

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 29, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russett):** Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my left, where we have 50 students of Grade 6 standing from Riverview School under the direction of Mr. Roch. This school is located in the constituency of Osborne, the constituency of the Honourable Attorney-General.

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

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions.

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

**MR. DON ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee met on Thursday, June 29, 1978 to consider the Financial Statement of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds and the Annual Reports of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., and Channel Area Loggers Ltd.

Messrs. R.G. Clement, Q.C., Chairman of the Board of Directors of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds, Orville H. Minish, President and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., A.S. Murray, Vice President of the Board of Directors of Channel Area Loggers Ltd. provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to the various Companies.

The Financial Statement of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds and the Annual Statements of Moose Lake Loggers Ltd., and Channel Area Loggers Ltd. were adopted.

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance could reply today with respect to the question I asked him yesterday — he did not have an opportunity to see the press reports yesterday with respect to the contention of very major new natural gas discoveries which have a bearing on value and pricing henceforth?

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Well, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity just to review the press statements with regard to the potential gas supplies alluded to by Canadian Hunter, who have the reserves in the area that have been indicated, or some of the reserves indicated, and there is a degree of speculation about the reports, so it's difficult to actually say anything very specific. But

if in fact the speculation is correct, of course, it would have a very very major effect on Canada generally of discovering these sorts of reserves.

The sorts of reserves alluded to in the report are 10, 20 times that order as large as the reserves of the Arctic Islands and the Beaufort Sea, which, of course, would indicate that the northern gas supplies that have been receiving the attention to date, including the Polar Gas Pipeline, the McKenzie Valley Pipeline, the Alcan Pipeline, would all be put into a different perspective if in fact these gas reserves exist in Alberta.

In terms of Canada as a nation, it would be an asset, a boon almost beyond comprehension, if that were the case. But I would hasten to add that having read the reports, there is still a high degree of speculation about the existence of the potential reserves. But in fact if there are 400 trillion cubic feet of gas in those reserves, they become the largest gas reserves, among the largest in the world; I think probably larger than the gas reserves contained in Russia, and certainly the largest in North America. If, in fact, they were to prove out and at \$3.00 per mcf produce 400 trillion feet of gas, Canada's future is very significantly affected in the economic sense by the existence of those reserves.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't taken it to the next stage to determine what Manitoba's policy might be within that framework, because, to repeat again, there is a degree of speculation here and I think that that would be something that is going to have to be — if they exist — is going to have to be accommodated within the total Canadian framework because the amounts and sizes are so staggering.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, admittedly because of the very high degree of speculation, one hesitates to question in detail, but I would like to ask the Minister this: Can he advise as to whether or not the Government of Canada has given notice or indication of intent with respect to the convening of the next meeting of Ministers of Energy across Canada?

**MR. CRAIK:** No, Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been any indication of that, to this date.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister considering the possibility of asking that such a conference be convened before the end of the year, in order that major speculation of this kind can be dealt with, so as to avoid the possibility of further adjustments in natural gas pricing that may be allowed to take place in isolation of the possibility of major increments and supply — very major increments and supply — being acknowledged without any impact on pricing policies?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, my reaction to the question from the Leader of the Opposition would be that the general gas supply hearings by the National Energy Board this fall would probably be the forum where one would want to pursue that. And I say that particularly in view of the fact that the reports in yesterday's media were somewhat speculative and by the time fall is here we probably will have a better indication. And I'm sure it would have to be taken into account by the NEB Hearings, so I would think that that might be the first appropriate forum to deal with that matter. If there is substance to the reports I'm sure that the Federal Energy Minister himself would want to hasten a meeting to discuss the matter.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister reporting for the Manitoba Telephone System, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and that is to ask the Minister, following his tabling here in this House of a letter which he addressed, rather a lengthy letter, which he addressed some weeks ago to the Federal Minister of Communications asking that the Government of Canada enforce its own policy relative to the agreement which it entered into with Manitoba relative to cablevision hardware, can the Minister indicate if he has received a reply to that letter and, if so, what is its main purport?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Well, Mr. Speaker, the question with respect to the response that has been obtained from the Federal Minister of Communications on our request that the offices of the Minister be used to ensure that there was indeed some consideration being given to the terms of the Canada-Manitoba Agreement. The response really has been, in terms of action, there has been since that time a meeting of three of the rural licensees with the CRTC in Ottawa and our interpretation of the results of that meeting is that the CRTC intends to amend the licenses in order that the drop ownership may be accommodated, that is, the drop ownership by MTS may be accommodated in those licenses. To that end, I understand that a further hearing by CRTC is

to be held in Winnipeg, I believe in August of this year.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answer seems reassuring but in order to attempt to get more directly at the main point, I would like to ask the Minister if he is confirming then that the Federal Minister has replied to the effect that an agreement entered into by Canada and the province, both sovereign jurisdictions in a federal state, that that agreement will be respected and honoured by any and all of its agencies.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm in such precise terms that those words have been used by the Federal Minister of Communications. My interpretation of her reply is that she does agree that it is important that these terms be recognized, that the CRTC has now indicated that they are prepared to review the license terms and that it is her interpretation of this move that an amendment will be made to permit the ownership by MTS of cable drops. Again, to repeat, a hearing the CRTC indicates will be necessary to accomplish this will be held within the next 50 to 60 days.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation. In view of the fact that the City of Winnipeg has decided to get out of the land banking program in Fort Garry and St. Vital, will the province, through MHRC, now proceed with the expropriation of the land since it held a 50 percent portion of that piece that we were talking about, especially since the Attorney-General has suggested to the City, in his letter to them, that the St. Vital site be kept since it could be serviced quickly?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, the Premier took that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Urban Affairs yesterday. I would say that the position that we are in is that the City obviously passed a resolution in Council last night making a recommendation to the province. When we receive that recommendation we will then discuss it as we had previously discussed our decision before, but until that time I can say to you that we have no policy; we have to discuss it and look over the City's recommendation when we receive it.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Two weeks ago the Minister took as notice my question about the dollar difference between the average cost of a lot and the average selling price of a lot in Inkster Gardens. Is he now in a position to inform us of what that dollar difference is?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, on Inkster, we have announced a program where there will be a saving of up to \$5,000 to people who qualify for our second mortgage program. I am prepared to say that the profits that we make are being passed on; I am not prepared to tell the member what our costs are of development. As a matter of fact, I don't think it's something that we should be advertising because if we are going to be in the development business or do any developing at all I think our costs are our business and not the business of other developers.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A supplementary question to the Minister. Since on the Peter Warren show today he told Peter Warren that the difference was something in the order of \$5,000, is he prepared to tell the members of the Legislature what the difference is rather than telling the media outside the House what the dollar difference is and then refusing to answer legitimate bona fide questions here in the Legislature?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the member has a habit of just talking without thinking. He well knows the answers before he even asks them but he just does it to try and embarrass people. I announced to this House that there would be a saving of up to \$5,000 for people taking second mortgages and that the extra development could support approximately 310 second mortgages. If he wants to take a pencil and figure it out himself closely, fine, but it is not my intention to give our development costs in this House so everybody will know them.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Minister may recall that in the Estimates process when we were asking him. . . In view of the fact that the Minister told us in the Estimates process that the Member for Selkirk and myself could in fact go to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation

and get the figures if we wanted to get them that way in detail, is the Minister now prepared to let the Member for Selkirk and myself go over to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and get the accurate detailed figures of what the difference between the dollar price and the average cost of the lots in Inkster Gardens is? Is he prepared to follow up with that commitment he gave us in the Estimates procedure?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I made the statement during my Estimates and I would be quite prepared to let any honourable member of this House go there and I would depend on his integrity not to let everybody in the province know what our development costs are when we are in the development business and other people are too.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister responsible for Housing has indicated to Mr. Peter Warren on his radio program that there is a dollar difference, there is a super profit of approximately \$5,000 per lot in Inkster Gardens . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I'm getting to the question, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I suggest to the honourable member that repetition is not a very good procedure in the question period.

**MR. PARASIUK:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. If you will let me finish my question, you will see that the question is an entirely new question so I would like to be able to proceed with a legitimate question. Can the Minister indicate whether this \$5,000 difference between cost and selling price is caused by the MHRC being very efficient or by the large land developers not having any competition brought to bear on them which allows them to over-price lots by \$5,000 apiece. Can he tell me whether in fact the private sector is overpricing lots or whether in fact MHRC is able to produce these lots at a \$5,000 saving because it is that much more efficient than the private sector?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to say whether we're more efficient than the private sector or we're not. I have only said to this House that the savings, or the profits, pardon me, that will be made by selling at market price in Inkster Gardens will support, when they are all sold, approximately 310 second mortgages of up to \$5,000 which will probably average in the neighbourhood of \$3,500.00. Whether we are more efficient than others, I don't know. I don't know the other costs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Transcona with a sixth question.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad you indicated that it was a sixth question. These aren't supplementaries if no other people are standing.

Can the Minister confirm that if there is savings of \$5,000 per lot in Inkster Gardens, and if in fact something in the order of 3,000 lots per year are sold to Winnipeggers, can he then confirm that because of the private sector overpricing its supply of lots, the people purchasing lots from them, 3,000 lots, are paying something in the order of \$15 million too much for these lots?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is hypothetical and ruled out of order. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, a different question to the Minister reporting for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I would like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that it is now entirely likely that the joint Manitoba-Winnipeg acquisition of land in the Fort Garry area is being terminated or abandoned, then can the Minister say now or would he undertake to take as notice as to what amount of land is then left in possession by MHRC on behalf of Manitoba under the federal-provincial land banking arrangement or program? Could the Minister give us an approximation now or undertake to take it as notice?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member of the Opposition, first let me say that the two pieces of land that the city is talking about are being, I'm sure as the honourable member realizes, are being expropriated by the City. It will be the City's land bank and they will be in control

of it although we are involved with them on a 50-50 basis.

Regarding the total acreage of land that the MHRC owns, that land bank you speak of, I would be prepared to take as notice and give him the figures, both the way the land is inside the Winnipeg Development District, outside it, within the Perimeter, and the overall land bank we have in Manitoba. I would be prepared to give him that.

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

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I have answers to some questions that the Honourable Member for Kildonan asked me during my Estimates, that I would like to give him.

He asked me about the increase in the Other Expenditures in the Industrial Hygiene and I would like to tell him that they are for printing and stationery supplies, telephone and administrative costs that hadn't been counted in in the previous fiscal year.

As well, there's an increase for certain amounts of technical, laboratory and testing equipment in order to expand our capability to monitor the workplace safety.

He also asked me about the Northlands Program that we had up there. I would like to tell him it virtually was to inspect the homes in the remote areas. This has been virtually accomplished, so we feel that there is no need to have these people continuing there and we have put it under the Fire Commissioner's office. The Assistant Fire Commissioner who has been stationed up there will be carrying on the duties that have been done in the past.

Also he asked me about the Other Expenditures in the Women's Bureau and I would like to tell him that the bulk of the reduction is due to not carrying on the bus advertisement that we had in the previous years, and there's a reduction in some of the publications, and that is what the main reduction is in the Women's Bureau.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. THOMAS BARROW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Does the Honourable Minister agree that the 73-cent raise to the affluent, overpaid, spoiled, undernourished MLAs is justified, while at the same time the Minister refused to increase the minimum wage for the poor, the starving, undernourished, needy members of the work force at the very bottom of the scale?

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

**MR. BARROW:** Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I would really like to know, have you made any arrangements to meet with the Minimum Wage Board in the future?

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

**MRS. PRICE:** Would the honourable member repeat the question? I didn't get what he said.

**MR. BARROW:** Do you mean just the second question? Has the Honourable Minister made any arrangements to meet with the Minimum Wage Board on the minimum wage in the near future?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been any meeting arranged but there is one contemplated. The Deputy is arranging one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. I would like to ask the Minister if it is the intention of the Manitoba Telephone System to move toward the larger telephone exchanges throughout the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Member for Ste. Rose that the boundaries of exchanges, in general, to my knowledge, are not under review in a general way. However, from time to time individual cases come to the attention of the Manitoba Telephone System where there are some difficulties arising and that these are considered on an individual basis. If the member has some specific case in mind, I'd be very pleased to hear the details and to obtain an answer for him.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister confirm if he has received a very substantial petition from the exchanges in Winnipegosis and Fork River who wish to amalgamate into one larger exchange?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes, I received a copy of a letter addressed to the Manitoba Telephone System with an attached list of names requesting a review of that particular exchange arrangement.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for Executive Council.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY — EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen:** Gentlemen, will you come to order. I start by reminding all members that when they are using their microphones, because of the fans, that they sit fairly closely to their mikes and speak up loud and clear.

We are on Page 6. Are we going to do that first or are we going to do Legislation? What do you want to do first?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Chairman, if it's all the same to you, I would prefer Executive Council.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Any objection? All right.

Lady and gentlemen, we are on Page 6. Item 1.(c) Administrativ Salaries. The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no questions with respect to 1.(a) or 1.(b) as we're reverting to that later. On 1.(c), I note that, unlike 1.(a), there is a change, an increase, in 1.(c). It's relatively significant and I would ask the First Minister if he could break out the more salient reasons for the increase.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood):** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the breakdown as I have it here, last year it was \$338,900 for 25 SMYs; this year \$402,700 for 30 SMYs and I'm at a bit of a disadvantage at for the moment because the staff haven't come in yet to tell me where those extra SMYs are but I'll reserve that to answer in a moment.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Perhaps in a general way, Mr. Chairman, the Premier might indicate in an operation of this side size and kind, the Executive Council, it has been relatively — I say relatively — relatively unincrementing over the years. There hasn't been that much increase in staffing b% in fact, it's probably true to say that the Premier's office in this province for many many years, a couple of decades, has been as thinly staffed as anywhere in Canada — but an increase of five would, without asking for detail right now, would seem to indicate as though some major additional function is being subsumed or transferred here.

**MR. LYON:** I'm speaking without benefit of confirmation of this from the staff, Mr. Chairman, but I have the impression, which I hope to be able to confirm shortly, that that may well have to do with the administrative support for the three Ministers without Portfolio. I think that's where it arises but I'll be able to confirm that shortly.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, if that's the case, Mr. Chairman, that would answer my question . . .

**MR. LYON:** Yes, I say that because in the Premier's office itself, as the Leader of the Opposition

will understand, the SMYs for that office are 24 and they represent the Premier, the Executive and the special Assistant to the Premier, as two; managerial support, one; and administrative support 20, for a total of 24. Reverting to the figures that I have used or mentioned earlier, the difference between the 24 and the figure that I gave earlier which I am now trying to find.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, we can always come back to that for confirmation.

**MR. LYON:** Yes, it's 24. It was 25 last year; 24 in the Premier's Office and I'm suggesting, without confirmation yet, that the extra SMYs refer to administrative support for the three Ministers without Portfolio.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Very well.

**MR. LYON:** But I'll confirm that later.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the members of the committee, I'll seek some guidance from you. Even though the Premier has undertaken to get a definite answer for the Leader of the Opposition, can we go on and pass the item?

**MR. LYON:** Yes, I'll undertake it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I came late. What is the item?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on 1.(c) Administrative Salaries. The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, this may not be the exact spot, but there was one thing I wanted to raise under Legislation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We're on the Executive Council, at the request of the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Oh, I was told we were on Legislation.

**MR. SCHREYER:** No, no.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, at the request of the Leader of the Opposition. He asked if we would start on that particular section.

1.(c)—pass; 1.(d) Other Expenditures — the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well again, Mr. Chairman, in relative terms, this is a significant enough increase. I assume that the First Minister's tentative answer with respect to 1.(c) would probably apply here for the same reason.

**MR. LYON:** That's my assumption as well. I'll have to confirm that in a few moments. The Hospitality Grants, I know, well, they're under 2. but they are down and . . . We adjourned a little early so the staff weren't expecting us to be here at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it all right if we pass 1.(d), to the he Leader of the Opposition—pass? Pass. 1.(e) Government Hospitality and Presentations — the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Here again, relatively minor, but could the Premier indicate if this small reduction is due to some one single thing or is it a case of it being spread over the whole totality of whatever was attempted here?

**MR. LYON:** This represents a reduction of \$15,000 which is not substantial, of course, in the overall Estimates but merely a reflection of the general restraint that applies in pretty well all departments of government. We are quite hopeful that we can make it through the current fiscal year with this reduction in place.

