

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 26, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the Speaker's Gallery where we have 50 people on Field Trip No. 78, sponsored by the London Free Press and the Abitibi Paper Co. Ltd. These people are from Ontario.

We also have 16 students of Grades 6 and Special Education standing from Assiniboine School under the direction of Miss Donna Smith. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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 . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board for the year ended March 31st, 1978. **MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY, Minister of Agriculture (Arthur) introduced Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2).

HON. NORMAL L. PRICE, Minister of Labour (Assiniboia) introduced Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK, Minister of Finance (Riel) introduced Bill No. 70, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1978) (2).

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. LAURENT T. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Over the weekend it was reported that the Health Sciences Centre was carrying a deficit of \$724,825 for the last 15 months. Could the Minister break it down for us? In other words, from April 1st of 1977 to November 1st, what was the deficit; and then November 1st of last year until the end of March of this year; and then finally, the last three months, that is, starting from April to now?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest that be handled in the form of an Order for Return, if that is agreeable.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could let the Minister just see if it is agreeable. This is information that I think that during the Estimates the Minister knew that we were going to ask this question and I think he's ready to give us this information or it shouldn't be very hard to get at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly obtain that information for

my honourable friend. I don't have it at my fingertips but I'll obtain it for him this week.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, to the Minister. Mr. Speaker, the President of the Health Sciences Centre stated that that deficit would be covered by the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Now in view of the statement by the Minister made during the Estimates that the deficit would not be covered unless there was a change of heart of the government, I wonder on what grounds does the President of the Health Sciences Centre base himself. Is that a commitment of the Commission?

Also, the second question if I may while I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, the President also seemed concerned that if the freeze is not lifted on the construction that not only the care of the patient but also the role that the hospital plays in the research and teaching will suffer. Could the Minister tell us when the freeze will be lifted or if it will be lifted?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the honourable member's first question, I think that he perhaps is mixing the position taken on deficits with respect to the end of, the 1978-79 fiscal year and deficits that exist at the present time. There will be budgetary adjustment that will be made with respect to the deficits that the Health Sciences Centre and various other health facilities and hospitals in the province have. I think I indicated during my Estimates that there had, of course, been no provision for the January 1 to March 31 period, no cost or price adjustment when hospital budgets were changed to the fiscal year basis in comparison to the calendar year on which they had always been based, so that that adjustment, that budget adjustment, was always forthcoming and there is provision in the Estimates and in the HSC funds to provide for that adjustment. Now when the honourable member talks to me, or makes reference to the fact that there is no provision for further deficits, he is referring to the situation as at the end of the 1978-79 fiscal year.

In answer to his second question, I can only say that we are still, in my department and through the Health Services Commission, intending to sit down and study these hospital budgets in a detailed way once they're in front of us. That HSC budget is not in front of me at the moment and I'm not sure that it's even in front of the Health Services Commission; it should be momentarily, and if there are certain adjustments or suggestions that are acceptable at that time they will be made at that time.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Now I understand the Minister saying that that is why I asked the Minister to break down the deficit, but I wonder if the President of the Health Services Commission really understands or knows what the Minister said — the Health Sciences Centre, I should say — because he is including the whole 15 months including April, May and June. Apparently there is a deficit and this is why I wanted it broken down, and he is saying that he shouldn't have any difficulty getting that, and I didn't think that decision had been made as yet; this is why I asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. I wonder if he could tell us how many more bills we can expect at this late date in the session?.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question — obviously my honourable friend wasn't in the House when I did — last week some time.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I thought maybe the Minister might have had some revision in his Estimates from before.

I would like to address a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that Bruce Kondratuk has been the successful bidder for the purchase of the Pakwagan log milling operation at Wabowden.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we are presently carrying on discussions with one of the people that was involved in the tender for the Pakwagan operation.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, if the bid has not yet been accepted, I wonder if the Minister could indicate why the partner of the person I mentioned is now hauling logs to the machine site if in fact they have no indication that they are going to be the successful bidder.

MR. MacMASTER: Discussions are taking place, Mr. Speaker, and when they are completed I will make the appropriate report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Environment. I wonder if he could report to the House whether his department has yet found an appropriate alternative site for the disposal of the 300 tons of arsenic which is presently being stored inside the town limits of St. Pierre, and whether the Provincial Government has yet undertaken any negotiation with the owner of that 300 tons of arsenic to start immediate removal and transference of that fairly dangerous material.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have been addressing myself to this problem for some time now. It is a long-standing problem of several years' duration, and I have had direct consultation with the federal Minister of the Environment. We expect to be able to take some appropriate action within a few months.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for the reply. Considering that it's now taken about five years the next two months I think will be looked forward to.

I would like to ask whether in the meantime, what steps are being taken to ensure the safety and security of the building inside the town of St. Pierre in which this arsenic is stored to ensure that there is no further deterioration of the building or any chance of accident occurring as a result of the building being in the poor shape that it presently is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any direct involvement or responsibility that our department has with respect to the maintenance of the building that the arsenic is stored in. My people certainly are in fairly regular contact with the local government of the Village of St. Pierre who are naturally quite concerned about this problem.

But as far as the actual upkeep of the building goes it is the responsibility of the owners of the building, and of the arsenic; it is not the responsibility of this department.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. When he indicates that some decision will be made within the matter of two months, does that mean that, in fact, the materials be moved within that period of time, or simply that a decision will be made to have it moved within that time? And furthermore, could he indicate whether there has been any discussion or communication with the municipality concerning the exact timetable that will be undertaken to remove this material, so that they can receive some assurances that this problem will be dealt with within the period of time that the Minister indicated?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I said that I hoped appropriate action would be taken within a few months, not within two months. It is an extremely complicated situation with respect to the responsibility. In whose hands the responsibility lies for dealing with it is not a clear-cut case of it being a certain responsibility and that you can assure that that responsibility is carried out. I believe that whatever kind of solution is worked out is going to involve some type of precedent-setting action by the government. It will not be done according to established procedures that are in place at this point; and that's one of the reasons why it's taking so long to try and work out a satisfactory solution. That's one of the reasons why it has taken several years, without any satisfactory solution.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, last week I posed a question to the Minister in charge of the Environment with respect to the cause of pollution in the wells at East Selkirk. His answer was that there was no evidence of bovine effluent in the wells in the test done in 1978. I'm wondering why

the Minister chose to confine his answer to a period, since 1978. Could he elaborate further as to whether there were any tests done to ascertain the same with respect to those tests in 1977?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the tests, through the Cadham Laboratory, were only conducted on samples taken in 1978. I do not believe there was any testing done on samples taken prior to that, but I certainly will undertake to enquire of my officials and report back.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the major pollution problem occurred in 1977 — the late fall of 1977 — could the Minister then ascertain why it was that those tests were not undertaken in 1977?!

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the tests that are involved of course are rather complicated procedures and it is my understanding that it is only within the past few months that the departmental officials had turned themselves to trying to have those sorts of tests conducted. Our own laboratory in the Norquay Building does not have the capability of carrying out those particular tests.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is only fair to the people involved that they be given the full information in that, at that particular time, tests were taken on the drainage system leading into the abandoned quarry where there was a very high count of bacteria flowing into the quarry which subsequently makes its way into the underground water system. It seems to me that there must be some reason why the tests were not pursued at that time. In that particular situation, at that particular time, the flow was from the Right Angle Farm, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, bacterial contamination of surface water can come from a number of sources and I am quite certain that the reason why the departmental officials did not conduct those tests at the time is because our laboratory did not have the facilities for conducting them.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to also direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources concerning a question I posed of him several weeks ago regarding the situation at Fisher Branch and the underground contamination by the leaking gasoline storage tanks. He indicated to me at that time that there would be no hearing by the Clean Environment Commission. Subsequent to that, I perused copies of correspondence sent to me by his predecessor which indicated that there would be a hearing held to determine the responsible party to the contamination of ground water in that community. Could the Minister indicate to me what the reasons are for the apparent change in position with respect to holding a hearing or could he take that under advisement and notify me?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I will take it under advisement to take it as notice because there is a change being proposed in the Act that may be related to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister on the topic of pollution. Has the Minister had any reports from the fishermen on the south end of Lake Winnipeg regarding the problem they are having with some kind of brown slime or algae collecting on their nets? It appears to be a problem with the fishery, a problem with their nets. I believe there is some form of pollution there which should be checked into.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, no reports have reached my office but there may be reports to the department. I will inquire in that regard.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Agriculture, in reply to a question put by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the cause of congestion at the elevator system, indicated to the House that he looked into the question of transportation problems and that he was going to convey some message to the appropriate authority to try to, or at least hopefully, have them alleviate those transportation difficulties but he neglected, Mr. Speaker, to answer the most important part of the question put by the Leader of the Opposition, and that is the question of making sure that off-board grain sales do not interfere with the legitimate quotas under the Canadian Wheat Board system, which is currently the situation and has been for some time.

I am wondering whether the Minister would be prepared to elaborate more fully as to the way that we can resolve that particular problem.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure the Member for Lac du Bonnet is well aware, that that jurisdiction lies within the responsibility of the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and we have not had any indication from him that there will be any changes. However, there is discussion right now with the provinces and the Federal Government. Further discussion is to take place at the Agriculture Ministers' Meeting in Yorkton this coming July, in that regard and the area of the feed grain policy.

But as far as getting any satisfaction from the Federal Government or any indication that there would be a change, there has been none.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could then indicate for the benefit of the House here whether it is his belief that something ought to be done to correct that anomaly. Certainly it was not intended that off-board grain sales take the place of the quota allotments allocated to producers under the Canadian Wheat Board.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, without further looking into that very problem before I would be able to make a decision on whether or not off-board grains were causing that great a problem, I do believe we do have a good availability of market for feed grains. It is a possibility that it is congesting the system to slow the movement for Wheat Board sales or Wheat Board grain. That would have to be checked further by myself before I could indicate to what extent that it was causing a problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

M. HOWARD PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Could the Minister advise us as to what progress is being made in respect to the Woodlands Development, commonly known as the Leaf Rapids Development in West Selkirk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, that development has just been turned over to Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to administer. It is our intention to try and market the lots, and they should be, as soon as possible. As a matter of fact, if somebody wants a lot at the present time we would be available and willing to talk to them and see if we could sell one to them.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the Minister then indicating that the lots are available not only to private builders for purchase of blocks of lots but also to individuals to acquire lots for purposes of construction?

MR. JOHNSTON: As I said, Mr. Speaker, we would be willing to talk to the person if they are interested in a lot. We have not come up with a merchandising policy or an overall selling policy, as yet, but the member will recall that in Inkster we had a week where individuals were able to come forward before the contractors were. We are quite willing to look at the same thing in Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Monday, June 26, 1978

In light of an earlier reply to a question, can the Minister indicate when we can expect an announcement on the sale of the Pakwagan operation in Wabowden?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: Discussions are taking place right now, Mr. Speaker. I can't give an affirmative specific date.

MR. COWAN: Yes, a supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister assure the House that the successful bidder in this case will be the highest bidder?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I can rephrase that. Can the Minister indicate what criteria will be used to decide who will be the successful bidder in this operation?

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service. Last week during her Estimates she indicated that she would supply a list concerning the vacancies, the numbers of civil servants that left by attrition, those that were laidoff, as she was confused whether it was 1,700 or 1,300. Could she indicate when she will supply these figures to the members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: m. Speaker, firstly I wasn't confused and I never used the number 1,700 for the Member for St. George. Secondly, the request that he has made is quite a complicated one, as he has itemized, and it is in the making now and it will be coming to him shortly.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education to inquire from him whether or not there is yet an agreement between the Universities of Brandon and Manitoba, relating to the Winnipeg Centre Project, and who is responsible for planning the program for the coming year and is it now being planned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two or three questions contained in the honourable member's statement. As far as the agreements are concerned, I would expect that they would be completed this week. As far as the programs are concerned, they are going forth. I believe that would probably complete the information that the member required.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I guess I confused the Minister by too many questions, so I will repeat the one that he did not respond to, and that is: Who is responsible for planning the program for the oncoming year?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, at Brandon there is a Director of the projects; at that particular location, the new Dean of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with a final supplementary.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister now to say that the Dean of Education at Brandon University is responsible for planning the program of the Winnipeg Centre Project. Is . . . ? —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Minister has now confused me enough to ask him to repeat himself and to clarify who is now responsible for the ongoing planning of the program at the Winnipeg Centre Project?

MR. COSENS: The Director of the particular projects for the Winnipeg Centre will be the person who is responsible, acting under the Dean of Education at the University of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce is prepared to answer the question which he took as notice, and advise us today as to the extent of the transfer of operations of Electro-Knit to the Province of Quebec. To what extent is the transfer taking place?

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

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I have had some officials from my department check. I understand that there are a number of machines that are being moved to another location. This will affect the employment level to not a very large degree in that the company has indicated that they will not be laying anybody off but there will be some attrition. As the attrition happens, some of those people will not be rehired.

