; of these, 5,240 convictions were related to drinking and driving or a reduction of eight percent over the year previous.

Convictions under the Highway Traffic Act rose from 83,400 to 85,400 representing an approximate seven percent increase. The convictions and accidents registered revealed an increase from 23,000 to 26,000 suspended drivers, or an increase of 15 percent. The main reasons for the suspensions were as follows, as I said before: alcohol-related offences, show cause hearings, suspension for other criminal offences and failure to pay fines.

The Motor Vehicle Branch conducted a total of 3,600 show cause hearings and written submissions during 1976 which revealed an increase of some 23 percent.

A total of 8,769 driver improvement road tests were conducted during the Driver Improvement Program, the failure rate being approximately 10 percent. In addition to the road tests, over 20,000 counselling interviews were conducted with 2,580 drivers being referred for a Defensive Driving Course run by the Manitoba Safety Council which is provided with substantial financial support by the government. These persons were drivers who, for a variety of reasons, had become involved in too many traffic infractions, violations, or a combination of both.

The Driving Testing Program administered some 48,641 road tests, this being exclusive of the Driver Improvement Test. The failure rate in the Driver Testing Program was about 32 percent. In addition, 97,516 written tests were administered to the various classes of licences. The failure rate in this area ranged from 43 percent in the higher class of licence to an overall average of 21 percent for all drivers. The higher failure rate in the supplementary test required for the higher class licence support the fact that a greater scope of knowledge is required in this particular area.

The Physical Standard Section, whose function is to process medical information on drivers to ensure they are physically and mentally fit to operate a motor vehicle safely, had 11,824 major dealings.

The Motor Vehicle Compulsory Inspection Program was in operation during 1976 from May to October. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this program received a lot of good comments from the members of this Committee last year when we dealt with our Estimates at that time. Forty-three locations and eleven rural communities were serviced. A total of 38,000 vehicles were inspected as opposed to 28,000 the previous year. We had hoped to reach the 40,000 figure . . . we are very close to it anyway, we did have a total of 38,000 vehicles inspected as was more or less anticipated, from 28,000 the year previous.

Vehicles called in for inspection again demonstrated a substantial amount of vehicles on the highways as being defective.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. In accordance with our Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour, to return to the Chair at 8 o'clock this evening.

**ESTIMATES - LABOUR**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan):** When the Committee rose the other night and I had called Resolution 78, the Honourable Member for Morris requested in accordance with our Rule 64(9) and (10), a recorded vote on Resolution 78. That is what is before the committee at the present time. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN:** I suggest that the vote is not on the entire Resolution 78, it is only on the Minister's compensation itself that the vote be taken.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. That is not correct.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Section (b) and (c) have already been passed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 78 (a) was also passed. It was on the Resolution that the motion in its entirety be . . . The Honourable . . .

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, does it make a great deal of difference if we revert back to the item that the honourable members say was not passed, take the vote and then proceed with the next item. I gather that that's what they want to do. They're not interested in debating it again. Well then I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, I guess it goes back to the Minister's Salary item. If it was slipped by, it was slipped by inadvertently and they wish to deal with that item by a recorded vote and we have no objection to that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 78(a) Minister's Compensation and Salary and Representation Allowance \$15,600.00. Shall the item pass? Ayes and Nayes. Call in the members.

**A COUNTED VOTE was taken,** the result being as follows: Yeas 27, Nays 19.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I declare the motion carried.

Resolution 78: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$609,500 for Labour. Shall the item pass? (Agreed.) That completes the Department of Labour.

**ESTIMATES - CO-OPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We now refer honourable members to Page 19 of their Estimates book. Resolution 45 Co-operative Development Administration (a) Minister's Compensation and Salary Representation Allowance \$7,800.00. The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield):** Mr. Chairman, in our Speech from the Throne, we have promised to continue our support for the co-operative movement in this province. Our government favours the encouragement of co-operative enterprise for reasons which I had always felt would be obvious to all members of this Assely. As a matter of fact, I had been under the impression that all major political parties in Canada supported the co-operative movement and recognized the enormous contribution co-operatives have made to the development of the Canadian economy.

During the most recent Federal election, the Co-operative Union of Canada canvassed all Federal Party leaders for a statement on co-operatives, which resulted in an overwhelming vote of confidence in the co-operative movement. The Prime Minister responded by saying, and I quote: "I have long recognized the vital importance of co-operatives in Canada and throughout the world. I am aware, also, of the expansion and of the growing financial strength of the Credit Union movement and its past and future contribution to the economic development of our country. My personal interest in co-operatives and credit unions stems from a deep belief in the underlying principles and ideals of sharing, of co-operation of self help which, in today's world can no longer be viewed as elements of distant Utopias but are essential to our very survival. Members of the co-operatives play a vital role as people of conscience and commitment, who are by their involvement in co-operatives, living the values and ethics which are based upon the realization that we are interdependant beings."

The then leader of the New Democratic Party, David Lewis, stated: "Since its founding convention the New Democratic Party and before it the CCF has expressed its support for co-operative societies and credit unions. These organizations controlled and supported by millions of Canadians, have demonstrated in a convincing fashion that they can perform an essential function in the economic life of our country. They benefit both producers and consumers. Co-operative organizations of farmers and fishermen have helped provide income security for these major producer groups. Consumer co-operatives have combined efficient service and competitive prices to produce an alternative to privately owned monopolies and chain organizations. Credit Unions meet the very real financial needs of both rural and urban Canadians. For these reasons, the extension of co-peratives and Credit Unions organizations have been and continues to be, an objective of the New Democratic Party."

Real Caouette, the then leader of the Social Credit Party stated his party's stand on co-operatives by saying, and I quote: "In general, social creditors look favourably on co-operative development. Our party has always emphasized that the satisfaction of the individual is the whole purpose for which society exists."