**MR. SCHREYER:** There's no one significant . . .

**MR. LYON:** No, there's no one significant item, Mr. Chairman. Th' Hospitality Committee, as my honourable friend is aware, deals with these on pretty much an ad hoc basis as they come in.

**MR. SCHREYER:** You haven't changed the formula.

**MR. LYON:** Not at all. Mr. Bedson remains the chairman of that committee and deals with those matters.

**MR. SCHREYER:** So to some extent, to a large extent, this will really depend on the number of conferences of national scope conferencing here in Winnipeg to which we have an automatic formula. So then it's not really discretionary.

**MR. LYON:** Well, and it would include, of course, any pre-commitments that had been made for national conventions of the type that the Leader of the Opposition speaks of.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Very well, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(e)—pass; 1.(f). There is no appropriation there. Are there any questions?

**MR. SCHREYER:** . . . Well, I just had the one question.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I know that there has been a pretty strong consensus of opinion that — at least I think there has been — on both sides of the House that generally speaking it's not the function and role of provincial administrations to become directly involved in foreign aid and for many years we weren't other than with respect to the so-called Little Columbo Plan in the early 1960s and this program in the mid-seventies. But this one came about as a result of joint presentations by what is known as volunteer citizen international aid organizations, there is a multiplicity of which, who joined together into a federation of Manitoba international aid agencies and organizations. They, in turn, received a pledge from CIDA, that CIDA would match dollar-for-dollar what they raised and in turn, that was matched by the province. So, as a consequence, \$1.00 plus \$1.00 equals \$2.00, matched \$2.00 for \$2.00 by CIDA.

I guess I would ask the First Minister if, as a result of dropping this, it means that CIDA will no longer be matching the volunteer citizen foreign aid groups whatsoever, or would you be aware of that?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, the reduction, that is the non-vote this year, again reflects the general program of restraint within the government, notwithstanding the fact that members of the government share the opinion that has been expressed by the Leader of the Opposition that this has been a worthwhile program. I think the Leader of the Opposition will recall, according to my recollection, the program was started in 1975-76 on a three year basis and the end of the three year period has, according to my recollection, now occurred. I have met with the representatives of the groups who received some of the grants out of this \$250,000 in the — I think it was some several weeks ago — and at that time, it was agreed that we would look at this program later on in the year with respect to a possible continuation of support for the fiscal year 1979-80. They wished at that time to have the opportunity to speak to the Cabinet and the Caucus and arrangements will be made for that to take place. But the program itself is not to be implemented this year. Now the effect that this will have on the CIDA grant, I am not sure, whether or not they can work out some accommodation for this year, I am not sure.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Could I ask the First Minister if he's able to recollect whether he's received any correspondence from CIDA relative to this international development program in the past, well since the beginning of the New Year?

**MR. LYON:** It would only be recollection, Mr. Chairman. I don't recall correspondence from CIDA as such, but certainly there has been correspondence from a number of the agencies who were funded under the grant for the last three years, in some cases telling about the work that had been done by them and, in other cases acknowledging the fact that they had had word that the grant would not be available to them this year. In addition, of course, I had the meeting with representatives of the group to which I have already made reference.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for elkirk on this matter.



**MR. PAWLEY:** No, I'm satisfied. My questions have been covered.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right. 2. Planning and Secretariat of Cabinet. 2.(a) — there's nothing there; 2(b) . . .

**MR. LYON:** This is a nil . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** It's a nil item. 3. Management Committee of Cabinet then. 3.(a)(1) Salaries — the Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Planning Secretariat is still a matter that comes under the Executive Council. Are you suggesting we do not debate that?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, I'm at the will of the committee. There is no vote, there are no appropriations. If you wanted to ask a question, you could ask under the Premier's salary, I would think.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's all right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Management Committee of Cabinet. 3(a)(1) Salaries; 3(a)(1)—pass — the Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to know the extent to which the role of Management Committee has changed from what it was when this government came into government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Premier.

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I can only speak from my knowledge of Management Committee since the 24th of October of 1977 and my honourable friend will have to make his own comparison from his knowledge of what transpired prior to October 24, 1977. But Management Committee still is a subcommittee of Cabinet, now consisting of I believe it is five members of the Executive Council, with the staff which were largely in place at the time of the change-over in government. It meets at least once a week on a regular basis, that is, formally once a week on a regular basis, and then of course the staff have meetings and other work preparatory to those meetings during the balance of the week and special studies are done from time to time and so on. I don't know if that's a sufficient explanation of the work of Management Committee but it's a brief capsule.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister, when he took over the chairmanship of Management Committee, found a staff in place with job descriptions and responsibilities. I want to know if he has made any changes.

**MR. LYON:** Well, there have been some diminution, of course, in salaries reflecting some depletion in the staff. Now let me see if I can find the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. SCHREYER:** While the First Minister is looking for that detail, if I may, I would like to just put in a very directly related question. It would seem, in a general way, as though there is a five percent decrease in the appropriation being asked. To what extent is that due to abolition of certain positions and, if so, what positions, or a combination of that plus the substituting of different personnel presumably at the bottom end of the range substituting for those who have left who were midway or top, or whatever. So, more specifically then, what is the total net change in numbers of positions filled?

**MR. LYON:** Well, in the Management Committee Secretariat, the salary is \$1.8 million as opposed to \$1.6 million being voted this year. Other Expenditures, \$709,900 and \$668,000 this year. The total SMYs voted for 1977-78 were 92; the total SMYs for 1978-79 are 80. The breakdown, in the Executive Division, the reductions were achieved through the cancellation of three vacant program audit positions. In Staff Relations, the SMYs last year were 16; this year 14.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Is that a cancellation of vacancies?

**MR. LYON:** I'm just trying to find the detail on that, Mr. Chairman. On the personnel administration

SMYs, 30 in the previous year and 27 for the current year. Responsibility for Management-Employee Information System was transferred from the Department of Finance to the Secretariat in 1977-78 and the note I have is that significant cost reductions have been achieved for 1978-79 through the implementation of cost-saving measures which is a general statement on which probably the Member for Inkster and I would like some more info.

Just to finish off with those, Development and Training, the same number of SMYs, 8 last year and 8 this year. Management Audit Services, 22 SMYs last year and 17 in the current year. Three SMYs from this branch are presently seconded to other departments to provide services for which Management Committee pays salary costs. The other salary reductions were through vacancies.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Chairman, relating to that, we were told that there was allocation for 92 SMY under this item and 80 SMY this year. I wonder if we could have the actual incumbency, the actual number of positions filled at this point in time and the actual number filled a year ago just to see whether . . .

**MR. LYON:** Not SMYs but the total number of actual people in place?

**MR. SCHREYER:** That's right, yes, the incumbency.

**MR. LYON:** I think the Leader of the Opposition is asking for the actual number of people as opposed to SMYs.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, exactly.

**MR. LYON:** Could we take that one briefly as notice?

**MR. SCHREYER:** All right, very well.

**MR. LYON:** Just to revert to the first question I think that the Leader of the Opposition was asking, I'll just ask this question in the hope that it will catch the ear of someone at the table. Under item 1.(c), the additional administrative salaries — I'm asking this as a question — I take it was administrative salaries attached to the offices of the Ministers without Portfolio? Under 1.(c), the additional salaries shown there from \$338,000 to up to \$402,000.00. I made the comment earlier that it was my suspicion that those were additional salaries required as support staff for the Ministers without Portfolio.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That makes sense.

**MR. LYON:** The Ministers without Portfolio, there was one existing vacant position. There was a transfer in of two Ministers without Portfolio positions resulting from the amalgamation of departments. The net result is that there is a total Minister without Portfolio and support, a complement of seven SMYs; 6 incremental to Executive Council in 1978-79, plus some additional contract funding for the Task Force.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, I think that's fairly close to what you can . . .

**MR. LYON:** Yes, the additional SMYs are then as we speculated and has now been confirmed relate to the Ministers without Portfolio and to the Task Force and the salaries for contract people involved in the Task Force.

**MR. SCHREYER:** That's fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I am not clear on it. Could we get a breakdown of the contract for the Task Force and since there's a difference here of some 60,000-odd dollars could we get a breakdown of that difference. It wouldn't be six people plus Task Force, you know, it just doesn't add up.

**MR. LYON:** That is a breakdown as between \$338,900 voted last year under 1.(c) and \$402,700 voted this year.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes.

**MR. LYON:** Okay, we'll see if we can get that.

**MR. LYON:** Six additional SMYs less the two that were cancelled is the information I have. We spoke of the two that were cancelled. I think, therefore, the Member for Inkster can . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** St. Johns.

**MR. LYON:** Oh, I'm sorry, St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So that's four SMYs. Do they make up the difference of the \$60,000.00? Do they average \$15,000 each?

**MR. LYON:** I'll undertake to get a breakdown of that figure, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, that's all right . . .

**MR. LYON:** But we know generically where it occurs; it occurs in the support staff for the Ministers without Portfolio but I'll undertake to get us a breakdown as to how it occurs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is that all right with the Member for St. Johns?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, as long as I can understand that there is no change in the Premier's administrative salaries in terms of SMYs, actual, which would make up the 300,000-odd portion of the \$400,000.00.

**MR. LYON:** No, the Premier and President of the Executive Council, the Ministers without Portfolio, their SMYs are up from one to three. The administrative salaries, as I previously mentioned, are up from 25 SMYs to 30 SMYs.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's exclusive of the support personnel?

**MR. LYON:** No, that includes the support personnel.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Oh, yes, well, I am trying to separate them. But does that then mean that the Premier's office does not have any more or less SMYs than last year?

**MR. LYON:** My advice is two less, 24 SMYs being asked for in 1978-79.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, then that two less is not the same two less that we were told about the support staff to the Ministers without Portfolio.

**MR. LYON:** The reduction on the two SMYs were support staff for the Premier.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** All right. So that there is a net reduction of two SMYs . . .

**MR. LYON:** Two, in the Premier's office.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** . . . in the Premier's office, exclusive from the Ministers without Portfolio.

**MR. LYON:** Exclusive from the Ministers without Portfolio, right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Okay, then we are told, I think, four additional on the Ministers without Portfolio. We will yet get a breakdown of that.

**MR. LYON:** A net of five, I think, after the . . . We'll get a breakdown of those.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Now are we clear as between SMYs and actual bodies covering the positions?

**MR. LYON:** You'll get both, Mr. Chairman, because the Leader of the Opposition asked for that special number . . .

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's fine, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. LYON:** . . . which, as I recall, is what I asked for last year too. I'm more accustomed to dealing with people than with SMYs.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** . . . but the SMYs are money.

**MR. LYON:** You're speaking like an ex-Minister of Finance.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's a long time since then, Mr. Chairman. One tries to unlearn some bad habits. Are we back to . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We are going back to Management Committee.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** 3.(a)(1)?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1). The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, there too, the note I have is 92 SMYs in 1978 fiscal year; 80 in 1979 fiscal year; reduction of 12 — these are SMYs — and then the Leader of the Opposition asked how they relate to actual vacancies of SMYs cancelled which means no reduction in actual people. I got figures which don't add up. So it may be that my addition is poor but . . .

**MR. LYON:** No, I gave the figures as I have them. Executive Division last year, according to the figures I have, 17 SMYs; this year, 14.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's three.

**MR. LYON:** Staff Relations last year, 16; this year 14.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Two.

**MR. LYON:** Personnel Administration, last year 30; this year 27.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Three.

**MR. LYON:** Development and Training, last year 8; this year 8. Management Audit Services, last year 22; this year 17.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Five.

**MR. LYON:** And I've run out of pages.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Eight and five is thirteen. That's a discrepancy of only one. Yes, that's close.

**MR. LYON:** Getting closer to it. .

**MR. LYON:** We have a number of vacancies and we're below the figure budgeted for at the present time but we are budgeting for 8. That's my recollection as well, that the effective staff last year, as I recall sitting in this committee, was about 90 and this year, at the present time it is down to around 73 but we'll confirm those figures exactly.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I want to understand clearly, when the Minister refers to 90, the fact is we were told the SMYs were 92. How many were filled last year? How many were filled as of October of 1977?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I might point out to the staff people that they officially can't give the answers to the committee, they must go through the Minister.\$

**MR. LYON:** We'll get that breakdown, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Premier compared around 90 last year with 73 this year.

The fact is he's asking for 80, so instead of 90 to 73, I want to know what it is to 80 or what it is to 73 to make sure that we're talking about the same kinds of either staff positions or actual people involved.

**MR. LYON:** Right, the figures that I was repeating, Mr. Chairman, were the figures of actual staff complement as related to me. The voted figure is as I gave it to the committee a few minutes ago and we'll relate those figures in terms of actual personnel, as the Leader of the Opposition asks, so that we'll know the exact number of people.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So we will get the actual staff complement, that is, the people actually working a year ago, and in October of 1977.

**MR. LYON:** Now, if you could tell us the dates, if the Member for St. Johns, Mr. Chairman, could tell us the period that he would like to have a comparison of, then we'll provide it.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes, we're talking about March 31, 1979, the Premier is asking for 80 salaries available and informs us that there are 75 people now occupying those 80 positions. That's the information that I have. Now, what I'd like to have is the same information as it applies to March 31, 1978 and the same information as it applies to October, 1978 and I'll let the Premier pick the date within October.

**MR. LYON:** All right. We have a record of those now, Mr. Chairman, and we'll endeavour to get that information.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Now, I would like to get clarification on how many are seconded, what is the nature of their job and why are they being continued to management? Is that because it's temporary? You mean, we'll wait for that.

**MR. LYON:** Yes, we'll get that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** All right then, Mr. Chairman, there was some reference to contracts for the Task Force. I don't quite . . . I thought they fitted into salaries but maybe that's not correct so I would like to get clarified where they come in.

**MR. LYON:** Well, it was my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that that had been dealt with when the Minister in charge of the Task Force was before this committee before but we can dig that information out even though it may be repetitious.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, maybe I can, because the Minister . . .

**MR. LYON:** It will be part of the overall figures that we have.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** . . . The Minister for the Task Force is here. Does he wish to comment?

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, there were questions during the Estimates on the Task Force, on the Estimates of the Minister without Portfolio, to which questions of the Task Force were asked. I think there was one particular contract was asked for; the information was given. In terms of additional contracts, the only additional contract that I'm aware of would be . . . Well, it's possible that there was a secretarial staff included in the contract. That I can't tell you for sure, but there would be probably another two that I'm aware of.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, a question that I'd like clarified is the amount of money used or set aside for contract for the Task Force which, I assume, is other than the support staff to the Minister responsible for the Task Force. I would like to know how much was used in the last fiscal year and how much is being allocated for this fiscal year and if the Minister doesn't have the information, we'll have to wait for it. I do recall that there was a question about one of the people, whether he was on salary or contract and I think he was secretary to the Task Force, and that was developed. I also recall, for the record, that the Minister talked about \$8,000 as being the total outside expense of the Task Force. I believe that's what he said and I tell the Premier that because that's all I recall that was said by the Minister for the Task Force relating to cost. So I'd like confirmation.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, I think I'm in a position to clarify that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister without Portfolio and responsible for the Task Force.

**MR. SPIVAK:** The secretary for the Task Force was on contract. That information has been given to the committee. There was one additional secretary, that is a stenographer, who was included as well as an assistant to the Minister.

**M . CHERNIACK:** How much?

**MR. SPIVAK:** Oh, the figures?

**MR. LYON:** While we're waiting for that figure, I can give this information on the secondments, Mr. Chairman. The Member for St. Johns asked about the secondments. The note I have is that there is one systems analyst seconded to the Department of Tourism, one systems analyst seconded to the Department of Education, and one systems analyst seconded to Finance who was recently transferred outright to that department.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, we're hopping around but now I can go back to the secondments. There are two secondments as I understand it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Three.

**MR. LYON:** Three.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, one has been permanently transferred to Finance.

**MR. LYON:** One is now permanently transferred, yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** So that there are two secondments. That does mean literally, I believe, a temporary change. Does not the Management Committee function at all times as being available to add support staff to other ministries? I mean, is this an unusual thing, this secondment?

**MR. LYON:** Well I can't speak, Mr. Chairman, for the history of Management Committee, as I've mentioned at the outset, prior to October 24, 1977, but since that time, we have had some secondments on a short-term basis, from time-to-time, on special projects. I think I'm aware of the secondment to the Department of Education, the purpose of the special study that's going on there at the present time or about to take place. So it's not unusual.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No.