MR. PAWLEY: Could the Minister advise the House as to the numbers of jobs that will be affected by attrition — whether or not his department has received that information from the owners of Electro-Knit — within the next six-month period.

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

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I'll provide the member with that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. With respect to the sale of the Pakwagan operation, can the Minister tell the House if there was a reserve bid on this sale and if so, how much is the reserve bid?

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister in charge of the Environment to indicate to me or to the House just what the pollutants were in the tests that were done in 1978 with respect to the ground water at East Selkirk?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member if he wants detailed information of that nature, he had better file an order for return. His question is out of order. Would you care to rephrase your question?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to know what the pollutants were. It's a very simple question and if the information is available it shouldn't require an order for return. The Minister had indicated that tests were done in 1978 and indicated what the pollutants were not; I would like to know what they were.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Is the honourable member asking for the genus and species of the contaminants?

MR. USKIW: Well, could the Minister then at least indicate to us whether it was human sewage that was involved?

MR. RANSOM: Well, I believe when I answered the question last week, Mr. Speaker, I said that it was possible that tests were available to detect certain types that came from horses and cattle and those were not there. The other tests that are available are of a more general nature and cannot narrow it down to say that it is either a human source or another mammalian source.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, during the examination of Finance Estimates the Member for Seven Oaks asked for further information regarding the school tax assistance to pensioners and I want to provide that information to him at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education based on an earlier question of late last week. Could the Minister confirm that in terms of the additional and special programs that the City of Winnipeg has, that he has only been able to provide the same million dollars that was provided by our government? In other words, no increase from last year to this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Well, repeating what the Member for Elmwood said, Mr. Speaker, "only one million."

MR. DOERN: Would the Minister confirm that he has been able to find an additional \$683,000 to give to private schools in Manitoba, an increase of 150 percent in their funding?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, that was covered in my Estimates. The sum of \$1,276,000 is provided there.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he can explain the apparent discrepancy that in one case he is asking the public school divisions to hold the line at a 2 or 3 percent increase; when they asked for special funding for special programs he gives them the same amount of money, and when the private and parochial schools come he is able to find an additional 150 percent increase for them. Can he explain how he gets this difference?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood seems to be intimating that there is some robbing Peter to pay Paul here. If we are going to follow through on that theory I would suggest that if I had the \$40 million that were spent on Saunders Aircraft that it could be well used in the educational system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources with respect to the sale of the Pakwagan operation. Is the Minister allowing the bidder or bidders to negotiate the reserve bid as they did in the case of the aircraft?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health to clarify to the House the problem that occurred regarding the failure or the inability to arrange a kidney transplant and whether as a result of that the opportunity was lost to take advantage of, apparently, two available kidneys?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether the opportunity was lost or has been irrevocably lost, to take advantage of the possible donation of those two kidneys. The problem occurred because of a lack of professional personnel, practitioners in that particular unit on those particular dates. The medical unit responsible is looking into it and I will certainly communicate to the honourable member any further information I receive on it, but I have not undertaken an investigation into the matter; it's in the hands of the medical unit at the Health Sciences Centre and the Health Sciences Centre itself.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, rather than the Minister being involved in an investigation of what has happened, I wonder if the Minister is prepared to enter into a review of what should be done in the future in the entire Province of Manitoba to ensure that when there are opportunities available for transplanting, that they can be taken advantage of without loss. If the Minister is sure that there has been no loss, then I could understand that would be less of a problem, but if there has been a loss of the possibility of taking advantage of a possible donor, then surely the Minister could investigate and attempt to establish a procedure not related to any one specific hospital but to the general question of taking advantage of emergency situations such as apparently occurred over the weekend.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I do intend to consult with the surgeon, the Chief of the

Kidney Transplant Unit at the Health Services Centre, to familiarize myself fully with the problem and with the likelihood of recurrence of the problem, so I can certainly go a step further and pursue the whole subject from the perspective suggested by the honourable member.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Honourable Minister for undertaking to make this review. Would he also undertake to inform the House in due course the results of the review and his policy in regard to same?.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questioning having expired, the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to indicate a change on the Municipal Affairs Committee. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is to be taken off and the Member for Lac du Bonnet to be placed on.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is one Order for Return that I think you should deal with before I proceed in the Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland on a point of order.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with due respect, I did note that at the beginning of the day today that we did take up about 5 minutes of the House's time with the introduction of bills and I understand that Question Period is supposed to be a full 40 minutes. I was wondering if there wasn't some oversight there and we didn't have 5 minutes left for questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize to the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. I have my reading glasses with me, not my ordinary glasses and maybe I didn't see the time as being fully utilized. There are another three minutes for the Question Period so if you have any more questions to ask, proceed.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, since we are in Question Period still and not in Estimates, I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs could answer a question. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what are the problems in making his decision in regard to the Pakwagan operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MacMASTER: There's no major problems, Mr. Speaker. We want to come out of it with the best arrangement that we possibly can and we're taking our time to do it. We don't want to charge in and blunder, as is often the case.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could then indicate whether or not there is renegotiation taking place with the bidders at this time.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not sure the interpretation that the Member for The Pas puts on the word negotiations. I have said before today here that discussions are taking place and they so are.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I used the word renegotiation and I wonder if there is a reserve bid and whether or not there is a renegotiation in regard to that reserve bid.

MR. MacMASTER: Discussions are taking place, Mr. Speaker, to come out of it with the best arrangement that we possibly can.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to revert to my questions to the Honourable Minister of Education regarding the Winnipeg Centre project. As I understand it from his answers today, the

University of Manitoba has no current responsibility in regard to the Winnipeg project. There is no agreement whereby they are charged with the responsibility. That being the case, could the Minister indicate the answer that I asked for before: Who, in terms of what person, is planning the ongoing program for the coming year and how is it that the Dean of Education of the University of Manitoba has taken on responsibilities which apparently he does not yet have in terms of an agreement with the University of Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for St. Johns understands that there is an agreement between our Special Projects Branch and the university providing the courses for the particular programs. The University of Manitoba is the university in question, Mr. Speaker — the Dean of Education there, of course — it provides those particular courses. We have our own director of projects that works in liaison with the Dean of Education.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Education clarify what the nature of the agreement will be when it is eventually signed this week or later on between the Universities of Brandon and Manitoba in light of the fact that he has now said that there is an agreement

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that an Address for Papers for technical information of that nature would properly serve the House. It is not a question for the Question Period.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, could you ask the First Minister to stop behaving like a little boy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Johns that those decisions I will make and I don't require the assistance of the Member for St. Johns.

The time for the Question Period having expired . . . A matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you are prepared to hear suggestions from members of the Legislature or not hear them either.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return of:

1. Any letters from Legislative Counsel to the General Manager of the Civil Service Superannuation Board concerning the status of Douglas A. Duncan within the Civil Service.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, for the usual reasons with respect to legal opinions and so on, the Order is not acceptable. It's clearly outside of the rules of May, Bourinot and Beauchesne.

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

MR. URUSKI: Could we have this matter transferred to the other part of the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of privilege, a privilege of this House I think. I don't think that the very recent comments of the Honourable Member for St. Johns should be allowed to stay on the record as suggesting that the Speaker of this House is not open to suggestions one way or the other with respect to any matter, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that those are remarks that should be withdrawn from the record.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to read the record when it appears in Hansard and I think you will note that I did not question whether or not you will reject it. I asked you if you would accept, be agreeable to listen to suggestions. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that you informed me that you would make your own decisions and, therefore, you might read the record, and if you feel that an apology or a withdrawal is in order, by all means, Mr. Speaker, I would expect you to say so without the assistance of the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: I will peruse the record of Hansard.
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: On the point of order, the matter raised by the Honourable Member for St. George, it is my understanding that if an Order for Return is out of order, in line with the precedence of Bourinot, May, Beauchesne and of this House, then it is not able to be transferred for debate. I would ask you, Sir, if you want to hear citations on the point I would be quite happy to give them to you but I would ask you, Sir, that otherwise you reserve and consider whether or not the address is in order. My submission, without giving all of the citations which are well known, is that it is clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the point of order.

MR. FOX: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable First Minister is debating the issue. You have accepted the order; it was read into the record and, therefore, I believe that we should proceed with the normal rules of the House, that it be transferred over for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If we will go back, I believe the motion was made and seconded. The motion was put before the Chamber and the Honourable First Minister got up and indicated that it was not an acceptable motion.

The Honourable Government House Leader on the point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think a distinction has to be made as to whether a motion is not acceptable for reasons that the government refuses to accept it, or whether a motion is not acceptable for reasons that it's out of order and if a motion is out of order then it is no longer acceptable even for debate. What the First Minister had pointed out was that the motion was out of order because it was not acceptable according to the rules and he's offered now to quote citations from several sources to prove that, in his opinion, the motion is out of order. And I would submit, Sir, at this time that perhaps you should hear those submissions to determine whether or not the motion is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan on the point of order.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there is some doubt as to whether it is in order or not in order and since you did accept it and did put the motion to the House — and that is when the First Minister introduced the issue in respect to the legality of it — I would suggest you take it under advisement and have a good look at it before you make a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I would thank the Honourable Member for Kildonan's advice on that particular point. Is there any other member of the House willing to give me advice on the same matter?
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, on the point of order, not to give you advice but to suggest that the recommendation made by the Member for Kildonan would be quite acceptable, that you reserve and consider; and in the course of your reservation, Sir, I would refer you to the ruling of Speaker Forbes, contained in the 1963 Journals, Pages 136,137. I would refer you to Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, Page 272. I would refer you, Sir, to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, 4th Edition on Page 249; and I would refer you, in addition, Sir, to Citation 213 found on Page 179 of Beauchesne, all of which support my submission that the address is clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I thank you for the advice. I will take the matter under advisement. In the meantime the matter will be held in abeyance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, before calling, the Orders of the Day, I should like to, again, advise honourable members that it is the intention to be calling Economic Development Committee in Room 254, to consider the reports of the Manitoba Development Corporation and that the Industrial Relations Committee will be meeting in Room 200, to consider Bill No. 28.

My understanding is that Bill No. 28, which is An Act to amend the Payment of Wages Act, is not at least — and I should never take that for granted — but as indicated by the Member for Logan was not one of those controversial measures that would require a great deal of time. It is our intention that if that matter is proceeded with and disposed of, the Municipal Affairs Committee will then meet, to consider Bill No. 18, which is the bill dealing with the controversy between the City of Brandon and the Municipality of Cornwallis.

It is my anticipation that neither of these two measures should occupy a great deal of time. However, that remains to be seen.

They are to be called in tandem as soon as the Industrial Relations Committee has completed its report. — (Interjection)— That's at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be leaving later on in the week for conferences, so I ask you to call at this time, Bills No. 41 and 56 which stand in his name, for second reading, before we go into a Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas on a point of order.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, through you, on a point of order; I wonder if the House Leader could just clarify, if it's expected that at the Economic Development Committee, whether they'll get to the report of Moose Lake Loggers, Channel Loggers and Minago Construction; or that is not expected to occur tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: If we get through with the report of the Manitoba Development Corporation, we'll be going on to Mineral Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface, on a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I ask the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, if he means 58, 57, or 56? I don't think there's 57 or 58, it's 56.

MR. JORGENSEN: It's 41 and 56.

MR. DESJARDINS: 56, yes.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 41 - AN ACT TO AMEND VARIOUS ACTS RELATING TO MARITAL PROPERTY

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 41, An Act to amend Various Acts Relating to Marital Property, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can deal with this bill very briefly. It is very similar to Bill No. 72, which was passed at the last Legislature, the third bill in The Family Law legislation along with The Family Maintenance Act and The Marital Property Act.

It, under the devolution of The Estates Act, still allows or follows the 1977 legislation in increasing the primary claim of the widow to \$50,000 and one-half of the residue. With respect to The Dower Act, in addition, it also gives to the widow a claim of one-half of the estate.

We have further amended The Dower Act by increasing the amounts that are set out in Section 16 of that Act, whereby the deceased spouse may avoid the requirement of leaving one-half of his

or her estate to the surviving spouse and we have arbitrarily increased the amounts from \$6,000 per annum to \$15,000 per annum, and \$100,000 to \$250,000, in total.

Where there is a combination of a lump-sum payment and yearly instalments, these amounts have also been increased from \$50,000 to \$150,000, and from \$3,000 to \$10,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of The Dower Act, of course, has presented some problems, and because of this we have made these arbitrary decisions, and I have forwarded The Dower Act to the Manitoba Law Reform Commission for a thorough review.

The balance of the sections, Mr. Speaker, generally follow the provisions of the bill passed at the last legislative session.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Attorney-General would agree to a question.