And finally, Robert Stanfield expressed his party's support in recognition of the co-operative movement by stating, and I quote: "As this party's legislative and committee record clearly shows we have long been a staunch ally of Canada's co-operatives and credit unions and their members. We have long appreciated and continue just as firmly to value the principles embodied in these movements, their basic methods of operation and the good they do to our society and economy by providing broad, reasonably priced services in all regions of Canada."

These statements of intent by all major political parties in Canada indicate to me that the encouragement of co-operative enterprise is a policy which all parties support and that therefore co-operatives stand above ideological political considerations. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, it was profoundly shocking to me to hear the remarks of the Leader of the Conservative Party here in this province on the issue of co-ops. In a television interview last December, the Leader of the Opposition conveyed to the people of Manitoba the impression that co-operatives are socialist organizations and that the taxpayer's money is being wasted by the Government of Manitoba in the encouragement of co-operative enterprise. This statement is an insult to the one-third of Manitobans who, as members and directors of co-operative organizations, have dedicated their time and effort to making their co-operative a successful undertaking. The implications of the member's statements are very serious indeed, Mr. Chairman.

I will read the text of the member's remarks, so that they are recorded for everyone to scrutinize in the records of this Assembly and I quote: "I think the main priority in Manitoba today in terms of the administration of public affairs is to restore a sane, sensible, common sense government to the province. We haven't had that for the last six or seven years. We have been off on sort of an emotional NDP binge for spending the taxpayer's money on, as I've mentioned before, government operated enterprise such as, planes, buses. Now I understand that they've got what — \$50,000 invested in a co-op form of grocery store in St. Boniface. To try out something that the British experience and all other socialist experience has taught us just don't work." Mr. Chairman, this statement is not only an insult to the many thousand of co-operative members and their organizations, it is also erroneous and misleading. The member said that we have \$50,000 invested in a co-operative organization. Doesn't he know that in co-operatives, people, the members provide the investment capital to finance the enterprise. The government does not have \$50,000 invested in a direct charge co-op in this city. Over \$50,000 in share capital has been subscribed by the members of this organization and, undoubtedly, by the time they are in operation the amount will be higher. Then what is the government doing to assist Boni Co-op in becoming established.

Well, firstly, we have provided a grant of \$15,000 to the group to help them defray a portion of their start up cost. Furthermore, our department and Federated Co-op, each have agreed to guarantee the lease of the premises up to \$50,000 during the first two years of operation. We do not anticipate these guarantees will have to be honoured. However, without some kind of guarantee it is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that a group of local citizens would be hard pressed to find and obtain suitable premises for their operation. These measures are not intended to finance the business in question, rather they are intended to remove some of the barriers to entry that co-operatives and, in fact, many other locally initiated businesses are faced with when they attempt to penetrate an established market. But the misinterpretation of the facts in this case, Mr. Chairman, bad enough as it is of less importance than the member's generalization about co-operative enterprise. I am astounded that any public figure would attempt to link co-operatives with a particular political philosophy. And by the way, Mr. Chairman, I quote the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney, an interview that he had with Bruce Graham, CKY-TV, December 30th, 1976. Furthermore I am astounded to hear the Leader of the Conservative Party, his statement that co-operatives don't work. I can hardly believe that any member, particularly a rural member, would have such a distorted and uninformed view of co-operative enterprise.

Perhaps he links co-operatives with the philosophy of this government because they don't fit in with his own political thinking. This does not surprise me because while the Conservatives pay lip service to co-operative enterprise, their action while they were in power clearly demonstrated that they did everything, Mr. Chairman, everything possible to discourage and thwart co-operative undertakings. They went so far as to prohibit municipalities, school divisions, and other public institutions by legislation if you please, from obtaining financial services from the credit union movement. Even the Co-operative Promotion Board established by an Act of this Legislative Assembly to encourage co-operative enterprise, was precluded, Mr. Chairman, from using the services of a credit union to handle its financial affairs.

Shortly after we took office in 1969, we amended the legislation to remove these arbitrary and unfair practices on the use of credit unions by these institutions.

What I can conclude from this is that while co-operatives should receive tangible support from all spheres in the political realm, they did not under the previous Conservative administration and they would not, Mr. Chairman, if ever that same administration would be returned to power. This I can say without doubt because of their record and because the leader has stated that he thinks co-operatives



are Socialist and that they don't work. I can now understand why many of the member's constituents in Souris-Killarney were so reluctant to see him as their representative.

The co-operative movement has very deep roots in the rural areas, Mr. Chairman, as it was there among the farmers that the early co-operatives in this province were established. I suppose that if the member had been Premier at that time, he would have told the organizers of United Grain Growers and the Manitoba Pool Elevators that their ideas were unworkable, that the grain business should be left to the experts in the Grain Exchange and that farmers could not own and operate co-operative businesses to handle and market their grain. This position would be entirely consistent with the position he is taking on co-operative enterprise today. History would have proved him wrong then just as it will now because people have demonstrated clearly that they are capable of managing their affairs democratically through co-operative organizations.

The proof, Mr. Chairman, is in the results. About 70 percent of all grain grown in Canada is handled by co-operatives. Over half of the dairy products are handled by co-operatives. One Canadian in three is a member of a credit union or *caisse populaire*. About one-third of the production input of agricultural industry is handled by co-operatives. Co-operatives in western Canada successfully operate their own refinery, chemical plants, lumber mills, machinery and manufacturing plants, all major employers and taxpayers.

In Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, the successes of the co-operative movement are even more apparent than on the national scene. Eighty-two retail co-operatives provide consumer goods and services to some 139,000 members. Three dairy and poultry co-operatives serve some 5,000 farmers. Twenty-one fishing co-operatives serve some 1,000 fishermen successfully. Twenty-one day care co-operatives provide day care for children of some 900 parent-members. Two health care co-operatives provide health care for some 655 members. Twenty-two housing co-operatives provide housing for some 1,600 families. Four manpower co-operatives provide jobs for some 600 people. Forty-seven co-operatives provide leisure activity for almost 4,000 families. Approximately 200 credit unions and *caisses populaires* with assets of \$750 million provide financial services for their almost-300,000 members. Farmers have organized their own machinery manufacturing firm, Co-operative Implements, one of the only businesses of this kind owned by farmers in the world. More and more, Mr. Chairman, interest is being shown daily by the people of this province in meeting their own needs through the self-help method of forming co-operatives.

I could go on and on discussing the accomplishments of ordinary people through their co-operative organizations to illustrate that there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that co-operative enterprise does work and that people are capable of managing their own affairs where there is that will to provide for one's self. And yet, Mr. Chairman, despite all this evidence of success, the Leader of the Opposition has proclaimed that co-operatives are Socialist organizations and therefore don't work.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is time that the Progressive Conservative Party clarified its stand on the issue of co-ops. You have their Honourable Leader saying that co-operatives are Socialists and then you have other members from that side of the House standing up and extolling the virtues of co-operatives and private enterprise.

Let me just give you a few examples. Last year when we were discussing the new Co-operative Act, even the Member for Lakeside got up and talked about the virtues of co-operative enterprise. He said, and I quote, "Yes, it is private because a co-op is a group of private individuals deciding their own futures." The quote is June 7, 1976, Hansard, Page 4680.

And during the same debate the Member for Rock Lake got up, and referring to the government philosophy of people getting together and forming co-operatives, "I want to say to them that they are wrong." That quote is June 7 again, Hansard, Page 4686.

And so, Mr. Chairman, this is why I contend that the Conservatives are totally without principle when it comes down to co-operative development. When they talk to the media, co-operatives are some kind of Socialist invention brought out by the present government. However, back in their own constituencies and talking to many hundred constituents who are members of co-operative organizations, co-operatives and credit unions, members of organizations of people trying to help themselves as part of the free enterprise system . . . Now gentlemen opposite, I ask you: Which is it? What does your party really stand for as far as co-operative development is concerned? Are we to believe the Member for Souris-Killarney or the Member for Lakeside or do you really have a position at all on the matter?

I think, Mr. Chairman, the record of the Conservative Party speaks for itself. It shows what kind of private enterprise the Conservatives are prepared to support. The Member for Rock Lake when discussing the new co-op legislation at the last session said, and I quote, "I think that people, whether they belong to co-operatives or whether they believe in free enterprise and forming a private operation or business of their own, should have equal consideration when it comes to dealing with government." That was a quote on June 7, 1976, Hansard, Page 4686.

May I point out the fallacy in this statement, Mr. Chairman. No one with any knowledge can deny that co-operatives are part of the free enterprise system. Perhaps he meant private enterprise but then the Member for Lakeside said that co-operatives are a form of private enterprise. Gentlemen, get your statements in order.

Look at what his party did when they were in power. They did everything they could to actually thwart the co-operative enterprise through legislation. There was no agency within the government with a mandate to encourage and promote co-operative enterprise. The only service they provided to co-operatives was to register them as companies. What kind of equal consideration did co-operative organizations which are owned and operated by the people of Manitoba, a major portion of the electorate and taxpayers all, get from the previous Conservative government? They got no consideration.

What kind of enterprise did the previous Conservative government support, Mr. Chairman? All you had to do, again only as an example, is to find out and to refer to the report of the Commission of Inquiry on CFI. The government had canvassed over 100 companies to invest in northern Manitoba and had been turned down by all of them. Undaunted by this, they ran an advertisement promising up to \$100 million to finance, and I quote, "Operation Industrial Breakthrough." The Commission concludes, Mr. Chairman, and I quote:

"The Government of Manitoba was unwise to advertise as they did in July, 1965, that \$100 million was available to finance Operation Industrial Breakthrough. Pulp and paper was part of the breakthrough and the government had already received the answer that private enterprise was unwilling to invest. To advertise as they did was to solicit the interest of profiteers and of development racketeers."

That is the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into CFI, page 1911.

**A MEMBER:** They call that rugged individualism if you use somebody's money.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. TOUPIN:** The ad itself shows, Mr. Chairman, the kind of reckless abandon with which the previous government set about to develop new industry in this province but the actions which followed were even more damaging to the people of this province. An informal committee of Cabinet composed of Roblin, Evans, Steinkopf and you, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition of today, conducted the negotiations with Oscar Reiser in September, 1965, which negotiations led to acceptance of Monaco's proposal. The Cabinet made no adequate inquiries about the *bona fides* of Oscar Reiser or the investment group he claimed to represent. In agreeing to deal with the representative of unknown Swiss principals the Cabinet group acted unwisely and laid the foundation of the fraudulent activities that later occurred. I quote CFI Inquiry Commission Report, Page 1912:

"There was no ceiling in the amount of the loan to be made by the fund and the rate of interest of the loan was fixed. This was the kind of deal that unknown Swiss principals could expect from the government."

Mr. Chairman, co-operatives could expect: What? Nothing. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I would wish that the honourable member, my colleague, would wait his turn.