**MR. LYON:** By my experience, it's not unusual.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No. The reason I mentioned that, Mr. Chairman, is that we were told there are 75 people now working in the Department of whom two, apparently two are seconded being effective 73, which adds up. But now I ask, are those 73 all working within Management Committee and are not doing support service to other departments?

**MR. LYON:** The three secondments that I've mentioned, the one that is permanent, the one to Tourism and the one to Education are, at the present time, on a continuing basis and the third one to Finance is an outright transfer.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, just to understand the mechanics, does that then mean that within the inner workings of the accounting system that one person who was transferred to Finance will have his salary transferred from this department to the other department whereas the other two who are seconded but not permanently will continue to be under Management.

**MR. LYON:** I'm informed that's exactly right.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Okay, thank you. Where do we go now?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, we've had some discussions recently in terms of the Provincial Garage,

a number of months ago and then more recently, about the size of the fleet. This came up yesterday in terms of the House and it came up earlier and whenever we try to get information from the Minister of Public Works, which is pretty well impossible since we never know when he's being serious, and since he's rarely serious, the other day, it was mentioned that there were studies that he was waiting for from Management Committee in regard to the car fleet and the size of the fleet, etc. We know, from our experience in government, that there were figures given to us by Harry Taylor and other members of Management Committee which indicated that at about a break-even point of 12,000 miles, it was worth the Provincial Government purchasing a car and operating it at government expense. Because, up to a particular break-even point, it's clearly let's say better for the government to pay someone to drive their car. After another point, it is clearly worthwhile for the government to provide a vehicle.

I wonder if the First Minister can tell us how these studies are coming along because we keep hearing references to studies. I don't know whether there are any studies; I don't know what these studies are; I don't know whether there is a revision of the previous studies because we used the same general sources as the present government, namely one part of MCC's operation, probably people from the Provincial Garage, etc. Our figures were that at about a 12,000 mile average — and it could be a little higher — it was worthwhile for us to provide vehicles. Can the First Minister indicate the status of those studies, what they have indicated, what progress has been made and when we will get the final information?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, in response to the Member for Elmwood, there is a vehicle study currently under way. The line department responsible, of course, is the Department of Public Works. Management Committee is involved in the study as are personnel attached to the Task Force.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I asked questions of the Minister of Public Works and I think he indicates he's waiting for Management Committee. Now the First Minister is indicating he's waiting for Public Works.

**MR. LYON:** No, I indicated no such thing. I said the study was under way and the three components of government who were involved in it. When the study is completed, it will be reported through the line department.

**MR. DOERN:** Can you tell me when that study commenced?

**MR. LYON:** No, I can't give an exact date but I can endeavour to find it out.

**MR. DOERN:** And can you indicate when it will be completed?

**MR. LYON:** No, I can't, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting. Maybe the First Minister could find that information out and either report it to the committee or report it to the House. I would like to know how long that study has been going on and at what point we're going to get that information.

**MR. LYON:** Well, I think, as the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Chairman, said not too long ago in the House — I can't remember the exact date — there has been some deferment on the renewal of the total fleet pending results of these studies. They're looking at all of the factors that flow into a more efficient use of automobiles by the total government service. My honourable friend would be aware of the spectrum of all of the alternatives that are available and when the study is complete, I daresay that the Minister of Public Works will be making some announcement.\$

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly urge the First Minister to attempt to see whether he can get some action in this regard because the present Minister seems to be flirting with the idea of significantly reducing the fleet. The Task Force has talked about cutting the fleet by one-third and if you take the studies that have been used by the provincial government previously, through Management Committee and Public Works, clearly indicates that if you cut the fleet by one-third and transfer vehicles from government fleet to private individuals, that it will probably cost somewhere in the order of \$750,000 to \$800,000 per year to do that. It will cost more to pay people to drive their own cars. Superficially, it looks like a good idea and superficially it looks like a money-saver but, in fact, if you follow the Task Force recommendations, you may wind up paying three-quarters of a million dollars a year more. If you eliminate the fleet, which was alluded to by the Minister

of Public Works yesterday, he seemed to intimate that he was looking at Alberta and that Alberta was such a shining example of a couple of dozen cars in the fleet because they paid everybody. If we adopted that policy based on 50 million miles being driven in Manitoba and probably a differential of about five cents between paying people and running the cars ourself, it might cost the Manitoba Government \$2.5 million dollars to go that route. In the meantime, you know, there sits the new Provincial Garage which supposedly, supposedly, is waiting for the outcome of these studies.

So, I think there are a number of important factors here. One is that the administration, which you head, is holding a facility which was designed in conjunction with departmental staff, Public Works, garage staff, and that building is being, in my judgment, deliberately and politically kept empty. There are monthly costs incurred in heating, lighting and security of that particular facility and all the while we are told that it is necessary because the government is trying to make up its mind as to what to do about the car fleet and what to do about the garage. Therefore, I think it's incumbent that the First Minister make up his mind and get the studies completed and then pass on the information so that we can see what the rationale is behind his decision-making. Because, you know, we know that the government has it within its power to do whatever it likes with any building. It can sell any building; convert it to any other use; can cut the fleet out; can cut it in half. But what we will be interested in is what they give as a justification for their actions.

So I'm saying to the First Minister that I don't think it's good enough to simply take a casual approach on the part of himself or on the part of the Minister of Public Works because there is something at stake here and that is, namely the government policy in regard to the car fleet and the use of a capital work which is sitting idle.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I just want a bit of advice. We haven't passed the First Minister's salary yet because I did have some questions arising out of some of the answers but they pertain more to the Task Force and I'll wait until we get to the Minister's salary.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** All right, the Member for Selkirk then.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire from the First Minister as to his views in connection with the recommendations of the Task Force pertaining to the Management Committee of Cabinet, particularly the general view that Management Committee of Cabinet had reached a point of being involved more and more in decision-making over the passage of years and that it had gradually moved from a supervisory and review body ensuring maximum efficiency and effectiveness in government operations to a powerful control and decision-making body — to quote the Task Force Report on Page 57, Volume I.

I would like, from the First Minister, an indication as to his general view in connection therewith and secondly, whether or not there has been any steps taken since his government's assumption of responsibility in respect to changes in the Management Committee of Cabinet.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Premier.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, in response to the Member for Selkirk, all of the recommendations of the Task Force have been and will be receiving the attention of the government including the recommendations with respect to Management Committee. As and when announcements are to be made, they of course will be made.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Has the First Minister any opinion in connection with the observations that have been made by the Task Force at this point?

**MR. LYON:** Well, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that I have opinions on all of the recommendations of the Task Force but those opinions are of little value until the government arrives at a policy which will be announced with respect to the different recommendations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(2)—pass. Resolution No. 5: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,362,800 for Executive Council, Management Committee of Cabinet—pass.

The next item is 4. Registrations and Elections — the Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister could give us a report here about the status of the redistribution proceedings. You know, I talk to a lot of people who are not supporters



of the government and they are all very enthusiastic about asking me continually if there is some way we can't get the government out quick. I always have to report to them that unfortunately they will have to wait three or four years. So I ask this more for their benefit than mine, but I'm curious about the redistribution aspects in terms of where that is and at exactly what point one can say that we are in a "Go" position in regard to the completion of the redistribution in preparation for the next provincial election.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, to avoid repetitious debate, I can advise the honourable member that there will be an item in Supplementary Supply dealing with the vote for the Electoral Boundaries Commission. It's not under this item; it will be in Supplementary Supply and it can be dealt with at that time.

**MR. DOERN:** And can we at that time debate the question about the tolerance and the ratio of seats. We used to have an old rural-urban formula. There's a resolution now on the Order Paper by my colleague from St. Vital recommending a 10 percent tolerance, plus or minus. Will we be able at that time to discuss and recommend to the government a variation of the existing 25 percent tolerance? Is that the place?

**MR. LYON:** I would imagine, Mr. Chairman, that that debate could take place under the bill that is presently before the House or the other spot would be in Supplementary Supply where the vote will occur. This amount of \$8,600 is just a guesstimate amount that is put in for possibility of by-elections or whatever. It's a guesstimate amount only.

**MR. DOERN:** Are you bound by some legal requirement to have this redistribution prepared by a specific date?

**MR. LYON:** It's all in the Act, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOERN:** Are you familiar with what that date is?

**MR. LYON:** Well, the honourable member, Mr. Chairman, can read the Act as well as I can.

**MR. DOERN:** I guess neither of us have read it.

**MR. LYON:** I've read it but I'm persuaded that I should never rely on my memory as to what Acts say. The Act is in the Statute Books, we can both read it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Resolution 6. —pass: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,600 for Executive Council, Registration and Elections—pass.

Item 5. has been completed. So we can revert back to Page 6. I will ask the members of the committee that are present for a little direction. On Page 6, Administration, the Premier's Salary has not been passed. Is it your wish that we complete that item on this page or do all other things within the Estimate Book that come under the Premier and then go back to that?

The Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would ask, and I therefore state the problem and wait for your proposal in connection therewith, I would like to ask some questions to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for PLUC. Now I won't be here this evening and I'm just wondering if it would be possible for a few moments to have that portion of the First Minister's Estimates dealt with at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, I'm agreeable if it's agreeable to the majority of the committee that we will complete the Premier's salary and then we'll get the other . . .

**MR. LYON:** We'll get the Minister without Portfolio on Planning.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** . . . on Planning, present and he can take the mike if we can wait for half a moment. The Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, are we on the First Minister's salary now?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Yes, yes.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I would like to ask him a couple of questions in respect, well, really that arise out of some of the First Minister's answers. I would like to know if the Task Force has been wound up because he indicated that there is some further work being done by Management Committee and the Task Force and I wasn't clear. My assumption was that the Task Force had been wound up.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Premier.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister, the co-chairman of the Task Force, dealt with this when this matter was up previously but my understanding is that at least one, and possibly two, staff members are still in place on a continuing basis doing follow-up work on some of the recommendations, some of the studies that needed more detailed work done and also offering advice with respect to some of the suggestions or recommendations for further consideration.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, the reason why I'm asking that question now, I think I had been advised earlier that this is probably the time that I can could raise these questions and that the discussion of the Minister without Portfolio responsible to the Task Force, the discussion on his Estimates was somewhat curtailed one evening and I couldn't be there for that particular discussion so I wanted to take this opportunity. I find out now that there are a couple of people involved with the Task Force. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell me if these are civil servants, if they are full-time civil servants or contract people.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Maybe the Minister responsible for the Task Force.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Chairman, one is a contract person and the other is an assistant to the Minister who was the executive assistant and who, at this point, is on contract because he will be leaving shortly to complete his studies overseas.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Okay, thank you. I would like to ask the First Minister if Mr. Conrad Riley is still acting as co-chairman of the Task Force or whether he's not acting in that capacity any longer.

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Chairman, subject to, because I haven't spoken to Mr. Riley for some several weeks, but my understanding is that he has wound up his work with the Task Force. He remains available to any of the Ministers of the Crown on a voluntary basis for advice vis-a-vis the Task Force and I know that advice has been taken from time to time or has been sought in the course of consideration of some of the Task Force recommendations. He's not occupying an office in the building anymore so far as I am aware.

**MR. PARASIUK:** The reason why I was asking this question, Mr. Chairman, is that there was some confusion in the minds of some of the public at least as to whether in fact the Task Force had formally completed its activities, whether in fact the review teams had completed their activities, whether in fact there was more work that was being done because the Minister responsible for the Task Force, in tabling his report, indicated that further work would be done and it wasn't really clear to me — and I didn't have the opportunity in the Estimates process to ask these questions of the Minister — it wasn't clear to me whether in fact by the Task Force he meant the Task Force or the staff working for the Task Force. It seems to appear now that he was talking about the staff working for the Task Force as opposed to the Task Force itself.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I can answer that just to clarify the issue. The members of the review teams have completed the work; the Task Force has completed its work; there is a very limited staff who are assisting and that has already been indicated in some of the work that would naturally flow from the Task Force Report and in terms of some of the work that's occurring within Management Committee. However, there are a number of individuals and organizations who have come forward with various comments with respect to the Task Force and its recommendations. Some have come directly to the Premier and to members of the Cabinet and others have come to the members of the Task Force. While the Task Force as such has been dissolved, nevertheless, as a courtesy and in the course of trying to acquaint the members who were the Task Force of the individual concerns and comments and support of some of the recommendations, there have been very informal meetings, just very informal discussions. That would be the extent to which we were talking about that. That really would not apply to the review teams; although there may be an occasion in which that has come up that I'm not aware of but I'm now talking generally with respect to the Task Force.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, literally order. I think we all agree it is a matter of courtesy to the Member for Selkirk to defer to have him discuss certain matters with Mr. Jorgenson since he won't be here this evening. I mean since the Member for Selkirk won't be here. Since I want to explore the Task Force as well, I'm asking whether we couldn't just proceed now to Mr. Jorgenson's Estimates and then defer the discussion until later.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Selkirk.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, first I want to remove any doubt as to my opinion in connection with the Provincial Land Use Policy booklet distributed by Mr. Jorgenson's department and indicate general support of the policies that have been outlined in that book. I believe the Minister without Portfolio would agree that in general the previous government in fact had developed, it was in the process of developing land use policies, that were probably placed before him when he assumed his portfolio that were similar basically to those that are contained in this book. Those policies generally have developed as a result of consultation over the past two or three years with the municipalities within a 30 to 50 mile radius of the City of Winnipeg.

Now what I would like to specifically inquire is to the procedure by which it is proposed to move now pertaining to these policies. I assume that there will be full-scale discussions with the municipalities, that at some point these land use policies or a variation of them will be announced as Provincial Government policy. Then it's the mechanics that I'm interested in at that point.

If the District Planning Board proceed with a development plan for a district or a municipality proceeds with a plan for a district which is in conflict with the Provincial Land Use policies as then determined by the Provincial Government, — and I just want confirmation at that point — the Provincial Government would not approve any guidelines that are developed at the District Planning level that are in conflict with these proposals.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, once a district has been formed and a planning statement has been approved, then it is our intention, as much as possible, to allow the decisions that have to be made with respect to subdivision or whatever applications appear before them to be made by the local council, by the local planning board, rather than have those being sent back here to the Planning Board in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Our hope is to decentralize the decision-making process as much as possible but the policies are now in effect and in those areas where they do not have planning districts or where there is not a municipal planning scheme developed, then those applications will still be reviewed here by the MUNICIPAL Board until such time as that municipality either has a planning statement that has been approved or is in a planning district. But until such time as the municipalities have had an opportunity of reviewing the guidelines and have an opportunity to submit recommendations or approval of the existing policies, I want to emphasize that they are tentative in nature although they are operative.

During the course of the recent municipal meetings I have had an opportunity of speaking on this subject to . . . they were kind enough to allow me time on their agenda to speak on these policies and there seems to be considerably more interest than I had dared to hope. I might add, even more approval than I had dared to hope, so I am very optimistic that the municipalities are taking the need for planning of this nature very seriously and are going to have a good look at these policies and will be making their submissions later on in this year.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, I would like to just comment insofar as municipal reaction is concerned, that I found while I was Minister of Municipal Affairs, greater support for development of land use policies in the region surrounding the City of Winnipeg than further away from the City of Winnipeg. Of course it is obvious, the municipalities around Winnipeg had already experienced problems relating to a lack of land use planning and had learned the hard way whereas municipalities 150-200 miles away, for a very good reason, found it difficult to grasp just why it was so important to establish clear land use policies.