I would ask him for clarification under The Devolution of Estates Act, is the proposed section providing for the entire estate going to the widow if it is less than \$50,000, is it not now an Act of the Legislature passed by the previous government last year? In any event, what is the provision that would remain in relation to the portion of the estate in excess of \$50,000 and is that now in The Devolution of Estates Act? I ask the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker, realizing that I could be looking it up, but I haven't done it yet, and I wonder if he could clarify that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the surviving spouse would be entitled to one-half of the remaining estate and follows the same provision as the bill which was dealt with at the last session, which is not in force.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Attorney-General would concur with a further question. I am wondering, too, like the Honourable Member for St. Johns, so far as this bill and the bill of last year that was passed last June, if the Attorney-General could advise us as to what is the basic difference between this legislation and what we processed last June?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I dealt with it, and I think that the basic difference is the fact that Section 16 has been further amended by arbitrarily increasing the amounts by which a spouse could avoid the application of the Act by means of leaving annual amounts to a wife or lump sum settlements, so that Section 5 of the new Bill is the primary difference between this bill and the previous bill.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, supplementary to my question, and I think it will help to clarify our study and processing of the bill, could the Attorney-General advise then why there was need to propose amendments in the earlier part of this bill? As I understand, there is no change dealing with Section 15 and other sections of the bill from that which we had processed last June.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we have primarily done it simply for the basis of making it easier for all members of the Legislature to deal with it by having it all before everyone and indicating the areas in which changes have taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 56 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PLANNING ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 56, An Act to Amend The Planning Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, members will note this is a rather detailed piece of legislation. Basically, it is a housekeeping bill which deals with some technical matters that should be clarified one way or the other and is better dealt with, I believe, in Committee rather than in the House. There are some subsequent sections that deal with some more serious problems that have been encountered. In one particular section, and if I may just highlight two of them, in one particular section, in Section 8, difficulties have been encountered where owners of land have circumvented the requirement for subdivision approval by entering into informal arrangements, sometimes known as handshake leases, whereby a number of dwelling units or mobile homes may be erected on a single parcel of land without the municipality having given permission, or without even having knowledge until the structures are in place. The proposed amendment would add a new subsection which would prohibit such an arrangement and would further on allow some exceptions, Mr. Speaker, in order to deal with a problem which has confronted a number of municipalities.

In Section 11, there has now been included in this particular subsection the authority which will allow a designated officer, a development officer of a municipality, to grant variations not exceeding 10 percent of the requirements of the zoning by-law or planning scheme. Mr. Speaker, this is an authority that has worked well under The City of Winnipeg Act and has avoided formal applications and formal matters being dealt with by council; they are simply minor variations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the balance of the bill is technical and could, I think, be dealt with better in Law Amendments Committee rather than a review in detail in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

And Mr. Speaker, I might add that in 254, the Estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General will be under consideration.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie: Resolution No. 19, Clause 1, General Administration, (a) Minister's Compensation and Salary, \$15,600.00.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just very briefly then, the members will note that the Estimates of the Department for the year 1978-79 totalled some \$31,232,200, this being an increase of \$2,894,900 over the previous year, which amounts to a 10.2 percent increase. This increase is made up as follows:

Increased cost of law enforcement: \$2,013,800;

New programs, which are the personal property Personal Property Security Registry and the Canada Manpower Gun Control: \$613,700;

Increased costs of goods and services: \$122,000;

Costs of the salary adjustment under collective agreements and annual merit increases: \$530,700.

That totals \$3,280,200, and it was therefore necessary to effect cuts totalling \$385,300 in operational costs to all of the departmental programs in order to arrive at the total amount of our Estimates.

With respect to staffing, the totals for all programs and all categories are 836. This is a total of 20.49 in all categories of staff man years over the previous year.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's briefly a summary of the overview of the department relating to the

increase in the amount of expenditures and staff man years and if any further details are required we can deal with those as we go through the various programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. Then we move to (b) Planning and Management, \$255,100. Sorry. We move to Planning and Management, (b)(1), \$255,100. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Dealing with the Minister's . . . I would like to ask the Minister whether or not there has been an increase in staff from last year to this year, and also if he could provide me with information as to the number of unfilled vacancies as of October 31st last year, and whether those vacant positions had been eliminated in his calculations as to comparison of staff now with staff last year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a subject of an order of return that the Honourable Member for Selkirk has asked.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Minister that I believe I can say with certainty that that information has been provided throughout by other Ministers through their Estimates review. I think it has been a pretty regular question that has been posed and has been answered previously.

MR. MERCIER: I didn't say that, Mr. Chairman, because I don't want to answer the question. I indicated that there is a total increase in all categories of staff of 20.49 man years over 1977-78. Dealing with it department by department, it is difficult for me right now to give overall information, but we will put together the information and give it to the honourable member later on in consideration of the Estimates.

MR. PAWLEY: I would like to also, at this time, because I believe it would be more opportune now than later, although we can deal with it later if it's felt it is more convenient to do so, that is I would like to have the Minister's observations and opinions, which I'm sure he has formed by now, pertaining to the recommendations of the Task Force on reorganization and rationalization of government, dealing with his particular department.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, dealing with Page 20 of the Task Force Report, there is a recommendation with respect to the possibility of using the Woodsworth Building for the requirements of the courts. With respect to that particular item, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the Woodsworth Building would be satisfactory for a new Law Courts Building. The space, in any event, is presently all being used with the Personal Property Office presently using the 15th floor. The construction of a new Provincial Law Courts Building is a top priority of my department and is presently being reviewed with respect to the location upon which it should be built.

With respect to the Manitoba Law Reform Commission, I would think that the Honourable Member for Selkirk is aware that in fact when he was Minister this department advertised for the Chairmanship of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission on the full-time basis. We have not been successful in receiving satisfactory applicants. In fact, we did not receive a great number of applicants at all for that particular position. We have, in the past few months, advertised for a part-time Chairman of the Law Reform Commission and have received a number of applications and are presently reviewing those applications but no decision has yet been made on the appointment of a Chairman of the . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Part time, did you say?

MR. MERCIER: Pardon me?

MR. PAWLEY: Part time? Did you say part time?

MR. MERCIER: Part time. We are presently considering those applications and have not yet made any decision.

With respect to the Land Titles Office and a recommendation that a study be undertaken to determine the feasibility of a computerized Land Titles data system, I believe, Mr. Chairman, there is presently underway an inter-departmental study of a computerized system under which many departments of government would be able to receive information from such a computerized system and that study is still underway and is not concluded yet.

In the organizational chart, — it may have been at the beginning there was a suggestion that a number of other departments be included in the Department of the Attorney-General — Consumers' Affairs, Securities Commission, etc. The only concern that I have with respect to any of those regulatory functions would be as to whether or not there might be a conflict of interest; for example, with the Manitoba Film Classification Board, whether there would be any conflict of interest on the one hand by a Board classifying a film and then on the other hand, Crown Attorneys laying charges under the Obscenity sections of The Criminal Code. So I think those have to be looked at in some depth before there is any final approval given as to whether any conflict of interest might develop as a result of the inclusion of some of those functions under the Department of the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like — first, I won't ask for an organizational chart from the Minister unless there has been some change since I was Minister.

MR. MERCIER: There has been no change. If any other members would like one we could certainly supply them with one.

MR. PAWLEY: Secondly, I just wanted to refresh my mind. Had there not been approval given in principle to the construction of a new Provincial Law Courts Building?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for Selkirk would know that better under the previous government than I would.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, well, I think there had been and it had been announced. I am just wondering, are you now indicating to me that it's under review?

MR. MERCIER: What I wish to review is the question of the location of the new Law Courts Building, whether it should be in the location the previous government decided upon or whether it is not more appropriate that it should be located adjacent to or in the vicinity of the existing Law Courts Building on Broadway Avenue.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I want to say to the Minister that I appreciate a review as to location because I do know that there are pros and cons to both locations, and I certainly don't take a dim view of the re-examination as to location. But what I am concerned about, because certainly it weighed on me during my term as Attorney-General — the Minister is now just beginning on his term as Attorney-General — is the fact that it was away back in 1967, I believe, when the then Attorney-General, Stewart MacLean, had proudly announced in the Legislature that approval had been given to a new provincial Law Courts Building. I gather that the announcement by the then Honourable MacLean had been received well by all members of the Legislature and yet we are still in the process of review.

I would like the Minister, if he could clearly commit himself as Attorney-General, to the approval in principle, and some statement as to whether or not we really can expect — because I know it's all right to re-examine location but the re-examination of location may mean further interminable delay — if the Attorney-General is prepared to commit himself to a commencement date of the new buildings prior to, for instance, our being back here next year. Now, I'm not asking the Minister to be reckless, but I do feel it's fair, in view of the delays which have occurred — not necessarily under his party's administration but also certainly during my own — whether he can commit himself to some definite start. Because approval had been made in principle to a particular location earlier and I would like some assurance from the Minister that a review of a new location would not mean a great deal of further delay insofar as proceeding with the Court.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the location of the new provincial Law Courts Building, as the member indicated, has been studied for some time and has been well-studied, even in this area I'm referring to the area across from the Legislative Buildings — so I don't think that the study of the location should be one that would delay approval of sufficient moneys in a budget next year. The priorities of the department are firstly the Court House in The Pas, and I think secondly would be the new provincial Judges' Building in Winnipeg. So the only impediment to the start of construction of a new facility will be the amount of money that is available in the budget. I will certainly be urging the construction of the facility as early as possible.

MR. PAWLEY: Now, is the Minister indicating that we would be unable to proceed with any start

in construction of a provincial Judges' Building because there are no moneys set aside in the budget for even a start, prior to our appearing here next year?

MR. MERCIER: There are no moneys in the budget for the 1978-79 fiscal period.

MR. PAWLEY: So that the Minister then would have to, unfortunately, acknowledge that there would be no start on the building during the 1978-79 period — it's not just a problem of examining possible relocation but also a problem of money.

MR. MERCIER: That's correct.

MR. PAWLEY: Could I ask the Minister whether or not the relocation study could be completed; whether there would be any chance of any request to his colleagues within the next one-year period for moneys to permit a start on the building?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there always is a possibility of course. . .

MR. PAWLEY: A probability?

MR. MERCIER: A possibility that additional money is approved before the next fiscal period, but I can't estimate what the chances are of the success of the approval of the closure.

MR. PAWLEY: In The Pas there is definitely a decision to proceed with the new Provincial Court building in The Pas. I believe the Minister indicated that. Would there be no start on that during this coming year?

MR. MERCIER: I indicated that that was the No. 1 priority of the department.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, would that No. 1 priority then be started within the next fiscal year?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that the Minister of Public Works has it as an approved project for construction in the 1978-79 fiscal period, unless again he takes the necessary steps to obtain supplementary moneys to proceed with it.

MR. PAWLEY: I just would like to comment, Mr. Chairman, that I don't want to question which is No. 1 and No. 2 priority, but it seems to me that the Provincial Judges' Building has at least equal priority with The Pas building.

MR. MERCIER: Well, if I could just explain that, Mr. Chairman, the reason is that that project had proceeded to the point where tenders, I believe, had been accepted, but the contractor in that case is being delayed in proceeding with that project at the present moment. The Minister of Public Works of course is dealing with that issue. But it's because that project has gone to such an advanced stage, that it has to be considered to be the project most likely to go forward first.

MR. PAWLEY: I don't want to be unfair to the Attorney-General, but a moment ago a disquieting thing occurred. The Honourable Member for Wolseley called across to me to ask why the Provincial Judges' Building ought to be a priority. In view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Wolseley is a colleague of the Attorney-General's, can the Attorney-General assure me then that he does consider the Provincial Judges' Building a priority?

MR. MERCIER: In saying that, Mr. Chairman, I might point out to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the Member for Inkster and the Member for St. Boniface are also colleagues but apparently have differing points of view on a bill that was recently introduced into the Legislature.

MR. PAWLEY: So I can take it from that statement that your view differs from that of the Member for Wolseley.

MR. MERCIER: I don't know, Mr. Chairman. I'm anxiously looking forward to hearing from the Member for Wolseley.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm very concerned with the Minister's comments that interviews are now under way for a part-time chairman of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. Is the Minister indicating

that we will no longer have a full-time chairman of the Law Reform Commission?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe I indicated that advertisements were made for a full-time position of Chairman of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. I've had numerous discussions with many people about the persons who might be available and acceptable to take on that job, and up until the early spring we simply had not been able to attract someone to take on the full-time responsibilities.

I think the member might appreciate that it is a unique sort of a position for a lawyer to take on here simply wasn't the . T/ interest expressed in the position as a full-time position, and that's why we took the position that we would advertise on a part-time basis and see what results we might elicit in that manner.

MR. PAWLEY: How much did the Attorney-General offer to anyone who would take on this position?

MR. MERCIER: The same amount, Mr. Chairman, that the previous government paid the former Chairman of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission on a full-time basis.