Actions such as these, Mr. Chairman, deserve to be referred to as an emotional binge to say the least. Our efforts to assist and encourage co-operative enterprise do not. Ours are the actions of a responsible government trying to make it possible for people to work together to provide themselves with goods and services at a reasonable cost. We, Mr. Chairman, support co-operatives, not because they are referred to as Socialist by the opposition, co-operatives, as we all know, are open to all races, creeds, thoughts and political practices. They take a non-political approach. Just try to place a political notice in a co-operative anywhere in this province and see what happens. Co-operatives transcend, Mr. Chairman, politics altogether because co-operatives are a means by which the average person can participate in a meaningful way in the economic development of our province. We believe that the opportunity to participate in co-operatives should be open to all. We believe that government should encourage co-operative development as a superior form of economic organization. Therefore, while we believe in increasing opportunities for the average citizen, the Conservative Party believes in creating opportunities for a select few in the big business sector.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that this attitude on the part of the Conservative Party of Manitoba has not changed and will not change despite any suggestion to the contrary. In fact just a few months ago the Member for Roblin was quoted as saying that, and I quote:

"The co-op movement is one of the wealthiest groups in the country. Retail co-ops can handle their own affairs very, very capably' presumably without any encouragement from government."

But the more amazing comment came a bit later when the same member was quoted as saying that he did not favour credit unions getting into the banking business. He apparently said that there were enough banks in the field already. I can only conclude that the Member for Roblin feels that he should represent the interests of the handful of bankers who manage the present banking system and not the thousands of co-operative and credit union members who though their co-op organization

have decided to seek the establishment of the Northland Bank.

This government, Mr. Chairman, had no problem in deciding which group to support and we provided every encouragement to the Western Co-operative and Credit Union Organizations in their bid to form Northland Bank. I believe, Mr. Chairman, it is fair to say that the people of this province will judge these actions and I think that when they do so, the almost-300,000 credit union members, the 139,000 consumer co-op members, the 5,000 dairy and poultry producer-members, the 3,500 members of recreational, social and cultural co-operatives, in fact all the members of the co-operative organizations in this province will recognize that their interests are not represented by the Conservative Party in this province but they will react as individuals, not because of some mystic, socialistic force alluded to by the members of the opposition.

Mr. Chairman, the 1977-78 Estimates of the Department of Co-operative Development totalling some \$1,634,000 reaffirm this government's commitment to the fostering of co-operative development in Manitoba. With the implementation of the new Co-operative Act and the introduction of the new Credit Unions Act at this session of the Legislature, I believe we have laid a solid foundation for the development of co-operative institutions in Manitoba. One of the Department of Co-operative Development's major objectives in the coming year will be the interpretation and exploration of these new pieces of legislation to co-operative organizations in Manitoba.

In concert with this, the department will intensify its efforts to provide the information on co-operatives to all Manitobans by placing increased emphasis on the development of the departmental Information and Communications Program. All branches of the department will co-operate in the production of materials to communicate the co-operative message to Manitobans and inform Manitobans of the potential applications and benefits of the co-operative formula.

Within the expenditure restraint guidelines established by the government, the Department of Co-operative Development will continue to develop and implement programs to further the development of the co-operative movement in Manitoba. Specifically, the department will continue to provide organizational and administrative support to a group of Winnipeg consumers in their efforts to develop a direct charge co-operative.

The government, Mr. Chairman, is unshaken in its belief that this form of retailing can provide real savings to moderate income consumers and large families as is well worthy of government support.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 4:30' Private Members' Hour, in accordance with our Rule 19(2), I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The first item Thursday on Private Members' Hour is Public Bills. Bill No. 9, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Stand, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you. Bill No. 17, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Stand.

**BILL (NO. 37) - AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE HELLER-NATOFIN  
(WESTERN) LTD.**

**MR. SHAF** presented NSKY Bill No. 37, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd., for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Mr. Speaker, Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd. was incorporated by a special Act in 1964 under the name of Tri-State Mortgage Corporation. A year ago I introduced an amendment to that Act to establish it under this new name of Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd.

Since the last application to the Legislature, the Corporations Act of Manitoba has come into effect. As a result of the provisions of the new Corporations Act, particularly as it relates to private lending institutions, there appears to be no reason whatsoever for Heller-Natofin Ltd. to continue to be incorporated by a private Act. In fact it appears much desirable for the company to be incorporated as if it were originally incorporated under the Corporations Act. The reason for this is relatively straightforward.

Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd., through its associated and affiliated companies, carries on business in all provinces of Canada with the substantive extent of its business being carried on in the provinces of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, appears to be the only jurisdiction today to allow private lending companies to be free of the red tape of government supervision. The reason for this results from the amendments to the Corporations Act which, in effect, takes the view that private lending companies need not have their investments supervised by the government as they are investing the money of their shareholders rather than the public. Because of this anomaly it is the intention of the Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd. to import substantial portions of their operations carried on in other provinces to Manitoba with the intent that the companies would then all be amalgamated with Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd. and form one large lending institution in Manitoba.

Under the current provisions of the Corporations Act however, companies incorporated by special Act may not be amalgamated with other corporations. That is the chief thrust of the current application, namely to restore Natofin (Western) Ltd. to the status of an ordinary corporation in order that the imported corporations may then be amalgamated.

In passing it might become obvious that should the importation and amalgamation be completed this would bring a large institutional lending business into Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the legal counsel for Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd. will be available when this bill goes to Committee to answer any other questions that may arise as a result of this bill passing second reading.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**RESOLUTION NO. 11**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now we are down to Private Members' Resolutions. We have Resolution 11 as the first one on the program. The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, I had held this for my colleague from Point Douglas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member from Point Douglas.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the expertise of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I am aware that he has devoted considerable study to urban renewal and urban planning. I regret it very much that he is not in his seat at the moment.

I cannot claim any outstanding credentials in this field generally but I believe I am well qualified to deal with the resolution before us because it concerns most of my constituency and the area I have lived in. I am quite familiar with this area and I also know what the present government has done for this area.