I would like to, simply because concern has been expressed to me by some of the municipal people in the area referred to by the Minister publicly, and also in the land use guidelines, and I want to say on the Minister's behalf that he hasn't spelled out any particular municipality, and I don't believe he has intended to directly or indirectly criticize any municipality, but point out that in the area that he refers to between Selkirk and Winnipeg, that I am advised that in the period prior to 1969 they were advised to consider development of river lots because of the steady development which had taken place even at that point, by the then-Minister of Agriculture, and that

from 1970 on, there had been in fact some limitations imposed upon subdivision development in that area, which they have worked under and have co-operated with the provincial department of government. I want to place that on the record because I believe there has been some degree of misinterpretation or misunderstanding as to the Minister's remarks, when he made reference to a general area within the province which he felt deserved some degree of criticism.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Well, I want to make it very clear to the honourable member and to those people who have felt that I was unduly critical, I made it very clear during the course of my remarks that I was being critical of no one, and because times do change. And at the time that those decisions were made, they appeared to be the proper decisions. Since that time we have learned that mistakes in planning subdivision development can be made, and the whole purpose of this exercise is to ensure that other municipalities who may reach a stage where development will be taking place in the same way it was taking place in that area, that the same mistakes are not made. In fact, I used it as an illustration of what to avoid in planning future developments. I might also say that I did make some reference to the possibility of subdivision development taking place on sand and gravel aggregate in the Winnipeg area, and the mistake we would be making if we allowed that to happen to the extent that it would be necessary for construction in the City of Winnipeg to have to haul their gravel some distance away. I know also that municipalities in which that happened took that as a personal affront as well; it was not intended to be that way at all. My actual remarks went like this: "A recent study indicates that there is less than 10 years of good aggregate remaining in the Winnipeg region. In some instances this is being lost to subdivision activity, for example, houses being constructed on top of this valuable resource." And that was the only reference that I made. That has happened, and I use them only to illustrate the necessity of ensuring, when subdivision developments take place in areas even away from Winnipeg, that these are matters that must be taken into consideration in order to avoid the mistakes that have been made, not only here, but in other countries as well.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I'd like to refer the Minister to Page 5 of the Provincial Land Use Policy Book distributed by him, and I would quote the paragraph which causes me some concern: "Farmstead subdivision shall be permitted only when the subdivision is for the retiring former resident farmer, or for an immediate member of his family who requires title to a residence separate from the farm operation, while still involved in farming as a major source of income." Now, it's those final words, "While still involved in farming as a major source of income." It's common that retiring farmers do split off their farmstead, buildings, retire on that, drawing their old-age pension, and the son or daughter-in-law, whatever it be, build a new home. I would like the Minister's comment as to whether it is suggested under that guideline that such farmsteads in the future would be prevented, due to the fact that that retiring farmer would no longer have as his major source of income, the operation of farming?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, that is not the intention. The intention is to ensure that subdivision development, to a large extent, does not take place on one farmstead. As my honourable friend is probably aware, there are some farmsteads that are fairly substantial with the opportunity for a great deal of subdivision development. It is intended to ensure that that does not happen. At the same time, it was intended to provide that immediate members of the family would have an opportunity of retiring there, or living there, in the event that there was a second member of the family actively engaged in the farming operation, as is the case in many farms.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Can the Minister advise me whether or not that insofar as a single lot split is concerned, whether the policy which had been developed by the former government in 1977, of not appealing any decision by the municipality to approve a single lot split to the Municipal Board is still in effect but rather to simply advise or warn the municipality if it was felt that the municipality's decision was unwise, to so warn them, but not to override and take . . .

**MR. JORGENSEN:** To the best of my knowledge, there has been no change in that policy.

**MR. PAWLEY:** And I would also like to enquire from the Minister whether or not there is any general studies underway at the present time as to an alternative, because it's used as a common reference of cost, whether there is any actual study underway insofar as an alternative traffic corridor along the Provincial Trunk Highway No. 9 area, from Winnipeg north?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I couldn't answer that question; I'm afraid it would have to be directed to the Minister of Highways.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I notice that the Minister has used a figure of \$750,000 per mile as the cost of that corridor. I assume that he bases that not on actual cost figures for that area but from general knowledge.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** A general survey that had been taken.

**MR. PAWLEY:** At what point in time does the Minister expect that the province will in effect have completed adoption of provincial land use policies? How long will the consultation-discussion process continue?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** It is hoped that some time later this fall, preferably after harvest, we will have an opportunity of holding a series of workshops throughout the province in which all of the municipalities will have an opportunity to participate. At these workshops, municipalities will then be able to comment on the guideline proposals and suggest changes or recommendations or alterations. They will then be taken into consideration in the light of six months or more experience, and most municipalities will have a fairly good idea of how well they can be applied, and in what areas are unworkable. I emphasized at the outset, and I emphasize again, that these are tentative policies; since there is no previous experience in this area, the departments that were involved simply decided that they would put together — as my honourable friend knows, because most of the work was done prior to the change of government — a set of guidelines that could be used as a basis for discussion. That discussion process will now be taking place, and hopefully, this fall the workshops will be completed. Following that, the Land Use Committee will again meet to decide on the final policies that will be adopted.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I would be interested in the Minister's reaction to where there are in existence now District Planning Boards and staff has been put in place, and that is the case with the Lord Selkirk Planning District.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Yes.

**MR. PAWLEY:** But I understand that the decisions in respect to approvals of the subdivisions, even the single lot subdivision, is still taking place in Winnipeg rather than at the District Planning Board level, causing some degree of criticism, because this has been now taking place for a number of months. How fast does he see the process taking, to transfer that local decision-making to the local level. In the case of the Lord Selkirk Division, though the district was formed, I believe it was January 1st this year, practically all the work is still seemingly being done in Winnipeg rather than at the local level with the local staff.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That Order-in-Council authorizing payment to that particular Planning District was passed not too long ago, a couple of months ago, I believe. I hope that that decision-making process can be turned over to the District Planning Boards at the earliest opportunity, and I firmly believe that because of these variations in the circumstances existing between one area and another, particularly those areas in the vicinity of Winnipeg as opposed to those that are somewhat removed from Winnipeg, priorities will be different, and it will be necessary to have that kind of local input into the decision-making process to ensure that proper priorities are developed. What may be a very important priority or policy in one area may be less important to another area.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Now, I expressed concern during the Minister of Municipal Affairs' Estimates dealing with the capacity or the ability to respond during the forthcoming fiscal year to establish District Planning Boards, to come forward. There's only very limited amounts of money available, yet much of the area around Winnipeg is still not formed in districts, District Planning Boards. I wonder if I could have the Minister's comments as to how he sees that process speeding along during — I think it's very important that these decisions be transferred to the local level. To do that we require the establishment of the district boards. Whether or not he sees — for instance, in his own area, the Morris-Macdonald area, or the Rosser area, or the Hanover area, are there steps now underway to actually establish the Planning Boards so that his policies, once they're proclaimed, can be dealt with at the local level, not continue to have to be dealt with through Winnipeg?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** The district meeting that was held in St. Jean encompassed most of the areas that my honourable friend is talking about. The impression I got, in talking to the various members of council from those areas, was that their original skepticism over the applicability of District Planning Boards has been somewhat removed. There seems to be a degree of acceptability, and indeed, several Reeves at that particular meeting were making pointed remarks about talking very seriously

now about joining with neighbouring municipalities and forming Planning Districts, because they feel that it is necessary. As a matter of fact, the closer you get to the City of Winnipeg, the more important the planning guidelines are, because tremendous pressures are being applied to those municipalities for subdivision development. In many cases, they want to resist them as much as possible until they are sure of the direction they are going. They now appear to look to the planning guidelines and the District Planning Boards as a means of ensuring that proper development takes place when it does take place.\$

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

### SUPPLY — TOURISM, RECREATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** I would direct the honourable members to Page 74 in the Main Estimates. We are in the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Resolution 109, 1.(a) Minister's Compensation — the Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief words to say before we open up the Estimates, or discuss the Estimates of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

Under this particular Ministry there are several important areas of concern to the people of Manitoba. No. 1, of course, is the Tourism Industry which is tied in very closely with our Provincial Parks System.

The problems that we have faced in Canada over the last number of years dealing with the Tourism deficit and the problems generally in Manitoba dealing with balance of trade, if you want to call it, as far as Tourism is concerned is of some worry to all of Manitobans, I am sure. Manitobans have been one of the residents of Canada that have contributed quite heavily to our Tourism deficit. As a result, it is the intention of the government to try and enhance our parks system to try and stimulate the tourism industry in the province, to try and, firstly, to keep the Manitoba people spending as much money in Manitoba for vacation as possible and, secondly, trying to attract new people to the province.

The other area which these Estimates will deal with is the area of recreation. The recreation grants, as far as capital facilities grants, the recreation directors in the different regions, and the general co-ordination of recreation in the province is carried on by this particular branch in an effort to provide a level of service to rural Manitoba comparable to that in the urban areas.

The other section, Mr. Chairman, deals with the Cultural Affairs Branch. Many of the moneys that we will be dealing with in these particular Estimates are grants made out to different organizations. I believe almost half of the budget of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs is made up of grants that go to cultural groups, that go to areas such as the Assiniboine Zoo and, as a result, those particular grants play a large part in the Estimates of this particular department.

Mr. Chairman, with those few words, I would like to open up the Estimates and ask the gentlemen opposite to ask questions with regard to the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Item (b)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I was really quite astounded that the Minister, in introducing his Estimates, would attempt to completely gloss over the whole issue of Parks and Recreation and the way in which recreation will or will not be developed in our parks. That surely has been an issue that he has been trying to duck for this entire session and it really comes as a surprise to me that now that we have a day of reckoning, namely his Estimates, that he would completely avoid mentioning the topic. And so I will raise it. What about the Jarmoc Development, very simply? Not just the Jarmoc Development . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

**MR. BANMAN:** On a point of order. I wonder if the Chairman could tell us what particular item we're on.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Chairman can tell you it's on Item (b)(1) Salaries, on General Administration. Would the Honourable Member for Transcona make reference to (b)(1) in . . .

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, I am talking about . . . I am responding to the Minister's statements and I am making reference to the administration of the department.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would direct the honourable members that if we allow debate on any subject other than General Administration, there will be no chance to debate it later when it does come under its regular clause. The Honourable Member for Transcona. The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. You did point out that we are under General Administration Division. You omitted to mention that 1.(b) is Policy and Program Development, what I understand my colleague to be leading into was a matter of policy an program development for the provincial parks.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I continue on I would like the clarification, where is the Deputy Minister's salary covered, as well. Is it covered in this section? It's usually covered in that section in every other Estimates. Can the Minister answer that particular question, and I will continue on with my remarks?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's covered here.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I was saying, a key question relates to recreation development. I think there is a very strong demand for recreation facilities by Manitobans in Manitoba, and there is a great difficulty in trying to satisfy this demand if you have a limited resource; namely recreational area. Some of this recreational potential is on Crown land; some of it is on private land. Much recreational area is in provincial parks.

The question is who, in fact, will control these various alternative supplies of recreational sites? Now, people have private property. I assume they will go through the regular municipal zoning procedures and processes. If people have Crown land, I assume that they will be going through the Provincial Government and relating it through the Land Use Committee, and they will be trying to provide recreational sites within the guidelines that the government has laid out in this respect.

However, when we come to provincial parks, I think we are into an entirely different area and I think the Minister and his administration have taken us into a completely uncharted and, I think, undesired and undesirable area with respect to the potential privatization of public parks.

Now, the ultimate example of what might be called a "public good" is a park. Everyone has access to it; everyone has fair and equal access to it.

Now, we have had a situation whereby cottage lots have been developed in public parks. They have in fact been developed by the public. But everyone has had fair and equal access to those lots through a lottery system. Everyone else has had that. We have had that before. And what I find very surprising is this government has decided on a pilot project basis. I am glad that we were able to catch it in the Legislature because, frankly, I think the pilot project would have not been only one but probably would have been seven or eight, and it still may be seven or eight, unless the public's consciousness on this issue can be aroused sufficiently because what they are getting into is a dead-end street. If in fact you let a person like Joe Jarmoc go into a public park, even though he has been able to take option on a private piece of land entirely contained within a provincial park, he will use the facilities of the public park, which have been put in there by the people of Manitoba generally, for individual use and, worse, for direct profit.

I don't think people ever thought when they invested in public parks that they were doing so so that some people would make profit from the land within that public park. I have never seen any indication that Joe Jarmoc, or any private developer of land in a provincial park, would supply the developed lots to the public through the lotteries system, which provides fair and equal access to those lots. They wouldn't do that, and I am amazed that we would depart from that procedure, which was not established, by the way, by the New Democratic Party administration when it was in power. It has been a longstanding procedure that was established by past, I think Liberal Provincial Governments and reinforced by past Conservative Provincial Governments.

But we have a new Minister in who has decided that somehow public investment in a public park isn't good because it uses up money. What he would prefer is to have private investment in a public park. He assumes somehow that this will not use money. Both private and public investments use money; both cost society. Both types of investment cost society exactly, exactly the same amount. The point is, is it better in this instance to invest in a public park privately or to invest in a public park publicly? Mr. Chairman, I would argue that it's much better to invest public funds in the public

development of parks for the very reason that I cited before, and that's that it is the major way in which fair and equal accessibility to that public good is provided by the public.

Now, this Minister wants to undercut that particular principle that is a long-cherished principle in Manitoba. I think it's one of the things that makes Manitoba, and particularly Winnipeg, a very interesting place to live in. We do have fairly easy accessibility to good recreation areas in public parks near to Winnipeg, within one or two hours' driving distance. I think that's what makes Winnipeg a very good place to live, and the Minister somehow will now want to change that; he will want to change that so that the only way you will be able to get a lot in the Whiteshell is to buy it from a private developer who will use up the publicly created capacities on the Big Whiteshell Lake or Crowduck Lake or any of these other lakes, and in order to get access to that public capacity you're going to have to pay \$40,000 or \$50,000 for a condominium, because if you do the arithmetic with respect to the Jarmoc Development, that's basically what those condominiums are going to cost people — \$50,000.00. Now, is that fair and equal accessibility to recreation in public parks for the people of Manitoba? No, it isn't.

Now, we've not been able to get a clear explanation of this development or of the policy of the Provincial Government with respect to recreation development in public parks. The Minister asked us to hold off for a long period of time while he did a comprehensive, detailed report on this subject. Frankly, that long-awaited comprehensive detailed report was not detailed, was not comprehensive, begs more questions than it answers and that's why I was awaiting with some bated breath the statement of the Minister with respect to the policy of his department. This is the first topic, and I still await that answer and I have not received it, so I express my disappointment; perhaps he is going to provide answers to those questions when we get into Parks, but so far he hasn't provided any answers to those questions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Yes, I'd like to ask the Minister just where in the Estimates we deal with summer cottage lot permits, what item under the Estimates would we be dealing with that item?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, on Page 75 under 2.(a)(3), Park Maintenance and Operation.

**MR. JENKINS:** I thank the Minister for that information. I'll deal with the problems that I have in that area when we get to that item on the Estimate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.—pass; 2.—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes. I was wondering if the Minister could explain what the functions of this particular section are. Is this for Tourism or for Parks or for both?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, it's for the whole department. It deals with research and planning with all the sections that fall under the particular jurisdiction of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Under this item, how many SMYs are involved in the item under Salaries? How many were involved last year and how many are involved this year? How many are vacant?

**MR. BANMAN:** SMYs last year's vote was 11.26, the same number this year, 11.26. I understand there's no vacancies, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. JENKINS:** Well, can the Honourable Minister then explain why we have a reduction if we have the same SMYs this year? We had 187,700 last year and 185,100 this year. Has one of the civil servants taken a cut in wages, or what?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the net decrease is due to the termination of a contract in this particular item which offsets the amount of money as far as salary increases are of the other people.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.—pass; 2.—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Honourable Minister tell us what causes the decrease of approximately



\$48,000 in this item?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, this deals basically with fees for research studies, printing and stationery, computer related costs and travel costs, and we have reduced the provisions for travel fees as well as printing and stationery and other related costs.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Honourable Minister tell us who holds the contract for the Data Services within this item?

**MR. BANMAN:** I understand it's the Manitoba Data Services.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I could ask this question now or when we come to (e). I am wondering if the Minister would undertake to provide the members of the House with an organizational chart of the department. Also, if he would undertake to provide to the members of the House a list of the staff man years and the number of people filling the staff man years, permanent, term and contract, April 1, 1977, April 1, 1978.

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will distribute the organizational chart and I'll try and get the other information for the member.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.—pass; 2.—pass; (d)—pass; (e)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister could indicate whether in fact he thinks that the 1.(e) is an essential requirement of his department, or whether in fact it shouldn't just be abolished.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that if we had thought that it was not essential to carrying out the details of the department, we would not have asked for the money for the members. It deals with 8,396 staff man years and it provides the necessary personnel for the payroll system for the department.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get what the Minister's position was with respect to this function. I think that it's probably required in the department. But I would like him to be aware of the fact that the government Task Force in Efficiency and Economy has suggested that there is too great duplication within the government administration regarding the whole personnel function in government and it's suggested this function should be taken out of the departments and put into a Personnel Management group of Cabinet.

They would make it a central group that would deal with all the personnel management functions of government.

I'm wondering if the Minister has had a chance to look at that particular recommendation, before he put these Estimates forward, or whether in fact he's had a chance since the Task Force came out in April, to look at that recommendation, consider it and then draw a conclusion with respect to whether in fact we should continue with 1.(e) or whether in fact we should take this opportunity to vote it out of the Estimates.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I have not looked at the Task Force recommendations and did not have any prior knowledge to them before dealing with these particular Estimates. This particular function does the payroll and provides some of the personnel services for the department and that's the way we're operating and that's what we're requesting the funds for.