MR. PAWLEY: I'm just wondering if that might be a problem because that was a year ago and certainly Mr. Muldoon had a particular zeal for Law reform, but his salary was — if I recall correctly — comparatively low in comparison with Law Reform Commission Chairmen in other provinces. Is the Attorney-General indicating that there has been no review as to the amount that might be offered to any prospective candidate for this position, beyond that which was paid last year?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the advertisement that went out for a full-time chairman went out under the previous government at the salary that was then paid. I would be interested in knowing what the honourable member would feel would be an adequate or an attractive salary for a full-time Chairman of the Law Reform Commission.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, with all respect, certainly the offer that was made while I was still Attorney-General was made with the hope and expectation that we would receive a suitable applicant. But obviously now there's been a passage of eight months and that salary offer wasn't sufficient, clearly, or otherwise there would be a replacement. I would hope that the Attorney-General could assure us that , in view of the failure of that proposal to draw forth a suitable applicant, there has been some upward revision in the salary offered since I believe it was August of 1977, one year ago.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the notice that was sent out at the end of April of this year to members of the Manitoba Bar Association indicated at the end that the salary was negotiable.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Province of Manitoba was fortunate, indeed, in having a man like Mr. Muldoon as Chairman of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. He had a particular zest and enthusiasm for that kind of work. I think it should be pointed out that it does involve potential sacrifices on the part of lawyers who might be willing to accept it, because what it means is that they are dropping out of the practice of law usually to take on a job for a limited period of time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Like the Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: No one has any sympathy for the Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: I concur.

MR. MERCIER: But that is the difficulty. You do want someone like Mr. Muldoon, who did have experience in the practice of law, so he was able to bring to the position his practical experience plus his desire to participate in Law Reform which, of course, has been substantiated by his appointment to the Federal Law Reform Commission. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a difficult position to fill and we have made a real effort through speaking to people involved in Law Reform Commissions across Canada to attempt to determine whether there is any interest from people even outside the Province of Manitoba, and those requests for applicants were simply not met.

MR. PAWLEY: Could the Minister then define what he might be looking for insofar as a part-time Chairman? By part-time, does he mean one that will provide most of his time to Law Reform Commission or only a minor part of his time? How many days, for instance, a week, what percentage

of his time?

MR. MERCIER: In general I would think that we would require at least half-time.

MR. PAWLEY: I am complete at that area unless maybe some of the other members would like to deal with that particular item before I lose my position.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to carry on both subjects that were the most recently raised; one is the buildings, the other the Law Reform Commission Chairman, and may I there, Mr. Chairman, on the buildings, I note that the Minister has no money set aside for Capital Works. And I am assuming also, although I don't have the lists supplied to us, that there is no carry-forward authority that is being used by the Minister. If I am correct on that, then there is no provision. —(Interjection)— I'm sorry. I may be wrong about that, Mr. Chairman, so I'll interrupt myself to await the response.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman — and I would ask my staff to confirm this it would appear that there was \$8,800 as carry-over Capital Authority for the Personal Property Registration Office.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, then there's no money available for Capital Works, that is, for a building such as discussed at The Pas or a Law Courts Building or elsewhere?

MR. MERCIER: That would be included in the Public Works budget, I believe.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's what I wanted clarified. Is there provision in this current fiscal year in the Public Works budget for this kind of work, for the Attorney-General's Department?

MR. MERCIER: For the new Provincial Judges Building?

MR. CHERNIACK: For whatever.

MR. MERCIER: Not in a substantial way; I suppose in a minor way for minor renovations, etc., that sort of usual ongoing expenditures, there would be some provision.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll put it differently. Are there any people in the department who are working on the planning for future construction?

MR. MERCIER: Of the new Provincial Judges Building?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. MERCIER: We have established a committee composed of representatives from our department and Public Works to review the location of a new building.

MR. CHERNIACK: And the nature of the building? That is, how many courtrooms, how many supplementary offices that would be adjuncts to it?.

MR. MERCIER: Part of that does include a review of the proposed plans for the building.

MR. CHERNIACK: And the reference to The Pas? I think the Minister said that tenders have been called for, so that means all the planning has been completed. Is that correct?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: But then there is no construction, is there? There's no money for construction of The Pas building.?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. CHERNIACK: I mean in the Public Works budget either.

MR. MERCIER: That's correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: So does the Minister foresee any source of money to go ahead with any of the work in this fiscal year?

MR. MERCIER: Of course, there always is a source. Whether supplementary Estimates will be approved for the construction of any of those facilities is something which would be dealt with in the future. I just point that out as a possibility.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes. Supplementary Estimates would mean bringing them to the House in this session; I doubt if the Minister thinks that that's likely.

MR. MERCIER: That's not likely.

MR. CHERNIACK: No. Then you may mean a special warrant for . . .

MR. MERCIER: Yes, special warrant.

MR. CHERNIACK: Does the Minister have any idea how much money is involved in what would have to be passed by way of special warrant without reference to the Legislature?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would allow me to estimate the figure for the facility in The Pas, which was a combined courthouse and corrections facility, I believe the figure was somewhere in the area of \$2 million if there was any inclination to proceed with it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just put to the Minister what my concern is and then drop it and he can probably respond when we come to a more particularized portion of his Estimates.

I am concerned about the fact that apparently there is no money set aside to do this work in The Pas, and the Minister guesses at \$2 million — I wouldn't hold him to that figure. I am concerned about the source of the money in the event that they do proceed in two ways: if it is by special warrant then I would be concerned that the Cabinet would be making a decision of a very substantial amount of money without reference to the Legislature at all. Usually special warrants are used for emergencies, for unforeseen, and this can't be unforeseen. And I'm also concerned about the possibility that — and I know that there is still authorized money not expended and not allocated in moneys passed for Capital Works in previous years. I understood from the Minister of Finance, who gave us a list of some \$30 million worth of projects, that everything else will lapse, but Mr. Chairman, I don't have an assurance that it will lapse except a general statement of intent. I'm not sure how it would lapse, and therefore I would suggest to the Attorney-General that if that is considered a source then it would be wrong in my estimation to use that source without clearing it well in advance during this session in his Estimates, because we are proceeding on our side on the assumption that the Minister of Finance has given us a complete list of allocations from previous capital bills and that there is no more money going to be assigned from any of the unauthorized portion of those bills, but rather they will lapse. So I am now going on the assumption that there is no possibility for moneys to be raised by the Attorney-General for this purpose in this year, just because I don't believe the special warrant would be used, nor do I accept that.

So that I would leave it at this, Mr. Chairman, on the assumption that the Minister will make whatever enquiries he would want to make to disagree with my assumption and do so during the Estimates. Is that fair enough, Mr. Chairman? May I move to the question of the Law Reform Commissioner.

I am assuming by the Minister's statements of his efforts to date to get a full-time Commissioner, that he believes in the importance of the role and function and the fact there should be a full-time Commissioner. I would therefore ask him, on that assumption, how much money he thinks he would need to pay to a person to induce him to take on this job and whether he has considered that there should be some form of tenure in the engagement that would ensure a person taking the job that he would have it for a certain minimum period of time which may be even five years or ten years — why not? — subject to cancellation for a cause. I raise that because I think he's absolutely right. I think that only politicians are prepared to risk their security and venture into the field of looking for jobs that will take them away from their financial security. Therefore, if the problem is, as I think it may well be, the insecurity in connection with government work — and one has seen people fired out of hand within this last year, even at the level of Deputy Minister — whether a non-political job such as the Law Reform Commission's Chairmanship could not have attached to it security of tenure. If that is the case, whether the Minister has any idea of what that would cost.

I would therefore ask also, what does he know about payments being made to similar positions in other provinces? Are we in line with what he is now prepared to offer for full-time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is in the legislation provision for an appointment for a term of seven years, subject to renewal thereafter. So that seven year period would appear to be a substantial appointment. According to my information, none of the applications under the previous advertisement for a full-time chairman were subject to, or no mention was made or discussions ensue about the amount of money that was being paid. What I'm saying is that nobody submitted an application subject to receiving \$40,000 or \$45,000 or \$50,000.00. We can certainly review the compensation paid by other Law Reform Commissions in other provinces.

It may, however, be possible that because the previous chairman did carry out a lot of the research on his own, that it may be possible to carry out the same function by having a part-time chairman and, at the same time, having an additional body who might do the research so that it would be not necessary to be full-time because that function of research could be carried on by an additional employee of the Law Reform Commission That might resolve the situation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't rule out the possibility although I'm inclined to think that it may be a more onerous financial risk or loss for a person to take on a part-time job and therefore have to pay for an office and maintain the overhead of an office on part-time law practice income. I would think that it might be even more difficult to get part-time. But, by all means, the Minister would then have to undertake to supply enough money to get some real good research people on full-time to assist a part-time Commission chairman. I'm saying that because it's a self-generating task and you have to have a well motivated person involved in doing it who really wants to spend the time and do the job as compared with someone who might like the honour and prestige and also be interested in the work, but still not be self-stimulating in terms of all the challenge that exists in that kind of job.

So I'm wondering whether the Minister wouldn't make a stronger effort to actually recruit rather than to just invite applications. I say that in the light of the fact that I didn't remember that there was a seven year term involved and I blame myself for not remembering because I was part of the Legislature and I think even the government that passed the legislation. I don't know whether enough lawyers aren't fully aware of all the attractions to this job and there are such. I would also think that there might be a question of recruiting people who might hesitate to send in applications lest they be rejected and these might be people who hesitate to do so. I'm thinking of people like judges close to retirement, lawyers who want to stop the active practice in a gradual way. Since I think this has proven to be an extremely useful job to the people of Manitoba, that possibly a very active form of recruitment would be more advantageous than just to maybe bump the salary or something like that. I would suggest to the Minister that if hospitals are paying \$50,000 and more for — and I only pick that as an example of people's money paying higher salaries than we are accustomed to within government itself — that this might well be the kind of job that would justify a high salary and a good staff to continue to provide the services to government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee members, I have the Honourable Member for Wolseley next and I see the Member for Fort Rouge. The Clerk wants to be at his desk at 4:30 so would it be in order for the committee to rise now so that he could carry on with the duties of Private Members' Hour and we could just recess until 8:00 o'clock tonight. Agreed? (Agreed)\$\$

SUPPLY — NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 67 in the Main Estimates, Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. We are on Resolution No. 101, Clause 7, Development Resources Division; (b)(2) Wild Fur Development, (a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, am I correct in hearing you that we're on the Wild Fur Development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing last week, when we did leave this section, the decrease in the various sections of the wild fur projects related to the decrease in funding that is before us. I believe the Minister took some questions as notice as to where exactly those main

decreases are taking place. I wonder if he has that information to provide for the House at this point.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have two or three pieces of information. I believe it was the Member for The Pas that wanted to know about the unconditional grant situation and where we stood with it.

The initial payment in 1977-78 to the communities, the unconditional grant was \$172,388.40 and a special grant was \$26,658.00. This was the summer of 1977. At the same time, to the Indian Bands there was \$433,110 in unconditional grants and in special grants \$86,622.00.

Within 30 days, we will be making the final payment to the communities and to the Bands of unconditional and special grants in the total of: to the communities, \$23,766.40 and, to the Indian Bands, \$138,760.80. Now that, to keep it clear, is a final payment for the year 1977-78, combined of special and unconditional.

The 1977 disbursements, the originals, were made on a basis of the 1971 census figures as the 1976 figures were not available at the time, and the adjustments required will be based on population figures as follows: The communities, your Indian Band, in conjunction — we will be taking them in conjunction as we have derived them from the 1976 statistics. The full amount is \$19.40 — that's the unconditional grant plus the special grant of \$3.00. That's what it will be assessed on this particular year, Mr. Chairman.

Now, we further expect to make the 1978-79 grants, both special and unconditional, possibly within the next 45 to 50 days, or very shortly thereafter when the others are made from last year.

There will be a further adjustment necessary, Mr. Chairman, because of your intercensus adjustment payments that are in relationship to the year 1971 to 1976, because of the increase that couldn't be worked in during that period of time but of which the communities and the Bands are so entitled. We estimate that that will be in the neighbourhood of \$150,000 to \$160,000.00. It may be somewhat more, but in that neighbourhood.

We will have, in our grants structures, some small surpluses and both these, the \$15,000 that was mentioned the other night and possibly some from the \$135,000, and we will be applying these towards that further adjustment. Now, it gets complicated at this point but then we will be going to the Department of Finance and asking them for the additional funds to bring us right up, so that at the end, hopefully, two months from now, we have got everything paid up in relationship to the grants and the grants owing and the intercensus adjustments, everything will be completely brought up to date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has an estimate of the amount that he is going to have to go to the Department of Finance for, over and above that which has been budgeted.