The Member for Fort Rouge tries to make the point that public works are not the way to rebuild the inner core area. I would agree with him that public works are not the complete answer but I cannot understand his reason for objecting to such public works. Rebuilding the inner core of many

Canadian cities is a tremendous job. We have over 900,000 unemployed in Canada. What could be more desirable than necessary public works? What could be more beneficial to the people than useful public projects that would improve our cities and towns? I wish I knew how we could get the Federal Liberal Government involved in a massive public works program to put some of the unemployed to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with some of the biggest public projects of our time. I am familiar with the redevelopment that took place in Britain after the war when much of London and other cities had to be rebuilt. I know about the vast building projects that had to be carried out in my own former homeland. As you know, many cities in Poland and the rest of Europe had been reduced to rubble and have since been rebuilt. And only one city, Mr. Speaker, Warsaw, after the uprising in 1944 was destroyed 85 percent, 85 percent, and now is rebuilt. Compared to those enormous building projects in war-divested Europe and Asia, the rebuilding of the inner core of Winnipeg should be considered child's play. But, if my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, is willing to think big, I have a few big ideas of my own. But my big ideas of rebuilding would involve the Federal Liberal government to a far greater degree than this imaginative Liberal government is willing to go.

The national leader of the New Democratic Party has suggested many times in the House of Commons that the Liberal government, in co-operation with provincial governments, launch a massive building and redevelopment program. This would take care of the decaying core areas of many Canadian cities. This would greatly improve the living conditions of the people in these areas. It would also employ thousands of workers in useful productive work.

But, Mr. Speaker, public projects on this scale call for a federal government of imagination and daring. As it is, we have a Liberal Prime Minister who tells young Canadians if they can't find jobs in Canada, let them go to some other country. All honourable members who are around my age or older will remember that sending the unemployed out to some other country is the way Liberal and Conservative governments in the past have solved the unemployment problem. During the depression in the '30s there was close to a million unemployed in Canada. No jobs could be found for them either in government projects or in private industry. Then, during the war, close to a million men and some women were put in the armed forces. They were equipped with the most expensive equipment, war planes, tanks, ships, guns and other things. With this equipment they were sent to Italy, France, Germany, Hong Kong and other countries. At that time no questions were asked as to where the money would come from to finance such a big enterprise. Today, when our national New Democratic leader asked the Liberal Government to embark on a rebuilding program, on a much more modest scale, it is being dismissed as being financially impossible.

Young people are not being offered jobs to help develop and improve conditions in Canada. They were told by our Liberal Prime Minister to go away to some other country to find jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you did not consider this a digression from the issue before us. I just mention all this so that my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, will know that when we consider redeveloping the core area of our city, we cannot count on the kind of assistance we would expect from a wise federal government.

**A MEMBER:** Baloney.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Maybe we will get nothing but baloney, I agree with the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Member for Fort Rouge seems to suggest that existing provincial programs are insufficient. He also inferred that these programs run contrary to the wishes of inner city residents themselves. But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, there are many examples of provincially-funded programs in which residents play a major role in determining the location of funds. For example, the city relocates funds provided under the Special Municipal Loans Program for many projects which are proposed by community committees. Also the projects funded under the newly started Inner City Employment Program are being based upon proposals by all interested local community organizations. All of these participate in the discussions of these projects.

I am most familiar with the situation in my own community of north Point Douglas. This is the renewal activity carried on under the three level cost-shared Neighbourhood Improvement. In my view this is one of the best examples of the democratic constitution process in effect with regard to inner city renewal.

For the benefit of all honourable members, I will give just a bit of background information on this. North Point Douglas is one of the four Winnipeg committed areas for which a total of \$16 million has been committed for urban renewal. Of this, the provincial government contribution will be some \$4 million. In my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, \$3 ½ million has been committed.

I would like to mention here the work already completed or taking place. This project includes parks, recreation, municipal services and home improvement. Municipal works have included street construction, street resurfacing, patchwork, line improvement, boulevards, sidewalks and curb repairs. Improvements have also been made in street lighting and road widening.

I am also glad to point out, Mr. Speaker, that extensive improvements have been made to existing parks and playground facilities constructed for young children. I should also mention that a

recreation association has recently been formed. This association is overseeing further improvements to recreation facilities in that area.

Another project is a Day Care Centre facility which has been constructed on the grounds of Mount Carmel Clinic which is now in operation. This has been founded by the Provincial Government. I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that in all this development and all other developments yet to be undertaken, the people in that area are consulted. The north Point Douglas residents have a voice in this development through the Neighbourhood Improvement Committee. This group has had a major input in planning decision involved. At present that committee is promoting the redevelopment of one of the original industrial sites in Winnipeg. That is the site of the Vulcan Iron Works.

The aim is to develop that into residential buildings. The committee has met with representatives of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to consider development of options for this and the other sites. The staff of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation intend to work closely with the group toward meeting their objectives for a housing development.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the people serving on this committee. I believe it is a tribute to their dedication and that of the three-level government officials involved that we have secured the degree of co-operation necessary to the continuing success of the program.

The resolution before us appears to be one of support of all the good work that Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has done. And this agency surely deserves such a support. It has often been pointed out that Manitoba has ranked number one in the recent years among all provinces in the *per capita* provision of housing. In the last seven years 11,000 family and senior citizen housing units have been completed. In addition, there was rehabilitation work done on some 30,000 units under the Home Repair Program since 1972.

I must also point out that of the 1,500 units committed by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, 800 are to be developed in the inner city.

As a clergyman I get around into the homes of many people in my constituency. My constituency has many poor people in the low income groups. Good homes are important to a good community life. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to provide that since 1969 the New Democratic Party Government has spent \$250 million to provide better housing for the people, and I am sure the people who have directly benefited from better housing are even more pleased that this government has made it possible for them to live in greater comfort and dignity.

In his speech on this resolution the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge questioned the wisdom of the government and its expenditures for government office buildings. Apparently he believes more of those have been built than are needed. Mr. Speaker, I would not condone the spending of money on buildings that are not needed whether they are government buildings or private business buildings. There is no evidence that we have more government buildings than we need, but there is plenty of evidence that private business is spending an excessive amount of money in erecting more business offices than we need.