**MR. PARASIUK:** So in other words, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated that having spent seven or eight months as Minister responsible for the department, having made himself well acquainted with the procedures of the department, having made himself well acquainted with the administrative requirements of the department, he is in a position to recommend to us that 1.(e) is required and that it's a necessary function. I think he's right and I'll be amenable to that. I, in fact, will want to pass that.

But I would like to take this opportunity to point out again the type of havoc that an irresponsible task force can generate amongst the Civil Service and amongst some Ministers. I'm glad that this

Minister obviously doesn't read. I'm glad that he didn't take the time to read what was hailed as the most important undertaking of his First Minister of this administration.

If he can recall, he said, "The most important first undertaking was to carry out this Task Force on government efficiency and economy," and I'm glad that the Minister of Tourism has not listened to his First Minister and has, by his actions, indicated that he doesn't think that the Task Force was an important undertaking. And I'm glad that he was able to do that because it led him to make a very sensible type of conclusion and draw a sensible type of conclusion after seven or eight months' experience in the job.

Imagine if he would have listened to one of those armchair quarterbacks who came in, possibly didn't even sit down with the departments, and then came up with this recommendation. Imagine the chaos that it would have caused. So, you know, I commend the Minister. I just hope that he pays the — well, no, I wouldn't want him to pay the same type of attention to other great undertakings of this particular administration — but I'm glad in this one that he's retained his common sense.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister. Can the Minister explain the cut here, how many SMYs were there last year, how many SMYs this year, how many vacancies last year and how many vacancies this year?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, there were 9.3 staff man years last year, that has been reduced by one.

**MR. JENKINS:** How many vacancies, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Minister? I asked him how many vacancies there were last year; how many vacancies are there in the present Estimates?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I understand there are no vacancies now and there weren't any last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Further to the Honourable Minister's remarks that about 50 percent of the expenditures in this department are for grants. I wonder if the Minister would be able to provide the Committee with a list of the organizations to which grants were made and the amounts for the year 1977-78, and a comparable list for the year 1978-79, to the extent that they have been decided upon.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The majority of the grants I think the gentleman opposite will find in the annual report of the particular department, but since that's a year old we'll try and get an updated list for him.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. I also asked the Minister under which section of the department I could ask questions about the rental of provincially owned cottages in provincial parks.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, on Page 75, 2.(a)(3) Park Maintenance and Operation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, inform us of the reduction from \$34,800 to \$31,300 and what is entailed in this cut in Expenditures?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** The decrease of \$3,500 will result from lower operating costs in this program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (2)—pass; (e)—pass; (f)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Could we have the SMYs for last year; the vacancies for last year; the SMYs for this year and the vacancies? And also how many languages do we translate besides French and English\$ for the Department of Tourism?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the SMYs in process, none; the vacancies were none, and there are four SMYs last year and four this year.

**MR. JENKINS:** I also asked the Minister how many languages we translated in besides, English to French or French to English?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we deal with from English to French and from French to English. We're dealing with those two languages.

**MR. JENKINS:** Then there are no other translation services. This translation service is just for the two official languages of the country. Is that correct?

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes. As the member will appreciate, that our correspondence with either Quebec or several other people in the Province of Manitoba, the majority of the translation work is dealing with that and this particular section endeavours to do the translation for different government departments.

**MR. JENKINS:** If the department then received say, a request for Tourist information in Manitoba, say from a Western European country that was not speaking either English or French, what would the department do then? Does this department look after that, or do they farm it out to another department of government where we have more than one set of language translation from French to English, English to French?

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, if it's the case of German, I recived a letter from West Germany the other day. Fortunately, I can speak German and I translated it myself. So what we're doing is we are relying on people from the outside that should a letter come to our attention, we can usually find somebody that can translate it, without having a department set up to deal directly with that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister could tell us whether the dollar decrease here indicates a drop in priority on the part of the government for this particular type of activity. —(Interjection)—

**MR. BANMAN:** The Member for The Pas is right; it has improved efficiency, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALDMcBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate exactly what are the great efficiencies that have been brought about, in some detail.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we are handling more of the translations ourselves, instead of contracting them out. And, as a result, our contracting out fees will be much less.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Does that mean that contrary to other practices of this new administration, the government has found it much more efficient to actually use in-house services rather than contract out; is that what you are telling us?

**MR. BANMAN:** In a case, Mr. Chairman, where we have people that can do the job, they might as well do it instead of letting other people do it at that particular time. I should also point out that we are going to be trying a new experiment with this particular branch. We will be lowering the charges to the different departments and I hope that the particular individuals that are involved in this particular department, their workload will be increased and, as a result, cut back on some of the costs that will be incurred.

**MR. PARASIUK:** You mean to say then that the department before used to charge other

for the translation service that it performed. So that means then that you actually receive revenue for this particular function. Can you tell us how much revenue you received last year, and how much revenue will Consolidated Revenue Fund gain as a result of your change in pricing for the coming year?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, we received \$13,500 in 1976-77 from translation revenues and \$17,100 from translation revenues in 1977-78.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (f)—pass; (g)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am wondering if the Minister could give us his position regarding the whole question of film classification versus film censorship. I see that he is putting money in. Does that mean that he believes in film classification as opposed to film censorship?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, that has been an item of some contention dealing with certain, I understand, Council meetings in the City of Winnipeg in the last little while. Some of the Councillors are recommending a Censorship Board. There has been some discussion between myself and the Chairman of the Film Classification Board as to what other jurisdictions are doing. I think it's very confusing for many of us, who see the workings of this particular Film Classification Board, to realize that all the other provinces have boards which are very similar to this, and many of the films that come into Manitoba have already been classified by different jurisdictions.

The particular items, whether or not we should be censoring it, is something that I have not had enough time to really sit down and really look at. I think that possibly there could be a lot closer workings between the different provinces. There seems to be a certain amount, as I mentioned, of duplication when it comes to straight classification, and I think that the Film Classification people themselves throughout the provinces are concerned about that, that there is some kind of uniformity created with the classification system. The censorship authority is something that we will have to look at. It requires a change in the Act in the Legislature. Some of the provinces, the member will appreciate, have it; others don't. And to exactly what extent the Provincial Government wants to get involved is another matter. There is a Federal Committee that has been set up to study the problems of this, dealing with the Criminal Code. At present, we in Manitoba has taken the position that if the film is offensive and contravenes the Criminal Code, then it's up to the provincial jurisdiction to prosecute under the Criminal Code, and that has happened several times in Winnipeg here. So until there are changes, which I understand there might be some recommendations coming forth from this committee that has been studying the Criminal Code, until that happens I think that we would be a little premature to deal with this particular matter.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister did answer my question. I think he talked around it for quite awhile but, you know, we are being asked to approve a sum of money, \$72,000, for a Film Classification Board, and I asked the Minister very simply what was his position on it, because he is the one asking us for the funds. He is the one asking the Legislature for the funds. Various Councillors aren't asking the Legislature for the funds; members on this side aren't asking the Legislature for the funds; the Minister responsible is asking the Legislature for the funds.

Now, I assume that in formulating his Estimates he would in fact have sat down and gone over every program with the staff and drawn a conclusion as to whether, in fact, this program was warranted or not. That is a normal budgeting procedure. Surely the Minister, if he has done his job conscientiously, has done that.

Now, is he saying that he has just sort of taken whatever existed last year and brought it forward this year? Because I see a lot of programs that have been cut this year in other departments reflecting the particular values and priorities of the Minister responsible for the department now. And those values and priorities will be different from the values and priorities of the predecessor Minister, and that's normal and that's to be expected. I think one of the functions of people in the Legislature is to point out the differences in values and priorities.

So, Mr. Chairman, it was with that in mind that I asked the Minister whether in fact he believed in the Film Classification Board, and he skirted it. I gave him a fairly open-ended question; I guess I should get much more specific, which I don't like because I think it puts the Minister into some type of cross-examination position, but I think he is putting himself in there by his answers. Could he tell us specifically if he values the Manitoba Film Classification Board's functions? Does he believe in them? Does he believe that they are efficient and sufficient for the task at hand of providing classification for films to the general public?

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that any changes with regard to setting up a different system will require legislative changes. As the member knows, that has to be debated in the Legislature before that can be implemented and as a result, this is the particular system that we inherited from the previous administration. Now, whether or not I feel that it should be tightened up or loosened up with this particular Estimate amount, this is an ongoing particular thing that is happening. We were expecting to expend something like \$72,000 or recovering \$68,000, because we're charging the people that bring the films in, we're charging them for classifying them. But let it not be misconstrued what my position is; I have mentioned, in talking to different people, that maybe what we should have is another classification rate of "Garbage" because some of the stuff shouldn't even be shown in the theatres — that's my own personal feeling. And I would be one who would want to tighten up on the controls rather than loosen them, if the member wants my position on this.

But, faced with what is happening federally right now, the Criminal Code might be changed. If the Criminal Code is changed and they loosen it up then we might have to look at how we can tighten it up, but till that report comes in, we'll have to operate under the rules we're operating under now, and that when something is considered obscene by the authorities, they will then prosecute the theatre owner for those particular violations. And that's the system we're operating under right now, and until there are some other changes and we introduce different legislation, which the member will appreciate as a policy change, then we will make the necessary changes, if that is indeed required.

**MR. PARASIUK:** I thank the Minister for his belated answer to the first question I posed him. He does believe, then, in personally a form of censorship, and the difficulty with that — because I think there are some difficulties that are of a public significance — relate to the question of who will define what is garbage. You know, I think that certain things are garbage as well; I don't go see them, then. And I assume then that the Minister also thinks that certain things are garbage too; now I assume that he doesn't go see those particular films as well. I assume that he and I must have been burned occasionally, however, in going into a film that, having seen it, we concluded it was garbage. His perception of what is garbage and my perception may in fact be different, and that is the problem: who will be the judge? Who will be the judge to determine what is garbage and what should be restricted, and what isn't garbage and shouldn't be restricted.

You know, when I was a student at the University of Manitoba about 11, 12 — yes, I guess it was about 11 years ago — I worked for a summer in Alberta and the government of the day in Alberta was a Social Credit government. I can recall going to see a film in Alberta at the time called "Tom Jones." Tom Jones was considered somewhat risqué at the time, and I thought it was a short film; I thought it was one of these short fillers. It was about 35, 40 minutes long. —(Interjection)— And it was really badly clipped; I couldn't follow the story, and I thought it was a very bad film. —(Interjection)— because the book is very good. As no doubt the Member for Morris can attest. And I returned to Manitoba and the film was being shown here, and so I decided to take a second chance and I went to see it, and lo and behold, it was a longer film; it was a feature length film. It maybe even had some parts cut out, I'm not sure, but it certainly had a lot more to it than the first version and frankly, the parts that had been cut out by the Alberta censors were rather silly cuts. And it was at that time that I came to the conclusion that it was probably much better to classify a film rather than to have one or two people exercise judgment as to what constitutes garbage and what constitutes obscene material, and have them make cuts which everyone presumes are related to the whole subject of sex, but frankly, are related to a whole set of other things. I frankly don't think that enough violence, or that the whole subject of violence is dealt with well by film classifiers. They may in fact have a difference of opinion. I think the public perception of this issue tends to revolve around the whole sexual aspect of whatever films are being shown today.

But frankly, I'd much prefer a classification system. I'd much prefer the judgment to rest with the people showing the film. I think we've had a system at work now that has been quite good. I think sometimes in prosecuting we've not been that sure whether we should be prosecuting or not, but I find that the Minister is not endorsing that system but in fact is saying that he's going to go along with it for one year, but that if he really had his druthers, and I assume that that's why he got elected, was to be Minister, and in fact impose or bring about his values in the department that he's administering, he would like to have another section. And I warn the Minister that in proposing, I think a well-intentioned thing, that he does run the risk of having somebody given some very strict and, I think, somewhat subjective powers that I myself, as a member of this Legislature, would not want to give a particular individual.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I'm not quite as sure as my colleague that the Minister has made up his mind on this thing. I also have some views if, in view of the fact that he's going to consider it — that's the message that I'm getting — to see if there's any changes that are warranted. I'd like to say a few words on that because I was the Minister responsible for the Department when the classification was brought in and we discontinued with censorship.

I can see that you wouldn't want the Minister to think that automatically, if you have censorship, that means that you're tightening up, because it hasn't worked like that at all. In the old days, when you had censorship, they would clip certain things in the film, or they would throw the film out. I don't remember of any time that there wasn't an appeal; most of the time they won the appeal, and you gave an awful lot of publicity to it and everybody went over to see it. Or you had somebody like former Minister Joe Borowski, who did the same thing to movies that he hadn't seen at all or films he hadn't seen at all, and somebody told him it was wrong, and he'd make a big thing, and you know, if I didn't know Joe so well I would think that he was on the payroll of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Now, why I say if there are certain changes in the Criminal Code, that's something else, and I think you'd have to take another look at it. But if there isn't, you have to remember that the Minister is right, if there is anything obscene or too much violence and if it is thrown out, well then, they could prosecute the same as was done in the past.

And in the meantime, we are saying to the public and to the church groups and to the other groups, and I would imagine that the Film Classification Board is just as representative as we always tried to have it in the past, and the individual members might even help their own groups if they wish. And then you are informing the families, and you are saying, "Well, this is what the film is all about: the language is not good, there's sex or there's violence," and you can decide, but one good thing about that is that in the old days that there was no way. You said Parental Guidance and that wasn't looked at too much, or they had to be accompanied by adults, but now if you have an X-rated film or — what is it? — restricted adult film, well anyone under 18 cannot go, and you don't appeal that. So at least we might agree with a certain group of the younger people, they are not exposed to this.

Now, when it comes to adults, it is quite difficult, because I think my colleague is absolutely right. In the debate that we had here I said to Mr. Borowski in those days that I very much believe in censorship, very much, but only if I could be the censor myself. And it wasn't a joke; I wasn't trying to be funny. I think that it's up to each one of us to censor. The argument that we had in our own Cabinet at the time. . . You will find in the same Cabinet somebody that — and I might exaggerate a bit to make a point — that anything goes, the more the merrier, and other people if you are holding hands, well then that should be censored.

You will find that in the courts. You will find that in the Court of Appeal. I am not going to name any judges but I am picturing two of them now that are two extremes.

So I think that with the Classification Board, I don't think that censorship the way we have it could work, when they could appeal it. If there was no appeal, but then who would you select? You know, you could select people that would not censor anything at all. You would have a Censor Board. The board would be named the Censor Board, but they would let everything go. And you could have another board that — Well, you wouldn't have enough movies to accommodate the theatres here.

So I would think that before, if the Minister . . . I didn't quite get that that he is anxious to change it. I didn't get that message. I think that the question kind of surprised the Minister and I don't think he had given it too much thought. But if he is going to do anything, I would hope that he will be very very careful before he recommends that we revert back to censorship. Because I don't think it's going to work and I think it is going to be worse, if anything.

So you have got the protection, and we know how hard it is to enforce the Criminal Code in the question of obscenity. I think that's one of the reasons they can't seem to . . . They have tried it for years, and things change so fast also. I remember awhile back some of the movies, Oh My God, I thought it was awful, and now you accept these things. I think that the people. . . we are living in a different world. I am not saying this is good or bad, but I think that they have tried to define obscene as something that certain people in a certain area feel is obscene, and I think it's all a question of what the people want.

So I would hope that the Minister has a good look. I think it's a good board. I think it's working well, and I think it would be very dangerous to try and change it. And furthermore, I don't think that the Minister, if he wants to tighten things, would achieve that by having a Censor Board.

What I would want to know now though is, are there any prosecutions? Were there a lot of people . . . ? I am more concerned with those under the age of 18, I think it is. Is that policed quite well, or are there inspectors, more inspectors? Is the Minister satisfied, or his staff satisfied, with what's going on, or are we having trouble?

Now, we have talked also about the identification card. Well, the Cabinet, a few years back,

without recognizing an official card, recognized, I think, that we . . . I was authorized to tell the people in the pubs, dealing with the liquor, but also the theatre people, that a certain card would be recognized. And I think that this was accepted by the Hotel Association and also recognized by the theatre owners, and it was working quite well, but I haven't heard any more since then. So if we are going to discuss this, I wonder if the Minister can comment on that.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I will try and get the number of inspectors that we have got. I believe it is one right now that is going and monitoring the different theatres, plus the different members of the board that are involved that go to a movie from time to time.