MR. MacMASTER: Possibly about \$140,000.00.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Minister had time in the few moments I was out to give the answer to some of the other questions that he took as notice before, such as the regional location of the persons terminated or fired by the Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: We have got the Northern Field Services, where the question, I believe, originated from and there was 42 SMYs deleted: 19 in Thompson, 6 in The Pas, 4 in Selkirk, 3 in Leaf Rapids, 3 in Mafeking, 3 in Toutes Aides, 2 in Moose Lake, 1 in Crane River, and 1 in Oxford House, for the total of 42. We have added back in 10.26 in Thompson and 4 in The Pas, for a total of 14.26, with a net final reduction of 27.26. That's on the Northern Field Services.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm just trying to recall if we dealt with this 14.2 that were added back in, under this section. If we did, I could just refer back but I can't recall how that fits in.

MR. MacMASTER: We dealt with them as we went through. Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BOSTROM: You know before we leave (a), Mr. Chairman. I believe I did ask at the outset

today if the Minister had any specifics as to the decrease in the various areas of the Wild Fur Program decreases. What areas are being cut, and how he views that impact on the total program, plus the effect on trappers.

MR. MacMASTER: I believe that I mentioned Friday, but nevertheless, the decrease under 7.b)(2) in SMYs was 4 but in fact was really nothing because those 4 were vacant, Mr. Chairman. I believe really when we left we were on 4.(2)(b) Other Expenditures, which I had explained we were not doing any large major construction this year. We had done a substantial amount in the last few years, and a lot of the community cabins and some of the larger dams were in place. I believe that I said that, you know, the program will never be totally completed, it will have to be a thing that we carry on for years and years but we felt the \$135,000 was sufficient to carry on this particular year.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Can the Minister break out how much of the \$346,900 is capital and what is operational expenses?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, approximately \$40,000 is equipment and the rest is travel and supplies, etc.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, does that mean that there will not be any capital expenditures on dam construction or the other things that were of a capital nature under the program before us since \$40,000 that he indicated is only for equipment purchases, I believe he said.

MR. MacMASTER: There is capital monies under 9, your capital division. I suppose you could call it operational equipment purchased.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that some of the money for the wild fur program will be contained under item (9)(a) or (b) and that some of that funding is being cost-shared under the Wild Fur Agreement?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. While I was Minister, a number of times a very controversial issue was raised with respect to the humane trapping issue in Canada and as it affects our province. I believe that the department was, while I was Minister, the recognized leader in Canada in terms of the development of humane trapping methods and devices. One of the staff in the department, in fact, was chairman of the Canadian Association for Humane Trapping, formed September, 1973. I'm wondering if there are any funds within this section of the Estimates or in another section of your Estimates to continue that work on the development of humane traps and/or humane trapping methods. If so, how much is being allocated for that purpose?

MR. MacMASTER: We'll find that again, Mr. Chairman, under 9, but the answer is yes, there is money this year.

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, previously there was a definite amount prescribed and budgeted for under the Wild Fur Agreement. I'm wondering if the Minister could be more specific and tell us exactly how much is budgeted for humane trapping methods and procedures for the fiscal year before us.

MR. MacMASTER: Can I take that question and get back to the Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Chairman?

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know if this Wild Fur Agreement will continue the practice of having the Manitoba Registered Trappers' Association as a partner in the management of the program and, in doing so, will the Provincial Government, through this program, be assisting that organization by way of grant funding?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)(a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister has the standard answers for the standard questions ready there: the number of staff man years that there were last fall in this program; the number of vacancies there were; the number of the staff that includes this year; and the regional location of any staff that was fired by the Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, there were 16 SMYs last year; there are 12 SMYs this year. They all came from Northern Affairs. The 4 positions that were cut were vacant.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, basically then there were 12 last year because 4 were vacant and there are 12 this year so there is really no basic change in the staffing of this section?

MR. MacMASTER: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Rupert's Island.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, just to get an idea here. What type of activity is being phased out which results in the reduction in programming here?

MR. MacMASTER: None, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could just explain. Maybe there were two people that were considered to be under this program but my recollection of last year's Estimates was that there were 14 positions in this rather than 16.

MR. MacMASTER: I'll check that, Mr. Chairman, but our initial figures show there were 16 with 4 vacancies which is really 12 and there's 12 this year.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain briefly what the reduction means here, like how many projects will be covered this year as opposed to last year, how many primary producers will receive assistance, how many new jobs will be created this coming year, or how many will be lost?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, we anticipate that the 12 positions that are to be filled this year will produce as well as the 12 positions that we had last year and that there will be no real reduction. I suppose we are as hopeful as those that were involved last year that X amount of jobs will be created but I don't think I can give to you or anybody else can give a number of jobs that we may create during the course of the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)—pass; (3)—pass; (4)(a) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could explain what this section is all about.

MR. MacMASTER: This is, as the title says, a co-ordinating and an evaluating group. Last year the closest I can determine is that there was one person specifically doing this but this year, with pooling the various programs under one roof and administering across the lines and helping each other, we feel that it's a very important group and we now have 8 SMYs in there. That's the reason for the increase and of course the increase in costs relate comparatively to it. This group will co-ordinate and monitor and evaluate, negotiate the whole works in relationship to the numerous shared agreements within the department being partly Northlands, Special ARDA, Wild Fur. We even have a person in there that I have assigned to the Flood Agreement. Your third year review of your Northlands Agreement is coming up, of course, and this particular group will also be running consultation meetings with the NACC and the MMF and the MIB and Northern Association of Community Fishermen, the commercial fisherman, and your Trappers' Association. So that's in

what this particular group is doing.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister didn't seem too sure when he indicated the staff man years that would have performed this function last year as opposed to the 8 staff man years this year. Was that for sure one position covering this area?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, there is one person that we've been able to sort of tie down as a person who did some evaluating and co-ordinating. I can't go back in history and determine how much of his time was really spent on that particular work but we were trying to be as open as possible. I suppose we could have said, it's a brand new division; nobody was ever doing any type of this co-ordinating, but I don't think that is really true so we have said that it is (a) a new division but there was at least one other that we've been able to determine that did similar type work. Again, I can't specify how much of it he did but this is now exactly what these people will be doing.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment here. It appears, as I understand this function, that there were probably more than one person carrying it out in the past. It seemed, Mr. Chairman, that it was carried out effectively and appropriately. We were able to get the maximum amount out of the agreements. We had good co-ordination, good relationship with the Federal Government through the Deputy Minister and the head of this section as well as the agreement co-ordinating staff. I have some difficulty seeing this more efficient and more effective management going from 1 person to 8 persons or, if my recollection is correct, more like from 3 to 8 persons, to carry out the same function whereas the development aspects of the department, those aspects that affect the community, the parts of the programs that go directly to the community and that the community can grab hold of and use, those have all been reduced. Those pieces that are meaningful at the community level to the people in remote communities in Northern Manitoba, those have all been reduced in this department and yet when you come to an administrative function — and it has really no relationship to the communities that I can see, the co-ordination of the agreements with the Federal Government — then we have a huge increase in staff of 800 percent if the Minister's figures are correct.

It seems to me that we are drifting in the direction of too many chiefs and not enough Indians in this particular operation if we're moving to increase the administrative but at the same time we're, drastically reducing the funds available for economic development and employment creation at the community level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I share the concern of my colleague, the Member for The Pas. I note at the beginning of our introduction to the Estimates of this department, that there was a transfer of functions to the Department of Finance, and I gathered from the Minister's explanation that these were people that had worked on DREE co-ordination to a sum of \$100,600, staff people transferred out of his department to the Department of Finance. Now we have an explanation by the Minister that there is one person left here and in addition to that one person left, they are going to increase this appropriation by approximately half a million dollars. As my colleague points out, this is certainly strange given that there have been so many cutbacks in the department. You would wonder why they would need to increase staff in the middle management administration level of the department that has been slashing its people development programs drastically. It seems, as I have pointed out before, Mr. Chairman, that this is another example of the screwed-up priorities of this government and of this department, under this Minister, that all of the programs, or most of the programs that relate to people development and employment services for people in remote communities are being slashed mercilessly and here we are, at the same time, they are building up a bigger bureaucracy within the department to co-ordinate, evaluate and what all you do in pushing paper around in Winnipeg offices.

Mr. Chairman, I think this clearly is uncalled for, given the cuts that this department is making, unless the Minister can justify to us that he is making some attempt to increase some of these programs that are relating to northern people, when you look at Employment Services being cut by \$2 million and the Development Resources Division, as a whole, being cut by over \$2 million and, Mr. Chairman, all of those cuts within the critical areas of services to communities, services to people and services to the resource developers — those people at the community level that are attempting to get themselves out of their unemployment rut by developing the resource bases that are available to them in the surrounding areas of their communities.

If we look at the section we just passed, the Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement, which has

had a cut of \$80,000 from last year, Mr. Chairman, that is a program where I would have supported an increase, since it was dealing with primary resource users attempting to get fishermen and pulp-cutters, and different people involved in actually working, getting jobs at the community level.

Mr. Chairman, when you set up another office of co-ordination and evaluation, you are just setting up another office to push paper around and not necessarily to get any kind of jobs for people.

I really am disappointed and I must express my disappointment on behalf of the people I represent in remote communities that this government shows such a screwed-up sense of priorities when it comes to programs for people.

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members opposite bely their sorrow back to the constituencies in the areas they come from and tell them that all we are going to do this time is involve great numbers of them in, for example, the negotiations and preparations and negotiations for the mid-term evaluation of the NORTHLANDS Agreement. And maybe they can remind them that all of them didn't play too big a role when they first negotiated the terms of the NORTHLANDS Agreement and this time we are asking them to, and they have been glad that they are going to be able to participate. And it's going to take time and people and money to hold meetings with them and travel around and meet the various organizations to prepare ourselves. It's a fairly major preparation. —(Interjection)— I have no idea how much effort they put into the original set of proposals but we certainly expect to involve as many northerners as possible, and that takes time, money and people to do it.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not he has negotiated or reached any understanding with the Manitoba Metis Federation to assume the responsibility for the delivery of this particular program that we're looking at now.

MR. MacMASTER: They are going to play a similar role to others in preparations of negotiations and in a consultation effort, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister then, since he foresees this consultation — of which there was considerable before . . . Where the consultation seemed to break down was on whether or not the Metis Federation or the Indian Brotherhood, or the Northern Association of Community Councils, would actually assume program delivery. And that's where we parted ways because it was not my position as Minister, except in certain cases, that the political organizations of the native people and effective political organizations of the native people would be involved in direct administration because the experience we had had in that regard was somewhat mixed. In some cases, there was an effective delivery of program when we subcontracted the program delivery; in other cases, there was not effective program delivery because the persons hired to do program delivery ended up getting involved in the political or the pressure group aspect of the organization, as opposed to the program delivery aspect. And that is where parting of the ways took place when I was the Minister, when these organizations wished to assume more and more full responsibility themselves for direct administration.

Now, the Minister is going to go through the process of involving them again and yet he has already had some discussion with them on a direct administration. I wonder if it is the intention of No, I do not see that at this moment.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I can understand the Minister's answer, in light of the realities of the agreements, and that answer does make some sense, although there have been on occasions certain specific programs that were effectively delivered by the organizations. But the Minister seems to be very concerned with what took place in the past. And just let me reassure the Minister that I never at any time made a commitment to any of the organizations in this regard. I never before led them to believe that they would assume administration of programs, and then changed my mind in the course of events. They were never misled by myself, as Minister, unlike the present situation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MacMASTER: Just to repeat myself once more, some of them certainly weren't misled, because all of them weren't dealt with.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that we should be going around the north informing people of what they will be doing, in terms of discussing the NORTHLANDS Program.

I think we should be advising people in the north that they will be presiding over the last rites of the Department of Northern Affairs and the NORTHLANDS Agreement, since this budget that we have before us is certainly not one which is encouraging to them, and one which would be encouraging them to take this government at good faith in terms of their discussions along the lines of what the people in the north want for future development.

I mean this is a joke if the Minister on one hand is cutting out \$2 million in Employment Services and cutting out another \$640,000 in support to local governments, cutting out \$3 million in Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets in Northern Manitoba and then he is going to turn around and fund another group to run around the north and hold meetings and ask people what they want. This is a joke, Mr. Chairman, when you consider that what this government is doing is obviously and deliberately cutting back severely and mercilessly on northern programs that affect people, that affect the potential development of the communities in terms of their employment base and then to turn around and add another \$500,000 to a group that will go around and hold meetings. All this group will be able to do, Mr. Chairman, is try to convince these communities that all is not so terrible because, Mr. Chairman, they won't be able to offer them very much hope for the future when you consider the massive cutbacks that this government is making in terms of the very critical programs that relate to possibilities for people to get out of the welfare rut and to develop their resource base and to be able to create jobs for the people in the communities that they represent.

Mr. Chairman, if the Minister says that consultation, as he calls it, is more important, this type of consultation is more important than making opportunity available for people; opportunity available for people who desperately want to get out of that unemployment welfare rut and to create jobs based on development of their resources that are available to them.