Some time ago there was a news item in the press showing that Vancouver had more office space than they knew what to do with. And a few weeks ago there was an item in Winnipeg papers that probably we had more empty office space here than in Vancouver and still many more business office buildings are being erected.

You may also recall that even 10 years ago a Royal Commission Report indicated we had far more shopping centres and supermarkets and other shopping facilities than we need. I mention this matter, Mr. Speaker, because I feel the business community should show greater responsibility in redeveloping the neglected inner core of the city. Some of them, the huge investments going into excessive office and shopping buildings should be devoted to building up and improving those areas of the city where this is vitally needed. Mr. Speaker, I'm not happy to see so many new office buildings going up in the southern part of the city near Broadway, while many good office buildings north on Portage or off Portage may be left empty. I mention in particular the huge magnificent office building on Main Street that used to house the Bank of Commerce. This huge building has been empty since the Bank of Commerce moved into the Richardson Building about 10 years ago. I am only a humble clergyman, I don't claim to know too much about matters of business, but still I don't think there is much profit in empty office buildings.

Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge had indicated in his resolution how some of this money squandered in excessive commercial buildings could be diverted to improve housing in the inner core area, I would have supported. I always appreciate the contribution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. He no doubt has made a great study of urban renewal. I have carefully considered the resolution and the speech he made on it but frankly I see nothing in the proposals he put forward that would be an improvement over the government solving of problems in this area.

He has suggested that people in their area should have more say in determining the kind of projects. I had indicated earlier that the people are already involved in the greatest extent possible in

the decision-making. He has suggested some changes in the manner of financing, but I cannot see how this would be an improvement over existing methods. It certainly wouldn't increase the amount of financing.

He has also suggested the formation of special agencies such as Community Economic Development Corporation. This would give us another agency, the CEDC, to be added to the MHRC, this would give us more alphabet soup. But I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, how this would be a way to improve the work carried out by existing agencies. I can see that my time . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member's time is up.

**MR. MALINOWSKI:** Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave to carry on? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder why the Member for Fort Rouge puts in resolutions such as this. There is every opportunity to discuss this particular resolution within the confines of the Estimates of this House. And at the present time when his suggestions, while he spoke on it, was used to berate the government for the housing plans and everything in the inner city, and that can also be done very easily and very thoroughly on the debate of the Estimates.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that this resolution with these suggestions in them could be much better done on the Estimates and would be more satisfactorily done because you can have a debate going back and forth with the person and get your answers much better and get your points across much better. So one would wonder why the resolution comes forward other than to just get up and make a long speech about the inner core area which I agree has problems, and the housing, etc., in the inner core area should be looked at. And as I said, we will be looking at them.

And the member that just spoke to us takes the opportunity to use the resolution to praise the government as is always done by the members of the other side when there's a resolution presented. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe the member is very sincere in what he says, and he has studied it very clearly.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intent to remain long on it because there are other places to debate this. But the actual resolution says to set up a Community Economic Development Corporation, and I don't know why we even need to do that, we have that at the present time in this province in a similar nature with MHRC. If there's going to be a branch of a government organization opened up to take care of this specific type of thing, there does not have to be a creation of a Community Economic Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of the urban development bank, if the member could possibly think back, I believe and I think all the members in this House know that the Treasury Branches are available to this government. It has been passed by this House and you don't really need to start up and establish an urban development bank. The authority is there for the government at the present time to do anything of this nature. So you know we can't really pile another bank upon another bank. And they established the Home Repair Program to be funded by the bank. We have in the province at the present time a Home Repair Program, that if it has to be expanded and supported by other financing from Treasury Branch or government funds, the authority is already there for the government to do all of these things as far as this resolution is concerned. And that is what the resolution says and as our side of the House we certainly can't support the setting up of more corporations. I say to you this, Mr. Speaker, that I have to say what I said before about setting up new corporations and Ministries, with this government and its power it is like having it rain for another six years in the Province of Manitoba.

There's no way that this government should be allowed or should even think of setting up more departments and more corporations to get this province more confused than they are at the present time.

**A MEMBER:** I would sure like some rain, for instance, now.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** So, Mr. Speaker, our position on the bill is very clearly this; that this side of the House if the Ministers will answer questions better than we had a couple of nights ago and if we have Ministers who will present their department programs better than the Minister did this afternoon, and tell us what the programs are instead of using their introduction of Estimates to berate the opposition and talk about the government, we'd be very happy to have that happen and we will examine and bring up points that we are supposed to bring up as an opposition on the Estimates, if the government Ministers will allow us to do that. I think that many of them could take some training from some of the Ministers over there who have done a good job.

So we, Mr. Speaker, will debate the housing in the housing Estimates; and we do not agree and we cannot agree to the setting up of more corporations and banks and funds and this thing as far as this government is concerned. And really if they want to do it, they have the authority to do it at the present time. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly glad that I stayed this afternoon and have a chance to participate in that debate. I've listened to the Member for Sturgeon Creek for about eight years and I don't think I ever agreed with him on anything, but this afternoon he has made a few points that I certainly concur in.

He said, in essence, that the ideas put forward by the Member for Fort Rouge were really not necessary and not very good, and I agree with him on that. Then he said that he also felt that we have the present mechanisms and government agencies to be able to carry the kind of programs being talked about and that it isn't necessary to establish new ones, and I agree with him on that particular point as well.

I think that most members of the Legislature, if not all, would agree that possibly the greatest problem that we are facing today is unemployment and that perhaps there has been a shift, over the past year or so, from inflation to employment or unemployment. And that our attention if it hasn't been focussing on that is going to in the next year or two. It will be very interesting listening to reports of the federal budget tonight and then seeing what our government comes up with in its budget proposals to counter what is probably the most serious problem in the country today.