I understand there was something like seven police seizures and court actions last year, and one conviction out of those seven.

The problems of classification and censorship, of course, are quite complex, as the member mentioned. However, you know, I think that we, as legislators, every day deal with a certain amount of passing judgment on whatever we do. When we are passing a bill, we are saying to the people of the province, yes, you can do this but you can't do that. So to a certain extent we are deciding what people are going to do and what they can't do. So that to that extent we do already make, in our wisdom — should I call it? — the decisions which govern society as far as their conduct and as far as the laws of the land are. So we do have a certain amount of responsibility in here. I appreciate that my tastes as far as obscenity might not be the same as some of the members opposite. However, I think that, in some of the instances, for the public good there should be certain things not shown, whether it be having excessive violence or other scenes in it.

Now, the Member for St. Boniface mentions the Criminal Code and this is exactly what I was trying to say. We are operating with this. We are going to be monitoring what is happening with the Criminal Code and should it tighten up, which really I would like to see — I would like to see them tighten up the Criminal Code on this particular item — that would mean that we would not have to jump in and fill that vacancy. So I think that's what I have been trying to tell the members opposite.

Coming back to the problem of identification, I am one who personally would favour the picture on a driver's licence. I think that that has tremendous potential, not only dealing with minors in theatres but minors in alcoholic premises, suspended drivers — running the whole gamut. And I would like to see that system. The voluntary ID system just hasn't worked out. It is a particular problem with regard to the theatre operators, who are trying to judge the age of the individuals entering there, but I would personally instead of implementing a one card for theatre passes and another ID card for hotels for drinking ages, I would rather like to see a program where we have that on the driver's licence and somebody can use that, and then there is no discrepancy or no argument about whether a person can enter or not.

**MR. CHAIAN:** The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dealing with the Film Classification Board and its function, I think that the Film Classification Board has done a fairly good job, as far as classifying the films, and I realize in this field that what is offensive to one person may not be offensive to another. Really when it all boils down, like my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, said, he believes in censorship if he could be the censor. I guess perhaps deep down maybe a lot of us feel the same way but it harps back to the old parson preaching from the pulpit to his congregation and saying, "Don't do as I do but do as I say."

It's a very difficult matter, the whole field of censorship and what should be viewed by the public. I think we are all fairly well agreed that there has to be some sort of an age limit and I think that the age of majority has been pretty well accepted.

I remember a few years ago I was in Copenhagen and Denmark and of course they have had quite liberal laws on what would be shown at movie theatres but I can tell you one of the things that struck me quite funny. I was walking down one of the streets of Copenhagen, my wife and I, and I saw something that I hadn't seen for many many years and that was someone out advertising a film with the old sandwich boards. So I stopped and I asked this fellow just what he was doing, and what the film was. I found out it was one of these blue films; it was one of these naughty, naughty films. And I said, "Well, surely with all the West Germans who were, supposedly, because of the strict censorship laws that they had at one time in West Germany and people coming from other parts of the world, and especially North Americans" — they seemed to be obsessed with seeing sex when they got over to the Scandinavian countries — I said, "I thought that you people would be doing a land office business." He said, "No, just the opposite. People are not flocking to the theatres to see the sex-oriented movies as they were in the past. They had become sated on the subject." And so it struck me as quite funny that the other movie theatres in Copenhagen didn't have to advertise with sandwich boards, and also in some of the hotels that you go to in

some of the Scandinavian countries, the blue films are advertised. And quite graphically, I might add, too. They are there strictly for the tourists, but the local population seems to ignore it to a great extent.

So I think that the Film Classification Board in itself has proved to be quite successful. It is always very difficult for someone to sit in judgment upon what other people should see, or what they should read. I don't want to assume onto myself, as a member of this Legislature, that I am going to be the be-all and end-all of what people can read, see or hear. You know if we get to that stage, we can decide that perhaps things that we may not look upon, or things that are not of a nature that are sex-oriented or violence-oriented, there may be other things that we may not want people to read, see or hear about.

So in the whole field of censorship, I think that it is one that we have to, as members of a legislative body be it at any level of government, I think that it is one that we have to handle with great care and not wind up being the person who is going to wind up censoring everything and anything, because after all the members of this Assembly are just representative of the general population and the general population has many ideas on what censorship should and should not be involved in. And until you get a very strong message — and I have never had any great vibes from my constituents one way or the other on this topic.

So I would say to the Minister, the Film Classification Board has worked quite well. The Minister said that seven cases went to court last year. They obtained one prosecution. If I am misquoting him, he can correct me.

But as the Member for St. Boniface said, even amongst the Bar, the members of the judiciary themselves, one will be very ultra-conservative minded as far as sex and violence is concerned and another one will be at the other end of the spectrum. Mainly what the Classification Board has done has been able to tell people what to more or less expect when they go to movies. And after all, we are not forcing anyone to go. The movie operator himself, I think he realizes that the film is rated as such and if he shows it and someone takes objection to it and wants to lay charges, that that is a possibility.

But as the Minister himself has said, there has not been that many prosecutions and I think that the Film Classification Board should remain as it is.

I would just like to ask him before I sit down since there is an increase in the item before us from \$26,700 to \$28,600, has there been an increase in the honorariums of the Film Classification Board members or has the board been increased, and also could he give us a list of the present members of the Film Classification Board?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, the increase includes the provision for a full-time film projectionist for the fees, and the increase is due to general salary increases and annual increments. I should point out that the fees with regard to the classifications of films was raised this year and I have those fees here if the honourable member would require them.

Further to some of his statements before that, we were privileged to have the Tenth Canadian Conference of the Film Classification and Censorship Boards held in Winnipeg this March, at which I attended, and the Chairman, Miss Barbara Weslake Mills, did a tremendous job of organizing it and hosting that particular convention — (Interjection) — No, no stag movies, Mr. Chairman. It was encouraging on the part of the communique that was issued at the end of the conference by the people involved; there was a general consensus among the people from all across Canada that even though the general explicit adult film market will not disappear in the years to come, there seems to be a trend away from their recent popularity and they seem to be on the downswing, which I think is encouraging from a moral standpoint, I guess, dealing with individuals who realize that that is not the type of thing that is educational in any way. So, that is an encouraging trend and was observed by the different people that did attend that particular conference.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, there's only one thing that I forgot; I would like to bring this up at this time. The Minister said that he is co-operating with the Federal Government, I think, in their study of the Criminal Code. Am I misquoting him? But the Minister said that there was a Committee, that is for the Federal Government, that is looking — all right. You could have the toughest censorship or classification, if the Federal Government doesn't do the same thing in some of the television programs, then you are wasting your time. More and more we seen, some of these programs on television not necessarily sex, but violence, and they show them in the prime time, when some children are still watching TV, and I think that that is probably the most important thing. If the Minister wants to spend some energy in this field, I think this is what he should look at, because right now you can have, as I said, very tough laws controlling the theatres and the cinema, but if you're not doing it on TV, there is no point.

And I wouldn't want the Minister to think that some of the exchanges that we've had here today — it seems that censorship is the toughest, and then classification comes after. That's not necessarily



the case, I don't agree with that at all. As I said earlier, I would want censorship if I can be the censor. Well, that can be done with a Classification Board. The Minister said that we have a certain responsibility when we come here. Well, fine, I think that that is exactly what we are doing by setting up a Classification Board and then if it is representative, there's nothing that prevents, for instance, the R.C. or the Mennonites or the Jewish group, especially if they are represented — and this is what I was encouraging when I set up the first Board — to have these people — give them, you know, in their own newspaper, let's say. They can have their classification, and then the different churches can deal as they wish. They can say, "Well, this is what we recognize as our Board, and we feel that you shouldn't go to see certain movies." That is being done now. And then if the parents are — and you know, we can't replace the parents; I don't think our responsibility as legislators is to replace the parents, it's to assist them. And I think that if you say you've got the classification and tell them that it's either classified "Parental Guidance," let's say, because of the language or because of sex or violence, well then, the people, if they're really interested, they're going to find out; either go and see the movie themselves or find out from other people that they know, they trust, before they allow their children to go to these films. So, you can have this Classification Board; it could very easy for those that want censorship to follow through after that. I think it's a lot easier, and as I say, I think it's working quite well now. I would agree with the Minister that what we need is probably a tightening up, or at least review the Criminal Code, and that has to include what we see on the idiot box also, or we're wasting our time.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we, as the Manitoba Film Classification Board have not had input directly. The body that we belong to that met here, the Canadian Film Classification and Censorship people have had input and also do meet with the CRTC. I should make one thing clear. As far as the television is concerned, the member will appreciate that we, as a Classification Board of the province, have no control over what is shown on those particular television networks. The problem is that that comes under the jurisdiction of the Federal Authority, the CRTC. Our national body does meet with the CRTC from time to time and expresses the concerns that we particularly have, but I appreciate the member's points. I have had correspondence from different people who have been quite upset at some of the violence, some of the things that are shown on TV, and especially when, sometime in the early evening, they flash on the screen, "There might be scenes offensive to certain people;" that's a come-on, that's a better advertising gimmick. It goes back to what the honourable member mentioned before, the problems we've had with taking films to court and then getting so much publicity that it actually helped their box-office receipts. So that's a problem that should be addressed to the CRTC and I can assure the member I agree with the points that he's made.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Logan asked a question; I think it must have slipped the Minister's mind. I wonder if there have been any changes in the composition of Classification Board, and if so, what are those changes?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that the people that are involved in the Classification Board, the last appointments were made by Order-in-Council in June 1976, and there have been no changes. What the general practice has been is that about 50 percent are changed and rotated to try and keep a proper mix on the Board and to try to get a good cross-section of the community involved in the classification.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there is an increase or decrease in the number of films that are actually classified, and whether there's an increase or decrease in the number of the most restricted categories, whether those are increasing or declining?

**MR. BANMAN:** There has been an increase over the last number of years. In 1976-77, Restricted Adults, 164; Mature, 141; Adult Parental Guidance, 78; and General, 40. And then we had some other films dealing with short subjects, that type of thing. The trend is that there has been an increase.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the organization chart that the Minister distributed to the members of the Committee there is a box labelled No. 1, the Film Classification Appeal Board. This is a board that I'd never heard of, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister about it and whereabouts it comes in his Estimates. Perhaps he can tell us which line it is, also what the board

does, and who are the members of it.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is not a Board per se; what happens is that when there is an appeal, the Minister then appoints a Board. There have been two appeals in the last five years.

**MR. WALDING:** I'd like to ask the Minister, then, Mr. Chairman, who would be making these appeals to the Minister? How does the Minister go about setting up his Appeal Board?

**MR. BANMAN:** It would be the film distributor who might not be happy with the classification that he or she has received, and they would then appeal the ruling of the Film Classification Board.

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Chairman, in the case of the two appeals that the Minister mentioned, have these been appeals in a downward direction or an upward direction as far as the restrictiveness of the classification is concerned?

**MR. BANMAN:** I don't know if you'd call it downgrading or upgrading. They were classified as Restricted Adults and they wanted it brought down to a lesser restrictive ruling, namely, Mature.

**MR. WALDING:** Just out of curiosity, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell me what the ruling of the Appeal Board was in those two cases?

**MR. BANMAN:** Fifty-fifty split, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate how it is that in the case of enforcement it seems that although there is talk of enforcement and talk of fining on the part of people who are showing obscene movies or whatever, that we have in Winnipeg the Venus Theatre, which is forever being fined, forever being hauled into court, forever being brought up in the newspapers, but continues to operate as if nothing ever happened. Can the Minister explain how it is that there is supposedly some restriction of motion pictures and acceptable and unacceptable material? This theatre apparently shows material that is considered to be obscene, or not allowable — and risque, if I were to pretend that I'm bilingual — nevertheless they operate without any problems and continue to operate.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that the particular individual at present does not have a license and is going through a business licence appeal procedure. The charges, when they're laid by the police department, are done so against the film and as a result what is happening is, instead of maybe blocking up the establishment till that particular thing is cleaned up, it can go ahead and show a different film and I guess go through the same procedure again, so that is part of the problem that we have.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, is the Minister telling me that a motion picture theatre operator can show films which are quite obscene and a charge is laid against the film; he simply takes the film out, puts in another film that's judged obscene, and can operate forever and a day because there are no teeth in this legislation whatsoever?

**MR. BANMAN:** We're dealing here, Mr. Chairman, with federal criminal law, and I'm sorry that I'm not that up to date with regard to the Federal Criminal Code. But he can show another film. In other words, they'll seize — that one film in he won't just bring another film of the same kind — usually what happens is they bring in a film of maybe a different subject matter. But they can show that film, and then if the police under the Criminal Code deem that that is obscene, they can charge them. But eventually the problem of getting a business licence, of course, is one which the owner or the operator will then have to face, and that, I understand, is the place where the particular Venus Theatre is at right now.

**MR. DOERN:** So I gather then that the city is involved in terms of the licence of the motion picture theatre and the city is involved in terms of the Winnipeg Police seeing movies, but that the Manitoba Government is not involved in that it does not, for instance, lay charges or make complaints in regard to particular material, even though the people on the board may see that before anyone else and they have those feelings.

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. We classify, that is under the Act, what our authority is, and that's all our authority is. As soon as there are charges laid, they're done under the Federal Criminal Code, and as a result we have no jurisdictional rights in that particular area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can clarify — he mentioned prosecutions — now, were those under the Federal legislation or were those under this provincial legislation in terms of people being under-age, etc.?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, those seven particular police seizures and court actions were undertaken under the Federal Criminal Code.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, have there been any prosecutions under our legislation in the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. BANMAN:** With regard to the question about juveniles in theatres, I understand there have been no charges last year. There were, however, people turned away from seeing different films, but as far as charging individuals in the theatres, there wasn't any of that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (g)—pass; (h)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** In (g), Mr. Chairman, under (2) Other Expenditures, we have an increase from \$39,500 to \$43,500.00. Could the Honourable Minister give us a brief explanation to this hardware item for the Classification Board? I understand you have a full-time projectionist now. Have they bought new projectors, or what?

**A MEMBER:** More scissors.

**MR. JENKINS:** Or more scissors, or what? No, they don't use scissors because they just classify. Would the Honourable Minister give us a brief explanation?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, some of the money was required to host the National Conference that I mentioned a little while ago. Others are increased costs because of the provision for fees, and that's about it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (2)—pass; (g)—pass; (h)—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us some breakdown on this item, what it's comprised of.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, this deals with the Horse Racing Commission and I'll read them off to the members.

Purse maintenance grants, it's a percentage of the wagering, half a million dollars; Horse Breeders Incentive Program, \$887,500; Manitoba Great-West Racing Circuit, \$50,300; Manitoba Standard Bred Sire Stakes, \$9,200; General Operation and Administration, \$133,500; bringing a grand total of \$780,500; less operating revenues of \$68,300, and less the portion of the program funded from funds from a trust account, \$40,000, bringing the total to \$672,200.00.,

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his information. I wonder if he could more specifically say where the reductions are in this amount. Would there be less breeding this year, or what areas are there reductions in?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister when he answers that, it wouldn't be complete unless he tells us also, as the tax system has been changed, are there maybe less grants now, but they're allowed to keep 3% of the funds that are not taxed as high? And, of course,

there is an increase in days of racing also.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** First of all, to answer the question from the Member for St. Boniface, the percentage of take that went to purse maintenance was increased by .5 percent. It was done so by Order-in-Council, and the Minister of Finance made that announcement in the House. That was dealing with the Federal Government taking off ½ a percent, in other words, the level of tax that is taken is still the same amount as it was before except that the .5 percent will be transferred to the horsemen. That will appear in Supplementary Supply because it happened after the Estimates were printed. I think it's something like \$230,000, which we will be getting in from the track and then giving back to the horsemen in Purse Maintenance. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's right. So, it'll be coming in as revenue but it will be going out as a grant.

The major difference in the amount of money here was that last year there was \$251,000 which was given to Venture Manitoba Tours for the operation of the M.S. Lord Selkirk and the Gull Harbour Lodge.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, does that mean then that the amount of assistance in terms of horse racing will actually be about the same or will it be increased? How does that work? Will it enable them to change the blankets for the horses more than once a week?