Mr. Chairman, they were well on their way to doing this before this government came in and drastically cut all these programs. I certainly, as a member representing the many remote communities, will not be able to give the communities very much encouragement in terms of them being able to convince this committee of civil servants, who will be coming in to meet with them, that this government is very sincere in wanting to listen to their concerns and to respond to those concerns by providing them with the necessary opportunities they desire and need in order to get out of the very serious problems that the northern communities are facing at the present time with unemployment levels, as I have said before, Mr. Chairman, well in excess of 70 and 80 percent in many of these communities.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the crux of the matter is that there has been considerable discussion with the people of Northern Manitoba and during various stages of their development there were different things that they emphasized that they wanted.

In the last two years, Mr. Chairman, to anyone willing to listen to the remote communities in Northern Manitoba, the answer has been that we want jobs; we want a chance to work. And that has been the clear and simple emphasis of the people in Northern Manitoba.

As my colleague says, all those programs that were providing employment opportunities were providing economic development, have either been cut off completely or drastically reduced by this government and by this Minister. And to spend \$545,400 to go around and ask the question that the people have already forcefully answered is a real waste of the taxpayers' money. If you want to talk about waste or horror stories, I think that you can look to this item right here: Agreements Co-ordination and Evaluation \$545,400 development.

Mr. Chairman, the answers are there. The answer from the Northern Task Force, the answer from the change in The Northern Affairs Act, the submissions from the Northern Association of Community Councils, submissions from the MMF, the submissions from the MIB, they're there, they're indexed, /, t the 're cross-referenced here is nothing more that can be done except, Mr. Chairman, to do what we were doing, and that's to get on with the job. Get on with the job of assisting the people in communities to create employment and to create jobs and not waste the money, Mr. Chairman, on another travelling bunch of civil servants to find out what people want, when we already know what people want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MacMASTER: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, when the various groups are submitting their submissions and I'm meeting with them, I should tell them that some of the members opposite consider that a joke that they be permitted to participate in their own destiny, as far as the NORTHLANDS Agreement goes.

There is money in here under the (b) section, the Other Expenditures, which is cleaning up some of the messes that we found behind us, that we can get to when we get to that particular section.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about here is the discussion of the agreements and basically the discussion of the NORTHLANDS Agreement. And what this Minister and this government has done, as far as I can tell, and maybe the Minister wants to add to the figures, so far as I can calculate they have eliminated or dropped \$5 million worth of NORTHLANDS funding. They have let it revert to the Federal Government. They haven't taken advantage of \$5 million that they are eligible for in the agreement. Mr. Chairman, the joke is not on our part on this side. The joke will be a cruel joke of going up north, making people think they are going to get something when there's nothing left; when everything's been drastically cut or completely eliminated; that will be the cruel joke, Mr. Chairman. The Minister is going to be — maybe we could just give him some advice — he's going to leave himself in an awful position to spend these kinds of funds in what he calls, "consultation", when the organizations basically want some administrative control over the programs — and the Minister said he is not going to give that — and the people in the communities want a chance to go to work. Mr. Chairman, that is basically what they're after.

And Mr. Chairman, yes, there might be some variances of that. Yes, people should listen to that and see if they can build those variances in there. But, Mr. Chairman, to spend half a million dollars to do that, at the same time drop \$5 million in cost-shared funds, the most of which were for economic and employment creation, Mr. Chairman, just does not make any logical sense.

Mr. Chairman, I would prefer, that the Minister actually took that \$5 million and turned it over to the Metis Federation because they would do a lot better job than the present government is doing and that this Minister is doing, because, Mr. Chairman, they are not doing very much in the area of Job Creation and Economic Development. So let him take that \$5 million; let them take this half a million and put it back into their coffers and save it. Give that \$5 million to the Metis Federation and say, "Prove yourself. Show what you can do in the area of Job Creation and Economic Development." I challenge the Minister to take a look at that possibility because he's doing nothing now, Mr. Chairman. It couldn't be done any worse than it's being done right now. So let's give them a chance; let's take that drastic reduction in cost-shared funds and give the Metis Federation some responsibility for it.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, before we get to the next section, I'd just like to comment on the Minister's last statement. As my honourable colleague from The Pas has pointed out, the joke is not that people are being consulted, the joke as I pointed out is that people are being consulted with a very cynical kind of approach; and the cynical approach is, that before the people are even being consulted, Mr. Chairman, the massive cutbacks are being made. The priorities are being set by this government before any consultation is taking place.

Mr. Chairman, all this money is going to go for is a sophisticated public relations exercise that this Minister and some of his staff will be going through, where they will be holding meetings with people and holding their hands and saying, "Yes, thank you very much for your advice and we will be looking at it and we will be studying it and we will evaluate it," and what else are they going to do? — "we're going to coordinate it." But, Mr. Chairman, what they should be telling the people is the truth and the truth is that they don't intend to expand the programs in northern Manitoba; the proof is in this pudding, Mr. Chairman — and it's a pretty mixed up pudding — because you can see that they're drastically cutting the very programs that are the life-blood of northern communities. You don't chop that much money off the crucial programs that the northern people need to create employment for their people, and then turn around and consult with them and ask them for their advice and their concerns.

Mr. Chairman, the northern people will not see this as a very sincere approach. They will see it for what it is, Mr. Chairman, a joke, because it's a joke that they should be consulted on something where the decision has already been made, the intentions of the government have already been made, the direction this government is going to be proceeding in have already been set and this whole process is certainly not one that the people are going to get very much out of, in terms of their future. The idea of them meeting with the Minister, going over these things with their staff, I predict, will not get them anywhere at all and they will see that before they even get into this process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (4)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1)(a) Salaries —pass — the Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could give us the staff involved in this section, a brief summary of the function, the vacancies when he came to office and the current staffing level.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Chairman, this particular section is to provide Support Services to communities and groups, identification of business opportunities, establishment of resource user fees, development of resource utilization advisory boards, and some program research and evaluation.

The staff in 1977-78 was 38; that was made up of 14 from Renewable Resources and 24 from Northern Affairs. This year we have added two positions to that.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The vacancies, the Minister missed that item. How many of the 38 positions were vacant when he came to office?

MR. MacMASTER: I'll get that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The amount here for salaries, \$777,800 — I assume that the Other Expenditures are basically in support of that amount. I wonder what source of funding, when these people do identify projects, when they do identify programs, when these funds are expended, where will the communities be able to draw from for the actual dollars, to get their project launched from?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, the three traditional ones that are still in effect, Mr. Chairman, are your Special ARDA, and your CEDF, and the SNEP program.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Last year, with a similar or a higher level of budgeting for this program although when you look at this overall section last year with a much higher level of budgeting there was a considerable amount of SNEP funds that were available to draw on. The Special ARDA had not been reduced to the extent that it is here. I wonder if the Minister could tell us, what's left in the SNEP — the Special Northern Employment Program — for this fiscal year. Is there any money left in that particular program?

MR. MacMASTER: That's not in my Estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a section here of the Minister's department, which I think he'll agree is in his Estimates. The purpose is to assist in the development of programs and what we have to understand, Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House, is there anything — once a project is developed — is there, in fact, any money to get the project off the ground? And, Mr. Chairman, that is why we really need to know if there's any money in the SNEP Program at all, or not; because if there's no money in the SNEP Program they might as well take about two-thirds of this money away because the communities won't be able to do anything. So, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to deal with that question; it relates very directly to this appropriation.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister isn't going to respond, I think we should at least point out from this side, that as my colleague has pointed out already, the Resource Economic section here is one which could facilitate the development of projects, could assist communities to design potential projects for purposes of creating employment, developing the resource base that's available to them; but, Mr. Chairman, that whole exercise is fruitless if these same communities are not able to get the necessary funding to make those projects a reality. It's just an exercise in academic study, which is taxpayers' money that is not very well spent. In fact, if you want to look for waste, Mr. Chairman, this is an example of waste right here; if civil servants are going to be doing studies, providing project proposals and so on, encouraging communities that these things are potential for creating employment, and then there's no corresponding opportunity for them to get the necessary funding to get those projects started.

Mr. Chairman, we have the example already, that the Communities Economic Development Fund — which is one loaning agency in the province which is available to northern people — has been stopped — effectively stopped — by this government. They are only loaning moneys to organizations that have had DREE financing or DREE grants approved. If an entrepreneur in a northern community has identified a potentially profitable operation, Mr. Chairman, who formerly could have gone to the Communities Economic Development Fund, had his proposal analyzed by the loan officers there and if it proved to be a potentially viable operation — and they were very good at their analysis in that organization from what I know, Mr. Chairman — they would have the opportunity of getting loan funding through CEDF. That process, as I understand it, has been stopped effective with the

election of this government.

So, Mr. Chairman, that door has been closed with a — as they have portrayed in one of the newspapers I looked at — with a big lock hanging on it there. Mr. Chairman, that door has been effectively closed by this government. No longer is that door open to them, that opportunity for loan funding through CEDF.

And on top of that, Mr. Chairman, the other available source of funding — the SNEP Program which the Minister has mentioned himself — has effectively been capped as well because the amount of funding that was available last year has been reduced from what I understand. This is one source of funding that was available to community groups, co-operatives, community councils, band councils in their development of economic opportunities for the people that they represent. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the Minister doesn't seem to want to discuss it, so I have to assume my information is correct, that this program — the SNEP Program — has been effectively curtailed as well. There has been no evidence that this government has any intention of reviving it, or providing necessary funds for this fund to continue in any realistic way.

I note that there was a press release that came out just after the election outlining certain grants that were awarded under the program; those were for proposals that had come in before the election. To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, there have been few, if any, projects approved since this government has been elected. So, Mr. Chairman, I can't really believe in the sincerity of this government with respect to this section. I don't think it is meaningful at all.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 8 — ADULT IDENTIFICATION CARDS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour dealing with resolutions. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I did wish to ask leave of the House to make an alteration in my resolution. I will proceed to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we can deal with it, we first have to have it before the House. If the honourable member wants to move that the resolution be on the floor of the House, then we can deal with the alteration, or how would you prefer to deal with it? The Honourable Member has not moved the Resolution yet.

MR. DOERN: On a point of order, for the House Leader's benefit, I intend to make an alteration, with leave, in my resolution. Should I move it and then ask leave or vice-versa?

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, there must be something to alter before we can proceed with an alteration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker:

Whereas an identification card would be of value to young adults for general purposes, and
Whereas an identification card is required for the purchase of alcoholic beverages and admission into theatres, etc., and

Whereas an identification card would be beneficial to Liquor Commission employees, law enforcement agencies and businessmen,

Therefore, Be It Resolved That all Manitobans, upon reaching the age of majority, be provided with a registered, plasticized identification card containing their name, address, birth date and photographic likeness,

Be It Further Resolved That this identification card be accepted as proof positive by all provincial government department's and agencies.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you prepared to move this?

MR. DOERN: Yes. Moved by myself, seconded by the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre this proposed resolution. Do you want me to read it back? (Stand)

The Honourable Member for Elmwood have some proposed changes that he wants to bring before the House?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, if I could have leave, I would like to propose an amendment to that Proposed Resolution or an alteration if you like.

MR. SPEAKER: An alteration.

MR. DOERN: As follows, and I have copies for the benefit of members of the House, I have 15 or 20 copies.

That the second clause, just to be clearer, instead of saying "is required", I wish to have changed to "would be a useful aid."

The key change that I wanted to make was the addition of "consider the advisability of" in the first Be It Resolved so that it would read in effect "Be It Resolved that the government consider the advisability of enabling all Manitobans, upon reaching the age of majority, to obtain a registered plasticized identification card."

MR. SPEAKER: You have heard the proposed alterations that the member has suggested. Is it agreeable to let those alterations stand?

MR. JORGENSON: We have no objection to the honourable member making those changes so that the resolution would read as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to thank the government, in particular, for accepting that change.

When I originally drafted the resolution I intended it to be on a voluntary basis but upon discussing it with some of my colleagues they read the provision as being a compulsory or mandatory requirement which was not my intention and is not the way that I read it. Nevertheless, since it appears to be read in that fashion, I wanted it changed so that in the key section it would indicate that the government, in effect, would consider the advisability of enabling all Manitobans to obtain an identification card as outlined because that is what my original intent was and that is to clear up that particular wording.

Mr. Speaker, when we listened to the debate that has taken place on the proposed change in the drinking age there were a number of members who singled out, as one of the important problems facing Manitobans today — in particular young Manitobans, in particular law enforcement agencies, hotel-motel operators — the problem of identification. In particular, if I can recall correctly, I believe the Member for St. Matthews made that point, I believe the Member for Fort Rouge made that point, I certainly made that point and other members of the House as well, because I believe it is recognized to be a fundamental need for requirement or condition of enforcement, to have a proper clear means of identification as compared to the present system which is best described as murky, and secondly, best described as not in fact being enforced.