I'm always sort of amused at the speeches of the Member for Fort Rouge and I have so much material on his two related resolutions, eleven and twelve, that I intend to save some of it for when he returns. But I recall, and I have to mention in passing, that when the AIB first established and the whole emphasis of the federal program was on saving money and budgeting money and tightening down the economy, and so on, one of the first things that they had to do was to go out and get 100,000 square feet of space. They had to establish a program. They had to have physical space to put in several hundred employees so that they could function. Practically the first action of the Federal Government was to go out and lease and pay government money, tax money, for the rental of space which presumably was vacant or available in the Ottawa area.

If I was trying to put my finger on the endless resolutions and rhetoric of the Member for Fort Rouge, I think that his strength and his weakness are the same thing, namely he is a political scientist. He is not a politician, or at least not that good a politician and he is certainly no economist. He appears to know nothing whatsoever about economics and perhaps that's unlike his previous leader. I don't know what the former leader I.H. Asper knew about economics, presumably a great deal. He certainly knew a great deal about taxation and I suppose that he knew something about economics and he proved that he didn't know anything about politics. So now we have the heir apparent after the present Liberal leader goes on to his reward, to the bench where he is going to make a direct bee-line towards, after his short career is over and he acquires the black robes of office that I think he deserves. I think he'd make a superb member of the judiciary. We all then have to look to the young dynamic MLA for Fort Rouge assuming he is re-elected, because I think that both the Tories and New Democrats intend to give him one strong run for his money.

But I say that his problem is that he knows political science, as a study, and that he really does not understand nor grasp principles of economics. So when the government is talking about budgets and fiscal policy and public works which is a weapon, or a weapon in the arsenal to counter downturns in the business cycle, to counter unemployment, as well as to at any time provide needs, to fill needs, to simply allow the government to operate on the basis of its program. He seems to be completely unfamiliar with that whole complicated field of economics.

The other thing that he's most enamoured with are American ideas. And I suppose all of us have to be influenced, to some extent, by our giant neighbour to the south. And the things that I recall there are his suggestions either implicit or explicit about the wonders of such things as social animators, which reminds me of the previous Liberal leader's great enthusiasm for referendums. This was something that we used to hear from time to time, that this is something for a referendum. We have to go back to the people, and so on. A seeming inability . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, that was one of his economic proposals, monorail. I really thought that was an interesting one. And the monorail from South Indian Lake to Winnipeg. That really would have been a technological feat.

I think again that there seems to be a failure on the part of our friends in the Liberal Party to really appreciate or understand the parliamentary system in which we operate. They seem to have no faith whatsoever in the elected representatives. They seem to think that they are some sort of an isolated people who operate at great distance from the people and it's only the people themselves, of course, that they trust.

Well of course, Mr. Speaker, we know what they have in mind. I mean we know what is at the back of their mind, namely that they are not in power therefore we have to get closer to the people. And since the people really don't know what they want and require some guidance, that they will then fill that role. That they will become social animators, or that they will tell the social animators what to tell the people and in that way, of course rather than listening to the government, they will listen to certain members of the opposition, namely the Member for Fort Rouge who knows all and tells all that he knows about problems in the core area.



The members of the opposition in general, though, and I say this in reference to the Official Opposition as well, they seem to think that there is something wrong about public works and public housing because that's what the government is doing. The government is attempting to implement programs in the core area of the city to solve the housing problems and to do something to improve the old rotting urban core of Winnipeg.

They think it's okay for the government to lease from private developers. They think that's fine. And that is the policy, of course, that they adopted. They didn't want to have any new buildings appearing on the horizon. They wanted whatever space that they required to be built by private developers or leased from existing buildings. They feel that that is an excellent program. It puts the money in the hands of the people that they most respect, the people who own the blocks or develop the blocks and support the free enterprise party.

So when it comes to things like Trizec, that's okay. Trizec, that's okay. Leasing space, that's okay. Private developers building new buildings, private developers taking on new projects, private developers building buildings that can't be rented with empty space in them, that's okay. But the government, no the government can't build. No sir. There's something wrong and peculiar and foreign, and as the Leader of the Opposition often says, un-Canadian, socialistic, about those kinds of ideas. We can't have that here.

So I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that unfortunately the Member for Fort Rouge who has a grasp of all the latest in American political innovations, in terms of social animators and that sort of thing, does not have any appreciation for the economic thought of someone like Galbraith or someone like Keynes. Even though he seems to be somewhat attracted to American ideas, he by-passes the fact, I guess, that it was recently announced and is now apparently going through Congress that the new President of the United States, Jimmy Carter, is promoting a package, a \$48 billion public works project, a \$4 billion package, to help put people back to work. Now it would be very interesting indeed to hear a comment from my friends opposite. I don't know how they regard President Carter or how they regard the United States, whether they think the United States is galloping toward Socialism or whether the new president is tainted, but I do draw that to their attention that one of the great capitalist countries in the world is, I suppose, the greatest capitalist country in the world in terms of prosperity, in terms of tradition, in terms of economic power, is the United States. And the United States is putting in a \$48 billion program to help do something about the unemployment in the United States of America.

I would also like to point out in passing that the Manitoba Archives Building which we renovated and was a building that was built in the 1930s by the Federal Government to try to encourage people to get back to work, to encourage and stimulate the construction industry, and I think everyone would agree that that is the kind of project that there could be or should be support for, that is a useful expenditure and one that most people would approve of.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek and my colleague from Point Douglas both pointed out that there are existing programs, there are existing departments in the government, agencies that could in fact accomplish everything that is mentioned in this resolution. MHRC can well handle public housing. We have a Critical Home Repair Program and so on.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that although I could speak at much greater length, I find little enthusiasm in doing so since we have the support of the Official Opposition in this regard and it looks like about a 35 or 45-to-1 vote and we are all together on this particular issue.