**A MEMBER:** Yes, in case they're dirty.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to say how often they are going to change the horse blankets. That's up to the horsemen out there. This figure does represent somewhat of an increase over last year as far as the horse racing is concerned because there is an anticipation that there will be more wagering at the track, and since Purse Maintenance is based on a percentage of wagering, the grant for that Purse Maintenance will be larger.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I can't recall whether the Minister of Finance gave an estimate of the dollars that he might get by Supplementary Supply for this item. Does the Minister have that information of the probable dollars?

**MR. BANMAN:** We've estimated — and the member will appreciate that these are estimates based on what we feel the wagering will be — that the Supplementary Supply will be about \$232,500.00.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (h)—pass — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** The Minister said that this was based on the amount of wagering. Could the Minister give us an interim report on: Is the wagering up or down for this time of year as opposed to last year? Does his department have that or would that be available from the Minister of Finance?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I haven't got the exact figures here, but our preliminary figures show that it is up slightly from last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (h)—pass. Resolution 110, Clause 2. Tourism and Park Resources Division. (a)(1)(a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. Whereabouts does the lifeguard item appear in this section?

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, in the same item that many other things do, on Page 75, 2.(a)(3), Park Maintenance and Operation.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the Management Service of the Provincial Park System, would they have had some role in advising the Minister? Would they have been involved in the Jarmoc affair?

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, then under this section, could the Minister tell us what sort of advice he got from this section and whether he followed that advice or not.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, the negotiations and different advice received were handled by the staff and by the Deputy Minister. The negotiation process on that was handled by the staff people and I have not sat down and talked to any particular staff person with regard to that.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Just for clarification — would the staff in this section have made recommendations to the Deputy Minister and the Minister, or would they have actually been involved in the negotiation?

**MR. BANMAN:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, they were involved in the negotiation.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister wants to take this opportunity to provide some of the answers that he hasn't provided yet, that we've asked from this side of the House in regard to the Jarmoc situation; whether he wants to now use this opportunity to further explain and give further answers that we didn't feel that we got from the Minister in the past.

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

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We are now on the Private Members' Hour dealing with Adjourned Debates on second reading of public bills.

The first item of business is Bill No. 5 and the amended version of it, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand)

On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Human Rights Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)

Bill No. 33, on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, The Venture Investment and Research and Development Corporation Registration Act — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

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

### BILL NO. 49 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ELECTORAL DIVISIONS ACT

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

**MR. DOMINO:** Mr. Speaker, I stood this on behalf of the Member for Pembina.

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

**MR. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, the Member for St. Matthews.

I just want to make a few brief comments on the bill as proposed by the Member for St. Vital, and Mr. Speaker I am going to speak against the plus or minus 10 percent provision as proposed by the Member for St. Vital. I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the provisions as I understand them to be at plus or minus 25 percent.

Now I have some reasons that I think are fairly important and especially important to the constituents whom I represent as a member of this Assembly. The farming vote is one which I consider to be very very important in this Assembly and members from rural Manitoba, I believe, need to have a very effective and very solid vote in this Legislative Assembly. I say that, Mr. Speaker, as representing a rural constituency, and more importantly, recognizing what rural Manitoba does contribute to the provincial economy and what agriculture, as one sector of the provincial economy, contributes to the total well-being of the province.

I think that when we consider agriculture as the No. 1 industry in Manitoba and when we consider the economic spinoff of agriculture in terms of the employment that we see throughout the province, and employment which to no small extent ends up in Winnipeg and in the ridings of many members

opposite as well as on this side of the House. Employment such as employment in Versatile Manufacturing, Co-Op Implements, a number of short-line equipment manufacturers, etc., etc., and the grain processing and feed processing industry, in the livestock slaughtering and meat processing industries. The total employment impact stemming directly from agriculture is really quite mind-boggling when one sits down and follows agricultural influence through, in the economic picture of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to see The Electoral Divisions Act with as much variance as is justly possible, and I support the Act as it sits right now with plus or minus 25 percent. Because the trends have been in the past years, and there is no indication that these trends will not continue, in terms of population growth and we will see our rural population becoming smaller and the magnet of the City, and particularly Winnipeg, becoming larger and larger.

Now that is a trend that we are not going to reverse through any legislation or anything that we might try to do in this Assembly, but with the amendment to the Act as proposed by the Member for St. Vital that particular trend will see, in the longrun and it maybe won't be apparent for the next five years, or ten year, or maybe it will take 15 years, but in the longrun it will end up with rural Manitoba and the economic contribution of agriculture not being adequately represented in the Legislative Assembly.

I would think that this would be a very harmful situation to agricultural Manitoba, to rural Manitoba, and a very harmful situation to the province in general, if that particular situation were to develop.

To give one example of that proposition, Mr. Speaker, I would refer only to the debate that was entered into in this Assembly on June 16th of this year. It was a debate on what appeared to be a relatively mundane bill, an Act dealing with the commodities exchange. In that debate the Member for Lac du Bonnet, who I might point out, as everyone knows in this Assembly, was the former Minister of Agriculture of this province, and as the former Minister of Agriculture of this province I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to assume that he represented the agricultural influence in the former government's caucus. As Minister of Agriculture what he thought would be good for agriculture obviously would be what the majority of members of the former government caucus would have to assume was good for agriculture because he was their leader in agriculture. But, I believe, that that was not the case in reference to that Commodities Bill, and if, for instance, and this is only a for instance and a proposition, if the former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, were to bring in a bill such as the Commodity Exchange I don't think we would have any doubt as to what would happen to the Commodity Exchange. It would do one of two things, his legislation that he may bring in if they were government and he was the Minister of Agriculture, the legislation would come in to be more restrictive on the Commodity Exchange or, going one step to the extreme, it would make Commodity Exchanges illegal and all grain marketing would be done, as he would have us believe, as the Member for Lac du Bonnet would have us believe, exclusively through a government-controlled marketing agency.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there would be any hesitation that were they the government, were the ND Party the government, that that legislation would pass. It would pass because the majority of members over there would vote for it as a government bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, it would not be in the best interests of agricultural Manitoba, and the reason it would pass is because the former administration did not have the depth, and I don't criticize them for it, but did not have the depth of agricultural representation that was needed to protect the legitimate interests of the agricultural community.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, that is why I stand up in full opposition of any amendment which would do anything to reduce the number of people, the number of elected representatives that rural Manitoba would have in this Assembly, because I think we can see it in other democracies, such as United States, where the agricultural production areas no longer have a very large degree of influence in the government of the United States. The elected people have, by far and wide representing rural communities, have been in the majority for a number of years, and as a consequence I think we have government not responsive to the needs of agriculture, and more responsive to the needs of the majority of voters who just happen to live in the cities.

Taking that example, and using the grain market of some years back, the President of the United States made several moves in terms of export levels which immediately dropped the price of grain in the United States. Now he did that, Mr. Speaker, out of a fear that increasing export prices and demand for grain would cause food prices to rise in the United States, and rising food prices is an unpopular thing for any politician who depends on urban consumers to get him elected. But I don't think there is any argument that those rising grain prices in the longrun were most beneficial for each and every citizen in the United States. And the farm community, as much as they protested and made representations to the United States government at that time, their information was not

heeded and that is why we can't have any move in the Manitoba Legislature which would in any way decrease the numbers and the effectiveness of the rural vote, because we don't want a similar situation developing in Manitoba, where members who, through the politics of food, may make moves which are not in the longrun interests of agriculture in the province. And since agriculture is so vastly important to the soundness of the Manitoba economy we might, as legislators, if we did not have a sufficient voice in agriculture, we might make moves in the shortrun in terms of votes over a four-year period, we might make moves as legislators which in the longrun would hurt the agricultural economy and hurt the job creation base that agriculture means in the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate on this particular bill, but I did want to point out the importance that I believe is representing a rural constituency, the importance of maintaining a strong and numerous rural vote, an agricultural vote, in this Assembly, so that we can work together as a Legislative Assembly in Manitoba to develop agricultural programs which are to the benefit of the rural communities, and (b) being in benefit to the rural communities will benefit all Manitobans, including the constituents, for instance, of the Honourable Member for Transcona who has industry which depends on agriculture, and there are many members on this side of the House and on that side of the House.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, and it is no fault of the political party, and I am not being partisan politically here. This can happen if the majority of seats in Manitoba come from non-rural areas, irregardless of the party in government, the tendency is there to institute programs which may not be in the longrun interests of agriculture for the shortrun benefit of votes from the consuming public.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that that is the very situation that we want to avoid in this province. We want to maintain the numbers of agricultural votes because of the economic input that agriculture in general has on the province, and I will not support the amendment as proposed by the Member for St. Vital. I am quite pleased to see the electoral divisions remain at plus or minus 25 percent.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in listening to the remarks by the Honourable Member for Pembina, one cannot help but reflect upon the early struggles by reformers struggling for democracy in England 125 years ago, that first proposed that the electoral boundaries and constituencies should be roughly equivalent insofar as population. At that time England was mainly dominated by what was known then as rotten boroughs. There would be small constituencies with very very small numbers of voters compared to large urban constituencies with many thousands of voters. And it was argued so that those rotten boroughs should be preserved, that the rotten boroughs represented a particular interest, an interest that must be continued, and in fact the interest that was referred to again was in rather similar terms to that used this afternoon by the Member for Pembina, the interests of the rural community.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake in this bill is not a question of protecting the rural community; not to preserve the interests of the urban community; not to safeguard the interests of the northern community, but rather what is requested through this bill is to extend the principle of democracy, that basic principle that each and every man enjoys equal voting privileges with the next man. And simply because a voter lives in one part of the Province of Manitoba, that should not mean that by that very geographic location that that voter is entitled to greater political power. That is not the democratic principle.

As I listened to the Member for Pembina's comments, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if his rationalization was in fact accurate then we should be increasing the ratio from what it is at the present time, from 25 percent to 100 percent, so that the Member for Pembina could be quite satisfied that there would be domination of the Province of Manitoba by what he sees as a particular view pertaining to agricultural policy, and I ehasis the words "his view" of agricultural policy. And his view of agricultural policy is basically the view that is represented by his particular political party. He disassociated himself from the views which I accept as the views of many of our agricultural producers, as were reflected in the policies and statements by the former Minister of Agriculture. That's his right, but let not the Member for Pembina feel that he has a monopoly, and his followers have a monopoly, on the rural opinion. And that monopoly on rural opinion should be expressed through the Legislature, through a domination of the electoral boundaries system. That's in fact what the honourable member was trying to do, to come in through the back door, to water down, to dilute the mechanics of the electoral boundaries system in order to protect a particular interest.

Mr. Speaker, if in fact the member's arguments were correct, then labour should say, "Look,

we are in Manitoba at the present time improperly represented because we do not have a government in Manitoba that has sufficient depth in labour representation. Therefore, change the boundaries set-up. Therefore, give the urban areas greater and greater representation." Because the Member for Pembina's words were to the effect — and I disagree with his words because I don't believe that they are an accurate observation — but his words were that this side is not properly represented in rural depth insofar as representation was concerned, therefore, he could not support the bill by the Member for St. Vital.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina in fact slides along very slippery ice, because if you consider democracy to be the efforts to ensure the domination of society by any particular economic group, whether that economic group be the farmer; whether it be labour; whether it be the mining community; whether it be the industrial giants, then, in fact, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to try to maneuver the rules in order to serve a particular social and economic group, then in fact you are proceeding in defiance of the very principles of democracy to which all our forefathers have fought very hard for over the years.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Vital, I believe, introduced to this Legislature a bill which does in fact extend, true to some small degree, because I do believe that our electoral boundaries legislation now in Manitoba is among the most progressive in Canada and I am not overly critical of the present legislation, but I do believe that the Member for St. Vital has introduced to this Legislature a bill which would gently push forward the present legislation toward more democratic framework rather than less democratic framework, without any mind, Mr. Speaker, of trying to ensure the domination of any political, any social, economic group.

As the Member for Pembina was speaking again I thought of the gerrymandering that went on during the Thatcher period in Saskatchewan, when Thatcher, too, provided for very very large variations insofar as constituencies were concerned in Saskatchewan in order to try to preserve his political life.

It didn't work, Mr. Speaker. In fact it is suggested in many quarters in Saskatchewan that because Thatcher tried to gerrymander the political map of Saskatchewan boundary-wise that it assisted in a great way towards his defeat by the present government in Saskatchewan.

So, Mr. Speaker, the important principle in this bill is democracy. One citizen — one vote, roughly, within at least a 10 percent ratio rather than a 25 percent ratio. Not to attempt to increase or to preserve the economic or social position of any particular group in society.

Mr. Speaker, the consequences of the thinking — and I am not attributing this to the Member for Pembina — but I am saying that his thinking leads to the situation which we have had in democratic countries, democratic countries that have proceeded with under the democratic rule for many, many years, decades, and then find themselves involved in military *coup d'état* by particular economic groups that find that the democratic system no longer is working to protect the minority interests of the particular group. And there are many examples of that that one can provide to members, where democratic governments were overthrown by military governments because an economic or social minority found that the democratic system no longer was working in order to preserve their particular interests.

The best example, of course, is Chile, 1973 and Spain in 1936, and Portugal in 1929. Democratic governments overthrown because powerful economic interests found that they could no longer manipulate the electoral system to their own advantage.

So, Mr. Speaker, when thinking is expressed, such as that by the Member for Pembina, it concerns me. It does create some fear in my mind as to the direction to which the thinking of the member for Pembina would lead us to.

I can see arguments that might be presented, Mr. Speaker. I can see arguments presented that, because of difficulty in getting about from one part of a constituency to another in rural areas or in northern areas, well maybe the riding should be less population. I can see that particular arguments, as were represented by the Member for Emerson which I would like to deal with as well. But, Mr. Speaker, those views I respect, those views, I wish to deal with. But the views expressed by the Member for Pembina I don't respect those views, Mr. Speaker. They concern me.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the views by the Member for Emerson, I believe that his approach should be — maybe he is concerned about better representation — in areas in which there is population that is sparse. Then there are better ways of dealing with that representation than through electoral boundaries. It may be that there should be increased allotment to rural MLAs insofar as constituency expenses are concerned, office and travel, etc. Certainly in the northern areas it may be that there should be additional funds provided in order to ensure better and improved representation because of the particular problems that member faces insofar as dealing with his area.

I understand very well the problems proposed by the Member for Emerson, but they are not problems that are insurmountable. We could proceed and pass the bill presented by the Member for St. Vital and come to grips effectively with the problems that are presented by the Member for Emerson, and I wish that the Member for Emerson would, therefore, consider alternatives to



dealing with the problems which he has raised in this House, rather than to suggest that they can only be dealt with by the ratio.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill, and I want to emphasize again, this bill is a few further steps along the way to the finest of democratic principles: One citizen — one vote.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson with a question.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Yes, could I ask a question? Does the Member for Selkirk feel that the northern part of the province is over-represented?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know about the numbers, but there is no doubt in my mind that the representation, the quality of the representation, that we have in the present Legislature from Northern Manitoba is probably the best of any region of the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin. Order, order please.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I forgot that Thompson is . . . 1

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Honourable Member for St. Vital for having the foresight and the thought to bring this bill in at this time. I think it's very timely. As the members all know every ten years the boundaries of the 57 constituencies are redrawn and rescheduled and put back into perspective from what the Clerk and the Chief Electoral Officer and the President of the University and the Judge figure should be the boundaries of the constituency.

I am very disappointed in the remarks that have just been raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, an ex-Minister of government, who talks about fair and equal representation by all people from all parts of this province, and just took his seat and was satisfied that he had convinced the members of this House that that was the way that this province should operate, under representation by population. I am very surprised that he would. In this legislation the north will likely, if we proceed with this legislation, lose two members. I suspect two seats will be declared vacant in the north and the north will be represented by three MLAs. Now, that's a tragedy in Manitoba, because the north represents two-thirds of this province. It's a vast area, Northern Manitoba, and the honourable member that just sat down is satisfied, the Member for Selkirk, that they should knock off two more seats from the north. Because if you look at the numbers of eligible voters in the last election from the north, Churchill had 9,501, Rupertsland 6,809, The Pas had 8,909, Flin Flon had 7,679 and Thompson had 10,007. So I suspect —(Interjection)— No, this is eligible voters. —(Interjection)— Yes, right. So I suspect out of that, under the plan as proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, likely Rupertsland and Flin Flon will disappear as constituencies.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Has the Honourable Member for Inkster a question?

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, yes, I wanted to ask the honourable member a question if he would permit me. Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the honourable member says that the north constitutes over half the Province of Manitoba, and I would think that probably north of 53 we could say three-quarters. Don't you think that they should have 40 out of the 57 seats in the Manitoba Legislature?