I believe that the present problem, as seen by some members of the Chamber, is that young people are not in fact being challenged in the Liquor Commissions and in the hotels and motels of the province. Regardless of the age, no matter what age we decide in this Chamber is best as the legal age for drinking, whether it is 18, 19, 20, 21 or whatever, enforcement is still the problem. There are still people, of course, who are more interested, more interested, more concerned with making money in the sale of liquor or not being bothered with the unpleasantness of challenging somebody than of enforcing the law. We need, obviously, a good identification system and we need regular inspection by hotel and motel owners — I guess I should really say hotel owners period — and by MLCC staff inspectors.

I also would be quick to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is not all young people who require such identification. There are always people who look more mature than their years. There are always people who look 18, as the present case may be, or perhaps a few years over. They are not the ones who have the problem. The problem is the person who is legitimately of the drinking age, who goes to a pub and then has to face the question of challenge. The problem also is that people too often don't challenge the borderline case. I gather from speaking to people in the industry and

from speaking to young people, that the number of challenges are few and far between and that many young people who are under age have no difficulty in being served. Whether you are a little under or whether you are right on, or whether you are a little older, it doesn't matter. The number of challenges are few and far between.

So I say this is basically an aid, a useful aid, if not a condition of enforcement. I believe also that it is up to the people who own the hotels and the drinking establishments to enforce the law. Of course, ultimately it is up to the Attorney-General's Department in terms of he being responsible for the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission to make sure that those people are kept on their toes as well. I believe that enforcement in Manitoba is and has been probably too lax and that there should be more challenges and more fines to enforce the existing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the identification system that exists in the province today, the birth certificate is taken to be a means of proving one's age. The problem with the birth certificate is, of course, that there is no photograph on the birth certificate and that people can, of course, loan or borrow birth certificates. Another identification given in Manitoba is the driver's license and the problem there, of course, is that if a person isn't old enough to have a driver's license or have had one let's say for several years, if one has had one for several years and one is 18 they can use the driver's license as a means of identification. But there the problem is that not every one has a driver's license or can operate a vehicle and may not have that kind of an ID. A still rarer proof of age is a passport and very few people, of course, are able to come up with a passport but a passport does have age and birth place, etc., and photograph which is, of course, an invaluable feature. So if one is looking for identification all the present means of proving one's legal age, in terms of the liquor laws, can be found to be deficient; i.e. the birth certificate, the driver's license and maybe the best of all but rarest of all, of course, the passport.

There is also the student card. I gather from talking to some young people that the student card is nothing more, in most cases, than a blank handed out to students for which they can fill in the details. So when one obtains a card, all you have to do is put in your name, put in your address, put in your birthday — whatever you like. You can put 20, 30, 40 or 50 as you see fit. So that, of course, is perhaps the most flawed system of all.

Now we all know that the Hotel Association and the theatre owners developed a card, that there was some thinking that went into a present system, and that there is a place in Winnipeg where one can go, make application, swear an affidavit, pay \$3.00 and then obtain a plasticized card with a photograph on it. The problem is, again, because the law isn't being enforced, Mr. Speaker, people are not going out of their way to obtain the card, because in most cases, they don't need it. There's such laxity in the enforcement of the present law that people don't need it, they don't bother. So even though the system exists it is superfluous, as my honourable colleague ventures and volunteers. So the number of people who have these cards is microscopic and the whole system, whatever it was worth at one time, has sort of ground to a halt.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should have a system which is sponsored by the government and guaranteed by the government. It should be at government expense. These cards should be provided by the Provincial Government. I believe the number of them necessary is not significant since not everyone would need it, only those who are regularly challenged or feel uncertain would require them. It would be on a voluntary basis. If you have no problem you don't have to obtain it. You would have to have proof, a sworn affidavit or a birth certificate, etc., etc., in addition to the sworn statement and there would have to be a photograph. My understanding, from talking to the man who has run the system for the hotel owners and the theatre owners and so on, he thinks that the system is foolproof in that it is not a system where you can easily open up the card, take out the photograph, replace it, etc. It appears to work well here and in other places in terms of physically work well, but in terms of the number of cards and the degree of enforcement it is almost totally ineffective.

There probably are some details that would have to be worked out in terms of availability to people in rious parts of the province, whether this would be available on a daily basis or once a week. Those details I would place in the capable hands of the Attorney-General and the MLCC to iron out some of the problems of a central place versus decentralization, etc.

But I think that we require more follow-through than at present, as I said, more inspections, more challenges, more fines and acceptance of the card. If we make it a totally acceptable thing to Provincial Government departments and agencies it will have widespread acceptability. I believe that the government has an obligation to provide something like this. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Liquor Commission's statement of profits for last year showed some \$64 million. I don't know what the exact cost of this system would be. If it is on the basis of \$3.00 a card and there's 10,000-50,000 Manitobans who would require them or who feel that they require them, then we're talking in the nature of \$50,000 to \$150,000 but that's only a guess on my part.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the government has an obligation to enforce the law, to provide a good system of identification and also to provide a sensible program of drug and alcohol education

throughout the province. I think all of us agree that we need a better identification system and I believe that this is the best system that at least I can think of. Someone may come up with an amendment that would be acceptable that would make it even better still, but I believe it can and should be supported by all members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, obviously there would be advantages, as the resolution states, to Liquor Commission employees, particularly inspectors, if identification cards were made mandatory. There have been and are difficulties in enforcing the regulations of the Liquor Control Commission in providing sufficient inspectors to adequately supervise and travel to every liquor dispensing agency in the Province of Manitoba, so that there would be some advantage to that, there is no question.

In the area of law enforcement agencies there probably are also some advantages. I can think particularly, Mr. Speaker, in the area of suspended drivers, people applying for drivers' licences and taking the test, where it has been known that some people in the past have taken tests for people to get their drivers' licences. Certainly businessmen might see some advantages, particularly when they deal with the question of credit card frauds which are prevalent nowadays. However, Mr. Speaker, it has been shown that even though quite a number of provinces do have voluntary identification cards, where the card is issued for the sole purpose of purchasing liquor, that young people have been known either to borrow or otherwise acquire the necessary identification documents to get the picture card.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if it is to be considered at all, it is the view of many people who have looked at this particular area that the card should be issued for a purpose other than the purchase of liquor, such as a driver's licence. Under that particular system the Vehicle Branch could issue a picture identification card to a person who did not have a driver's licence if the applicant was supported by birth certificates or statutory declarations, etc. That has been a matter, Mr. Speaker, that I believe has been given some consideration by the previous government. Certainly one issue that always enters into the fray is the question of whether or not such a procedure should be voluntary or compulsory. The wording of this particular resolution would appear to be one that involves a mandatory system of the issuance of an identification card or photograph. There are many people, Mr. Speaker, who would reject that. I believe that there are many members on both sides of this House who would be opposed to a compulsory system.

Mr. Speaker, the wording of the resolution before us indicates that a card be issued upon reaching the age of majority. Certainly there would have to be provision for the renewal of a photograph; that is something that could be accomplished under a system of having an identification card issued with the driver's licence which has to be renewed annually. There was, I am told, a review of this kind of a procedure done in the past and the cost, Mr. Speaker, in the initial stages was estimated to be approximately \$2 million dollars. To that figure, Mr. Speaker, I believe was a preliminary review done by the Department of Highways who looked at it some time ago, that would involve, Mr. Speaker, I think, accomplishing the task of providing everyone with an identification card within a fairly short period of time.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood raises the question whether or not that should be paid for by the applicant or paid for by the Liquor Control Commission. Mr. Speaker, it is my view in the event that such a system were to be implemented, that it should be paid for by the applicant. Then we get into the situation again of whether or not it should be compulsory or mandatory. There would again be many people who would question a decision that people be compelled to pay a fee to obtain an identification card which they didn't want in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Ontario has been dealing with a number of aspects that are relevant to raising the drinking age, such as the driver suspensions, using the Alert machines the readings are between .5 and .8. We do have amendments to that particular legislation before the House; it was passed by the last session of the Legislature and has not been implemented. As a result of the perusal of that legislation by law enforcement agencies in the Province of Manitoba we have made certain amendments to make it workable and practical and that matter should be dealt with by the House before we prorogue so that it will be a fairly simple task to deal with that particular item in the same manner as Ontario. Ontario has also, Mr. Speaker, imposed or is contemplating imposing higher fines both on the part of individuals who drink while under age and on the part of the owners and operators of drinking establishments who allow that kind of a breach of the regulations to go on in their premises. They are increasing those penalties against both the young people and the operators, Mr. Speaker. Even there, though, they have only a voluntary system of identification cards and have not seen it necessary yet, Mr. Speaker, to go as far as making identification cards compulsory.

The last paragraph of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, deals with providing that the card be accepted

as proof positive. Mr. Speaker, I have commented on the experience of a number of other jurisdictions which do issue voluntary identification cards for the purpose of purchasing or consuming liquor. They have raised the particular question that where that card is not issued in conjunction with another purpose such as for a driver's licence, they have concerns over practical problems of properly issuing those cards and the general view seems to be that the cards should be issued for use with another purpose such as a driver's licence.

Mr. Speaker, I think in view of the mandatory form of the resolution and the fact that it is not to be issued with another use, that I would find some difficulty in supporting this resolution. I certainly would, though, Mr. Speaker, be prepared to personally support a form of identification card that was voluntary, that was issued in conjunction with a driver's licence, for example, as one separate use, and that was paid for by the applicant. But I do have some difficulty with the practical problems of enforcing the kind of identification card that we are presented with here that is issued apart from any other use, which is made mandatory and apparently the cost is to be borne by government and not by the individual user.

Mr. Speaker, it is a worthwhile topic to raise in conjunction with the question of raising the drinking age. I think while we are not proposing any amendments to The Liquor Control Act this particular session, I think in the future we will have to take a serious look at the question of severer penalties under The Liquor Control Act for breaches. We are looking, Mr. Speaker, at the number of inspectors available under the Liquor Control Commission. I think as the reports that I filed in the House indicate, the report of the Liquor Control authority, that occasional permits are an area where there is a real difficulty. The RCMP report attached to the Liquor Control Commission report indicates, particularly in western Manitoba, the number of liquor offences has risen considerably and there is in fact a substantial increase in the number of occasional permits issued each year. That is becoming a very real problem in the way of enforcement by inspectors and by police authorities because of the tremendous number of occasional permits that are being issued, that are being issued for a very small fee.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not only looking at enforcement of the regulations in hotels and beverage rooms and pubs, but at the places where occasional permits are issued, because a great deal of the under-age drinking takes place at those particular establishments; there is a lack of real enforcement on the part of the Commission as to drinking regulations; there is simply not sufficient staff at the present time to attend each one of those functions. In many cases they are one-shot efforts by the holder of the permit, are not done on a regular basis, so that there is a tendency for the permit holder not to worry too much about the regulations, and that is where, Mr. Speaker, a large part of the problem occurs with under-age drinking. An identification card in the regular drinking establishments would assist the hotel operators and the inspectors in upholding and supporting the regulations, but there is over and above that a much greater problem under occasional permits that the Liquor Control Commission has not yet been able to deal with but are actively looking at it because of the recommendations of the police authorities.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if any identification card is to be introduced, that it should be on a voluntary basis, not a mandatory basis. Government should not pay the cost of it, and a system will have to be devised so that it is issued in conjunction with another purpose such as a driver's licence because of the difficulties other jurisdictions have had in issuing identification cards solely for the purpose of purchasing or consuming liquor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a question.

MR. DOERN: I just wanted to ask the Attorney-General whether he was present when I introduced the resolution and clarified the wording to indicate that it would not be mandatory but would be optional. I don't know if the A-G was here when I made that comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hesitated to rise in case somebody on the other side wanted to add their comments to the resolution, but I guess the Honourable Member for Elmwood doesn't necessarily have that great a support on that side or has unanimous agreement, I don't know which.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have great reservations of supporting the resolution, whether the identification card would be voluntary or compulsory. The reason I raise this point, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that I can see where, if the card was recognized either in regulation or by provincial legislation, that it would open up many avenues of applications in our social way of life and also restrictions. That I could see, first off, that people would accept that they would be lulled into the idea that an identification card would enforce the law, which I don't believe it would; that's the first thing. The other assumption would be taken by many people, and I think possibly by the Honourable Member

for Elmwood himself, that the majority of people are dishonest and have a tendency to want to break the law and by having an identification card, it would make it easier for someone who may, because of the law being broken by that individual, be charged as well. In the case of the hotel owner, who happens to accept today a driver's licence from somebody who in fact was using somebody else's driver's licence, he is guilty of in fact accepting that, that the individual in fact was over the age of eighteen.

So that, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that all people are dishonest or I don't believe that all people who happen to be 18 years or thereabouts, or under the age of 18, want to go out and break the law. So that I don't think that the particular identification card that is being put forward at this time in this resolution is necessarily the answer.