I would like to say this in conclusion, that it is a peculiar thing when the Department of Public Works goes throughout the province and meets with the representatives of the various councils, like at Portage la Prairie, we are treated extremely well. We meet with the people. We discuss sites with them, *et cetera*. There seems to be a great positive reaction in the community. When we go to Dauphin, the same sort of thing. When we move around —(Interjection)— Well, you have your buildings many years ago. You acquired that many years ago. I suppose in the Roblin days that building was probably . . . —(Interjection)— Well, that is very interesting. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that throughout Manitoba when the Provincial Government puts up a building, it is, I think, understood and appreciated. Somehow or other —(Interjection)— No, not in the Chamber. Not so much in the Chamber. When you deal with the City of Winnipeg, somehow or other there are people in the city, and I am not necessarily speaking of councillors now, but there are people in the city who somehow or other seem to think this is a terrible thing. The government is putting up a building to the detriment of the city. —(Interjection)— What does it do? It provides employment in the city. It provides the city with tax revenues. It provides the city with attractive, new, modern facilities. And somehow or other they say they don't want it or they don't need it or they want something else, and I hear those voices. Now those voices seem to emanate from the Liberal Party. The Member for Fort Rouge, his buddy Arenson the lawyer, and then their associate Nick Ternette a sometimes New Democrat. So we are more than prepared, Mr. Speaker . . . —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. DOERN:** . . . to either put Mr. Ternette on waivers or to donate him. I speak on behalf of my

colleagues here. Perhaps I will be reprimanded for this but we are prepared to give — Nick Ternette — so that when we look at that one TV channel instead of seeing those two separate programs which really belong together, the Charlie Huband Show and the Ternette Report, we can then have a new show, the Huband-Ternette Report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** I wonder if the Minister would permit a question. He was speaking about public buildings. I wonder if he might inform the House when the public building across the way is going to be unlocked because when the bus was leaving for Brandon for the Royal Winter Fair yesterday, there was a chap relieving himself in the doorway and I just wonder if you might unlock it.

—(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie have a question also?

**MR. G. E. JOHNSTON:** Yes. —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister who just gave us such a moving speech made a statement that aroused my curiosity. He said that the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party were going to field one strong candidate against the Member for Fort Rouge. Is that a correct statement?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply said that I think that the Member for Fort Rouge is in some trouble in his own riding because I think that there will be two candidates. We are not going to join forces. We are each going to run our own candidate and let the strongest one take it.

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

**MR. WALLY JOHANNSON:** Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a grab-bag of intellectual garbage. It is one of the worst, most stupid resolutions I have ever seen drafted and needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against it. Let there be any doubt in that matter, I'm going to vote against it. And I'm going to vote against it because essentially what the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge wants to do is place the rebuilding of the inner core in the hands of Nick Ternette. Essentially what the Member for Fort Rouge is suggesting is that we place, we the elected government of Manitoba who have a mandate to the people of this province, be is asking us to place the job of rebuilding the inner core of Winnipeg in the hands of Nick Ternette, and perhaps the urban institute in the City of Winnipeg.

Now Nick Ternette cannot get elected as a garbage collector. Neither, Mr. Speaker . . . —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. JOHANNSON:** Mr. Speaker, essentially what the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is doing is he is attacking the whole concept of responsible government. He is suggesting that, and he says it in his second whereas, "that we offer to the residents and city officials of the inner city community financial incentives for the form of physical renewal they would choose themselves, is more effective than programs chosen for them by the Provincial Government, because it builds a sense of confidence and self-respect in the community."

He is asking us to place in the hands of people who are not elected, who cannot get elected, place in the hands of these people the responsibility of government.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to do that. We are not prepared to do that. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge may be prepared to do so because, Mr. Speaker, he can't get a government elected in this province. He and his colleagues can elect three members. They cannot elect a government therefore they are suggesting that the government should abdicate its powers and place them in the hands of people who can't get elected.

Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful theory for those who can't get elected but it's not a theory, Mr. Speaker, that I can accept. And it is not a theory, Mr. Speaker, that is conducive to democracy. In fact it is an attempt to undermine democracy. It is a basic attempt to undermine democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the inner city area has elected, without exception, NDP MLAs. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas sits for an inner city constituency. I sit for an inner city constituency. Perhaps my statement is a bit sweeping because if we expand the definition we will bring in Wolseley and Fort Rouge and other areas. But essentially the inner city area has elected NDP MLAs. And they have elected NDP MLAs not to give away the powers of government, they have elected NDP MLAs because we are committed to doing something about the problems of the inner city.

The member continually astonishes me. In his second whereas he states that we should offer financial incentives to residents and city officials of the inner city community. Now what on earth is he talking about? Is he asking us to bribe the residents of the inner city? Give them financial incentives? Is he asking us to bribe the people who are employed by the City Planning Department? By the City of Winnipeg? Because this is precisely what it sounds like. I was under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg paid its planning personnel pretty adequate salaries. But the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is now asking us to provide financial incentives to these people

Thursday, March 31, 1977

---

so that they should do their job properly. The idea is absurd. It's ridiculous.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the area of the inner city has been studied and consulted to death. Urban Renewal Area No. 2 existed for well over a decade. The members here who were on City Council and on Metro could probably give the exact figure. But Urban Renewal Area No. 2 existed for well over a decade. We then had the Peoples' Committee which I gather the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge had some connection with, located in the area, publically funded, consulting with the people. Now for almost two decades the people of the inner city were studied and they were consulted but nothing was done. The area was falling apart.

This government believes that we have a responsibility to deal with the problems of the inner city and we have already begun doing things about the problem.

And, Mr. Speaker . . . Yes we will continue. Mr. Speaker, do you want to call it 5:30?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thirty seconds, unless the honourable member wishes to stop here.

**MR. JOHANNSON:** Okay, I'll stop now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, I'm now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.