**MR. McKENZIE:** I hope the Honourable Member for Inkster gets an answer to my question when I am finished, because we right away look at the problem of the City of Winnipeg, where there are more people in the city, itself, than there are in all of Manitoba. Now, I don't think there is a member of this Chamber or a citizen in this province wants to see the City of Winnipeg run Manitoba, under representation by population, have control of the total jurisdiction of the province, because they would have more seats in the Legislature than all the rest of the province. They would have control. So, therefore, in all likelihood we would delete the name Manitoba and call it Winnipeg.

Of course that struggle, Mr. Speaker, has gone on in this Chamber for years and years and years. As members that have been around here for awhile well know, the various formulas that have been proposed and offered to the committee that draws the lines of the constituencies over the years, came up with various ways to possibly avoid a all costs that Winnipeg would not be Manitoba, that the rest of the province have an equal right here. Unfortunately, due to our geographic location, it is a large city and I like Winnipeg; I am all for it and it's too bad that we don't have another jurisdiction maybe a quarter of the size or two-thirds of the size of Winnipeg in the north, and maybe

some day we will. But in the meantime, we have to deal with it as it is. The geographics are here, the people that live in this city are more than half of the people that live in the province.

So I become very alarmed when I see the north losing. I think the north needs the five seats that they have at the present time, if we have to change the formula somehow, because of the vast areas and expanse that's in the north. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Inkster could imagine himself being an MLA for Rupertsland, how he would operate. In the city, all he does is just phone City Hall and the problems are solved; that isn't the way you solve them in rural Manitoba or in the north. I well know how the city MLAs operate because I see them in my own caucus every day; as soon as a problem comes up, they phone City Hall, because the bureaucracy and the staff and the ability to solve those problems is all there. But that's different. Imagine having the Member for Inkster representing Churchill, and a problem comes up — how would he deal with it? That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, and that is one of the reasons that I can't support this bill in its present form. I'm very disappointed to see a New Democratic member bringing in a bill to knock off two of his own buddies at this time, which would be most unfortunate. I think if anybody should have brought the bill in to eliminate two northern seats, it should have been somebody on this side. But the tragedy of this is, it was the Member for St. Vital that brought the bill in, which in all likelihood will remove two of his members from the Legislature, because the north, I suspect, under this bill, will now have three seats. I suspect that rural Manitoba will likely lose three to four seats, if my calculations are right.

So in other words, the City of Winnipeg, if we follow through this bill, will gain about 10 seats — eight to nine, pretty close to it. So then we'll have a Legislature where it doesn't matter what the problem is in rural Manitoba or northern Manitoba. If the city boys want to club together, they can run the whole province, and we sit back here as idle puppets on a string and do what we're told by those MLAs that live in the city. Now I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that's not the way the citizens want Manitoba to be operated; that's not the way they want the constituency boundaries to be drawn. I think due to the geographics and the many problems we have with this special Keystone province, that this bill is not going to solve the problem; it's going to make it worse, and I shall not be supporting it.

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

**A MEMBER:** The former Member for Churchill.

**ANOTHER MEMBER:** It might be the last speech.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Yes. If we are to believe the doom and gloom that comes from the other side, it may well indeed be the last speech. I had not really intended to enter this debate until the Member for Emerson and the Member for Roblin, in particular, threw down the gauntlet, saying that if I, as a northern MLA, supported this bill to amend The Electoral Boundaries Act; if I would do that I could be doing a disservice to my constituency, that I would be doing wrong by the people that had elected me. And that particularly is what spurs me to talk on this bill.

First, to clear the misconceptions, because there are a number of misconceptions that have been bantered about in this debate, misconceptions that the Member for Emerson made and the Member for Roblin made about, in particular, the Churchill constituency.

Secondly, I speak to clear the record so that when I do vote for this bill, which I fully intend to do, my constituents will not be under the impression that I have sold them out in any way, so that they, and the Members for Emerson and Roblin, will know exactly why I am voting the way I do. And I speak, at this point, lastly, to put on the record some of my own philosophical views and feelings towards this legislation and towards the principle embodied in this legislation, that of one person, one vote.

But first things first. The Member for Emerson began his remarks talking about the size of his constituency, and he told us how large that constituency was, how many phone calls a day he received, how many letters a week he received, how many functions he had to attend. All in all, Mr. Speaker, it boiled down to, he was telling us that the lot of a rural MLA is not a happy one, or at least not an easy one; it may be a happy one, it may not be an easy one. And because he obviously was having a hard time in servicing his constituents, he was telling us in essence that they should have special privileges and rights over other citizens of this province, that they should get a better deal. He suggested that they should get that better deal by retaining the 25 percent tolerance or differential written into the Act now —(Interjection)— which is 50 percent, yes indeed. And I would just like to suggest to him that even if the Member for St. Vital's bill does go through, they will still get a better deal; it will be less of a better deal, but there will still be a differential, a tolerance built in, of 10 percent.

But back to the size of constituencies. The Emerson constituency is approximately — and I figured it out quite roughly before coming into the House this afternoon — 160 kilometers by 60 kilometers, and while that's large enough — it is huge, Sir, in comparison with many city constituencies — it would get lost in the northern seats. You know, in the Churchill constituency, I don't think I'd be making too much of an exaggeration if I informed the Member for Emerson that we have muskeg bogs as big as his constituency, or darn near that big, anyway. You know, the Churchill constituency, Mr. Speaker, for the record, is 780 kilometers by 820 kilometers at its widest points, and the most appropriate description of that constituency is "huge."

I speak from experience, it is a huge, large, hard-to-service constituency. There are nearly two dozen different communities in that constituency, separated by every conceivable obstacle to modern transportation that any reasonable person could think of, and those people that live in those isolated communities, I would suggest that those people need the services of an MLA, as much if not more than anyone else in this province, because there is as much if not more to do to bring them up to the standards of the rest of the province. And I will be the first to admit that much of the time in the past they have been lacking in that service of an MLA, if one is to judge by city standards. But when there is a problem — I can only speak for myself in this case, Mr. Speaker — when there is a problem, I can assure this House, and I can assure those constituents, that I will do what I can. And if I can't drive right over to where the problem is happening, because most of the communities in my constituency don't have roads; and if I can't go by train, because surprisingly, most of them don't have train service; if I can't hop on a scheduled air service because of the problems in scheduling in the north and the fact that some of those communities are not serviced adequately by scheduled air service; if I can't charter a plane because of the costs; if I can't pick up a phone, because — this may surprise some of the members — some of those communities still don't have phone service — then we write letters bank and forth. But whatever the case, Mr. Speaker, I address myself to their problems, and eventually the problems get solved. I do what an MLA is paid to do, and I do so quite readily and quite happily. And if the Member for Emerson, or Roblin, is sincerely concerned about my ability or their ability, or the ability of any members in this House to service their constituency, then they should put forth a resolution, or convince this Cabinet to put forth a bill providing for increased travel expenses for rural and northern MLAs. Because that is the problem, okay? The problem is not the number of constituents, Mr. Speaker, the problem is being able to get to those constituents, and if we are to address ourselves to the problem, that is what we must address ourselves to.

But I didn't enter this debate to complain about the size of my constituency, or even to complain about the troubles that I do have in serving those constituents. I stood to speak to the principle of this bill, and to my understanding, reducing the allowable percentage differential, the 25 percent tolerance that's built into the bill. By reducing that we are moving closer to one person, one vote, and I will vote for that bill for that reason alone. Because I believe that all persons are equal, no matter where they live in this province, no matter what business they're involved in, whether they work by the sweat of their brow or they work behind a desk, whether they wear a blue or a white collar, or overalls, they are all equal. And being equal, they deserve equal treatment. And because this bill put forth by the Member for St. Vital moves us closer to the principle of one person, one vote, I support the bill and I will vote for it. And for the record, for the Member for Roblin, as close as I can figure, using the 1976 census results and the guidelines for determining the size of constituencies, the Churchill constituency could remain the same under a 25 or a 10 percent differential, so in my particular case — and I won't speak for the Member for Flin Flon or Rupertsland or The Pas — but in the case of the Churchill constituency, it will remain essentially the same whether the allowable differential is 10 percent or 25 percent.

But I must be quick to add that I am not voting for this bill for that reason. I am voting in favour of this bill because of the principle behind it. And in response to the Member for Pembina's contribution to this debate, I would remind him that the system used to be that the rural constituencies benefitted by a four-to-seven ratio, before The Electoral Boundaries Act was revised and reformed. And I might add, that was done by a Tory government. In other words, on a statistical basis, it would take 4,000 rural constituents to elect one member, and it would take 7,000 urban constituents. And it was a Tory government that recognized that inequality — and there is an inequality there — and first brought to this House a bill to change The Election Act to at least reduce that differential, to move us closer to one person, one vote. And the Member for St. Vital's bill does exactly what that Tory government did, moves us again, closer to the principle of one person, one vote. And if we are to follow the Member for Pembina's logic, that this House should be staffed in favour of one minority group within this province — if we are to follow that logic because he says that we, as members of the Legislature, and because we were not elected from a rural constituency, cannot represent rural constituents in this House, I have to inform him that my colleagues and myself, while we are elected from different constituencies — city, rural, northern and suburban constituencies

— while we are elected from different constituencies, we hope to, and we try to, put the best interests of all Manitobans forth when we enter these debates and make our contributions to this House. Because what is best for Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is best for every constituent, whether they live north of the 53rd, Winnipeg, rural Manitoba, suburbia, wherever they live; what is best for this province, ultimately is best for every citizen in this province.

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, like the bill that we debated yesterday, I believe it was, this is the second round again for me. I remember this same bill, or a bill similar to this one, being debated in the House of Commons, and at that time one of the NDP members from Toronto, who moved the bill, which was similar in nature to this one, moved it because he felt it was time that the country was liberated from the rural tyranny that had gripped it since Confederation. And I suspect that in response to the Member for Selkirk, who chastised the Member for Pembina because he took the approach he did, that was really the attitude that was taken in Ottawa. It was nothing more than a rural-urban fight. I don't see it that way, I don't quite see it that way, although there are some elements of that difference inherent in the debate that is going on now.

The Member for St. Vital posed a problem in the introduction of his bill. The problem that he posed was the difference in the membership of the constituency of St. Vital as opposed to the number of voters in the constituency of Riel, and he pointed out that at the time that redistribution had last taken place, there was an equal number of members in each of the constituencies. Subsequently, one constituency had grown to a total of 40,000 while the other one remained approximately the same, about 20,000. Nothing — nothing in the bill that is before us is going to change that, and that was the proposition upon which he based his bill, that he wanted to correct that anomaly. Well, my honourable friend will not correct that anomaly in this fashion. The only way that you can correct the increase in growth in population in one area of the city as opposed to another, is to have a census every year, and to have redistribution every year. So, all the more reason why the tolerance should be there. Because at the time that the constituency boundaries are drawn, one has some reasonable idea of the areas in which the growth will take place; but providing for the tolerance — the current tolerance of 25 percent — at the end of the 10-year period there is a reasonably good chance that those constituencies will be relatively or reasonably close to the figures that he would like to see, to the principle that is being espoused so vociferously on the other side of the House — the principle of one man, one vote.

Nothing, I repeat, nothing in the bill that is before us is going to correct the problem that the Member for St. Vital has cited. And so why introduce the legislation? What is the purpose of the legislation? Well, Sir, I submit that it is not to correct the problem that he saw between St. Vital and Riel; that there's a more underlying reason. It seems odd to me that wherever you go you find NDP members introducing this kind of a legislation. Why? I submit, Sir, that it is not the principle of one man, one vote; there's something deeper than that behind it all. —(Interjection)— The whole principle is, that they want to remove what I will refer to as the steadying influence of the rural communities in the councils of government. —(Interjection)— Well, my honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood says, "What a myth."

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have a rule, I believe, about imputing motives to other members. I did make the remarks that I made in good faith and I believe it's up to the honourable member to accept those remarks that I made and not to read into them other motives.

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of imputing motives to my honourable friend. I'm just simply saying that it seems strange to me that the people who are constantly advocating a reduction in that tolerance, or in that variance, are the NDP; and I just don't happen to believe that it's the principle of one man, one vote. —(Interjection)—

But to get back to my honourable friend from Elmwood, who has the capacity to make statements that, like babes, have an element of truth in them. At least, out of the mouths of babes come some of the most surprising statements and the Honourable Member for Elmwood is one of those who has a capacity to do that from time to time. The comment he made just now that the rural communities provide a steadying influence is a myth, is about as inane as a statement that he made awhile back, that the people needed the NDP to guide them because they didn't know what they wanted, that it took an NDP government to lead people by the nose in the direction that they wanted them to

go rather than allowing people to make their own decisions. —(Interjection)— Now, that's the attitude here.

I submit, Sir, that there's a very simple reason why they want that principle adopted. Because they know that they cannot appeal to the rural communities; they can't appeal to the rural communities by votes. The other alternative is to remove them.

Now, in my opinion there are several reasons why the tolerance that is here at present — the 25 percent tolerance — is a sensible proposition. There are several reasons for it.

In the cities the influence that can be exerted by, for example, the head offices of the unions are located here as well as Great-West Life, as well as the Chambers of Commerce, as well as the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg who has a tremendous amount more influence than the Mayor of the Town of Morris or any other rural community. There are so many other ways that people living in urban communities, the very proximity to this building itself, gives them influence that is not available to the rural communities.

And that tolerance is there simply to attempt to redress the kind of imbalance that exists because of the larger influence that can be exerted by people in the urban areas; if, for nothing else, the fact that their proximity to the building here gives them an advantage that is not available in the rural communities. I don't want to argue rural against urban. I simply want to argue on the basis that members representing rural areas are not as close to their constituents, do not have the opportunities for immediate contact that is available to urban members — and I accept the honourable member's argument, the Member for St. Vital's argument that if there are expenses that have to be incurred by rural members, that can be redressed in another way, I don't think that that should be a part of this argument — because whether or not you have greater expenses in looking after a constituency in a rural area as opposed to an urban area is a situation that can be, as I say, redressed by amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act, as indeed the previous administration took steps to do. They must have recognized that difference in making those amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act; for that we're appreciative.

But it has nothing to do with the other factor, the factor that provides for people living in the urban areas of a city opportunities for a greater influence in the councils of government than could possibly be available to people living in outlying areas. That is particularly true, not only in the rural areas here, but it is I think even more particularly true in the north.

So the 25 percent tolerance, first of all, or the 10 percent tolerance that is recommended in this bill is not going to solve the problem that the Honourable Member for St. Vital cites as his basic proposition. It's going to do nothing to help that. Only a census and a redistribution every year will correct that problem. In fact, as I said earlier, a tolerance would help him eliminate that problem that he cites as his initial proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known the occasion where the existing tolerance, in the present legislation, has proved a hardship or has created difficulties or injustice in representation. But I do submit that if the tolerance is reduced, there could be a heavily weighted influence on the part of members living in certain parts of the province as opposed to members living in another part of the province, without making any references to what their occupations are or anything of that nature.

Sir, the existing legislation, in my opinion, has served us well in the past. I see no reason to change it at this time. In the future, there is a possibility that conditions and circumstances may change that may make the proposition proposed by the Member for St. Vital acceptable. But at the present time, I think it will work more of a hardship — not only between rural and urban areas but within the city itself; because at least at the present time with a 25 percent tolerance, those who would redraw the electoral boundaries map have an opportunity of determining where the growth areas are and provide for that kind of a tolerance to ensure that at the end of the 10-year period the populations of certain areas are not out of proportion to what it is in others.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the member's bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Vital with a question.

**MR. WALDING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the Honourable Minister who has just spoken, as a senior member of the government, whether if the Boundaries Commission should come in with a report which is within the 10 percent, would the Minister or the government be prepared to vary that?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he can only ask questions on the statements that the member has made in his speech. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to begin a speech now, because I think it's clear that the government is quaking in its boots. But in view of the lateness of the hour, I wonder if we could call it 5:30 and if I could commence next day.

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

Order please. Order please. It has been brought to my attention that we have a problem dealing with the bill. That the bill is standing open. There has been no motion for adjournment on the bill. —(Interjection)— He had started speaking?

**MR. GREEN:** Well, he started speaking, so the bill stands in his name. Mr. Speaker, the member got up, was recognized and commenced a speech. Therefore the bill stands in his name. —(Interjection)— No. He got up and he made two sentences and then said, "Call it 5:30." But he did commence his speech.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I will recognize the bill as standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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