I could see where, if a government agency, such as a Provincial Government or a Federal Government, accepts and recognizes this as a tool for enforcing the law by enforcement agents, that it will open up many more applications. I could see that it would become necessary for somebody to produce the card and if he or she didn't happen to have the card would be restricted. And what in actual fact we are then saying is that that identification card is becoming a legal document, similar to the birth certificate that we now recognize as a document that proves the age and the sex and the origin of birth of the individual who legally possesses that particular card.

So that I would not want to see our government support this particular resolution or bring in this type of regulation, because I could see where we would get to possibly be a group of people in Manitoba — if we went to the extreme — that we would have to wear this little identification tag on the front of our suit so that if we went in to buy or pick up a prescription at the drug store, say, that happened to be drugs or something, that the druggist would say, well, I will just ask for the identification card to make sure the individual is a correct individual — this type of approach.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that even though the Transit Commission of the City of Winnipeg recognizes an identification card, it is actually the agency, the Transit, who is recognizing this card and passing on an economic saving to the person who applies to get that economic saving, and it's slightly a different issue. The identification card in the case of the senior citizen, he is using it to take and get an economic advantage because of the fact that he is a senior citizen. Whereas in this case, the resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, is applying the card to help enforce the law, that the individual has to produce the card because the individual thinks he is breaking the law that requests that card. And it's slightly different, Mr. Speaker, in this application.

So that in the case of the Transit Commission, they are putting forward this card as a basis of passing on a saving. The resolution before us is proposing the card to make sure that the person will not break the law, and it will be used.

Then the next question arises, Mr. Speaker, that anybody who has the card or doesn't have the card, if it's accepted by the government as a legal document now that this person who carries the card is a certain age, then I am sure there will be ways that they will forge these documents. So that just because the person carries the card doesn't say that that will stop them from breaking the law. It will stop the majority of the people from breaking the law, but the majority of the people don't break the law now anyways. So that those that want to break the law will seek out to break it, will find some means of getting that identification card.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood indicates, am I opposed to the driver's licence identification card system. Well, just because my picture might appear on my driver's licence and I could be suspended from driving, that doesn't mean that card is going to necessarily stop me from driving if I want to drive. All it will mean is if I happen to get stopped that the policeman who stops me will ask for my driver's licence; he will take a look at the picture on it and he will look at the back of it and see if it is suspended, or whatever.

So that, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I have mixed emotions about this resolution, whether it is voluntary or not. It depends on the application of the card. That is my concern, because if we then concern ourselves that somebody is going to break the law, whether there is an identification card or not showing your picture, the next step is that you will have to put your fingerprints on the bottom of it because then at least they will be able to make a fingerprint check immediately to make sure that the fingerprints match on the card.

So, Mr. Speaker, this may sound to the extreme but this is how things happen. It is simply accepted that it will do something in one application, but because it is recognized by the authority, who has certain rights to create laws in the province, that it becomes accepted as a legal document, so that agencies within our economy or in our social life say, well, here is a means that we will be able to possibly have an opportunity to raise a question to somebody and take the onus of some law off our backs. This basically is what the hotel owners are proposing is that if we have a card and we look at the Honourable Member for Elmwood and they happen to say, well, he is a young-looking fellow, could you produce the identification card and prove that you are 18, they now feel more safe about it. But really, Mr. Speaker, the onus is still on them to make sure that in actual

fact you are over 18.

And, as I said earlier, if the individual wants to break the law bad enough, there will be a market somewhere in Manitoba that will provide some means of getting that identification changed so that the individual, if he is below the age of 18, will be able to present the card.

Mr. Speaker, I really have said basically what I wanted to say in this particular debate. I might comment that I could see, to some degree, where it would be useful for that group — the 18-year-old age group — but as I say, I am noncerned about the fact where it will lead to. In fact, at the present time I have mixed emotions on how I am going to vote on the drinking bill, and I will be speaking on that later during that particular debate. And this in a way would be an easy out for me, but I don't think it's a correct out. But I think by applying this particular identification card in this one particular arena will open it up into other arenas, and can lead on to what I have mentioned earlier. So that I, at the present time, could not support this particular resolution.

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

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I think I might be unique in the House in my remarks that I am going to be making this afternoon. I don't think that it should be a choice, I think it should be compulsory to have an identification card with an identifying picture to identify the person carrying that card. I think it might be a little distasteful. We are not talking about taking away the rights of the individual by making him carry an identification card. I think that in fact, we will be supplying them with proof of age and it will be a convenience to all those people that will be coming of age and will be requiring some proof of age, for whatever reason, either to go into a liquor outlet or to cash a cheque, or just for identification of any kind.

I will take us back a little ways. Oh, it was a few years ago when I was in my heyday and I was refereeing professional football. It wasn't that long ago, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— That's right. No, I didn't wear glasses, Mr. Speaker. It got down to a point where, after you reach the age of 40, you require glasses to read and I only need my glasses to see, not to be able to do anything else.

But I would just cite a little story that happened to me a little way back. This was at the time that they were just at the process of investigating people as they came into the airports. There was the fear of carrying arms aboard airplanes. I can remember one of my first occasions that I was involved in entering an aircraft right after these regulations were first initiated. And I can recall the people who were so indignant at having to be searched before they were allowed on the aircraft. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in those days I felt a little indignant, also, that I was not trusted. Anyways, after considering it very — I thought, well, you know, why are they searching these people as they are entering the aircraft? It was for my own protection, Mr. Speaker. I was not embarrassed; I was not indignant. And I don't think that people who complained about being searched should have been indignant. It was for their own good.

I like reminiscing, Mr. Speaker, but to get back to the reason that I have brought up the story, I think that if we did have identification at that point' and they were compulsory, it's for our own good. It's not just because an 18-year-old will be able to go into aliquor outlet and supply an identification but it's also in favour of my 21-year-old niece, who is married, who was embarrassed the other day when we went out to a local restaurant and she had to produce identification. She was dressed in her formal attire and she didn't have identification. But I think if it was compulsory, we would have our identification with us, Mr. Speaker. We would have it with us at all times, and therefore you wouldn't be embarrassed.

We are not taking away any of the privileges and rights of anyone by stating that they must have identification, proof of identification. I'm not sure whether the true reason is that, or the reason that we would have identification, should be with driver's licences. I can see that there would be all kinds of problems, Mr. Speaker, particularly with driver's licences that are suspended and then you wouldn't have ways of identifying the age groups of the people who have driver's licences suspended. And maybe that wouldn't be a bad thing if we took away their suspended licences with their pictures, they might not be allowed to go in and drink. I'm not saying I would support it but it might not be a bad thing, Mr. Speaker.

I think why it should be compulsory, Mr. Speaker, is I know of another story where somebody was writing a real estate exam not too long ago — and maybe I shouldn't be bringing this up because I believe that it might be before the courts — but I will state, rather than refer to that particular subject, let us say that somebody went in to write a real estate exam and was identified as not the person who was supposed to be writing the exam rather than somebody else who was more qualified. I think that proof of identification would be of a great benefit to those type of people. I think that we must have identification for things of that nature. I know of people who have played football under an assumed name. I'm really Paul Dojack in disguise, Mr. Speaker, but if I had a form of identification, if I had a form of identification, I could prove that I'm Abe Kohnats and not

Paul Dojack. I was much quicker so if you saw us on the field you would know the difference anyway.

But I think that it would cure some of the other problems, problems of young people who are playing football and it's so easy to get a birth certificate, Mr. Speaker, that would allow a person to play under an assumed name. I believe that when they are playing in a particular age group, I think that there has to be the control of having an identification card with a picture for proof of that person.

I really could cite lots of stories that would be in favour of identification cards, Mr. Speaker. I think that I'm also speaking in favour of a bill against increasing the age on drinking. I believe that the age of 18 is a suitable age for drinking and a proper identification would give that proof of being of mature age, age of majority.

So, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on two bills. I'm not quite in agreement with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in his proposal. I don't think that he's gone far enough. I believe that it shouldn't be a person's choice; I believe that it should be compulsory. Unless there is amendment that would make it compulsory, I don't think that I would be supporting his bill because I believe that it is better than the present system, there's no doubt about it, to the Honourable Member for Elmwood. But I believe, as I spoke against raising the drinking age, I stated that the government must provide some identification and I believe it to be compulsory. I'm not sure whether, as the honourable member stated, that it is better than nothing but not much better. I believe that the government, and I've accused the government before and I'm even suggesting today that government has got to take some action in providing these identification cards.

Maybe just as a sidelight, Mr. Speaker, I think that the cards should be paid for by the actual people who have to use the cards themselves and without making it a prohibitive price, I think that the price should be reasonable and there could be a few dollars into the coffers of the Provincial Government. I think, in fact, with those few dollars, we could put it into alcohol education where we seem to be a little bit short of money and I would be prepared to support a bill that would allow the government to have compulsory identification with a proper picture.

I've kind of ambled on, Mr. Speaker, just to give you my feelings, and I guess I've jumped from place to place but, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, I'm in favour of having a compulsory identification card. I don't think that the resolution before the House goes far enough and I'm going to have a little bit of a problem as to whether I'm going to support it but I don't believe that it does go far enough, Mr. Speaker. With those remarks, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, earlier when I spoke on the bill that's being put forward by the Member for Emerson to raise the drinking age to 19, I singled out as one of the problem areas in our liquor laws presently the enforcement of the drinking age. At that time I suggested that it might be helpful if we had a picture on our driver's license so that we would have an official government document with a picture on it, a photograph which is easily verifiable as the individual so that we could control some of the under age drinking. or we could stop some of this swapping of identification cards just before you go into the pub and things of this sort.

I still feel that way and I feel it's a major problem but I'm not so sure now that we want a government authorized card and that we have to have a compulsory card. I notice the Member for Radisson thinks that we should have compulsory identification of some sort. I'm a little more fearful of things of this type. I'm fully aware of what's happened with our social security cards and our numbers. I can recall, it was back in the late 1960s and I wasn't all that old but I was a high school student at the time and I was following public affairs, I recall that the then Prime Minister who was Mr. Pearson, assured us that the social security cards and the numbering system would be kept confidential and it was for the government only and there would be no abuses of it. Just yesterday when I was reading in the paper, I noticed that the RCMP, when testifying before the MacDonald Royal Commission, admitted that they were using it as a means of identification to keep track of Canadians moving from province to province and that they were using it in their activities — and these were activities against political organizations — and against criminals and that it was their considered opinion that if they were forced to stop using the social security card that it would, in a major way, deter their ability to fight crime. Now I'm not arguing that with them right now; I'm just suggesting that when a thing starts it snowballs. I'm a little frightened of that. So I'm very aware of the problems.

I'm also aware of the problem we have with under age drinkers. I know the problem is serious in under age drinkers but I'm not so certain that it's that serious a problem that we want to open ourselves up to what I would call state abuse of our individual freedoms. Now, we may have to have pictures on our driver's licenses and that is something I will have to make a decision on at the time, to see whether it does more good than the potential harm. However, the resolution we

have before us, I don't think it changes very much, changes the present situation, because presently the Hotel Association will make available to anyone who wants, for \$3.00, an identification card. The problem is that it's only available in one obscure location, somewhere on Notre Dame, and I apologize to the Member for Winnipeg Centre because it's probably in his riding. I'm sure he wouldn't identify the particular third story office as obscure. Maybe he does identify it as obscure. At any rate, it's difficult to get. I think what an intermediary step might be on behalf of the government, we could undertake to see if we couldn't come to grips with this problem without having to force a compulsory identification card on people. —(Interjection)— The member says it's not compulsory. I think it would become compulsory. I think that's the only way it could become a —(Interjection)— No, I think that it would become compulsory. When you start something like this, it would . . .

A MEMBER: If you didn't have one you'd be left out.

MR. DOMINO: Yes, people would start asking for it and you'd have to get it. It's only available in one location at this time and I don't know, I think probably the same argument could be used against the Hotelmen's Association card in that if it becomes widely accepted and widely asked for it too will become almost compulsory. However, I guess a person could always refuse. If they looked kind of young they could always refuse to go to the pub. That would be one way of getting around it. But it's only available now in one place, and it's not well publicized. I think, if the government was to hire more liquor inspectors, this is a problem we have, we don't have enough liquor inspectors. I have a man who works in this capacity who lives in my constituency. He tells me that they very rarely get around to enforcing the law because they're so grossly understaffed. I think it's something we have to consider. We have to consider finding the money to hire more liquor inspectors so that we could enforce the laws we pass, because that's the problem I think. If we were to increase the penalties to hotel owners and to people who had occasional permits so that if the liquor inspector arrived and he found some people under age the penalty was more severe, I think that would be the incentive to start selling these cards on the premises, so that every hotel would sell the cards and the government wouldn't have to be worried and bureaucracy involved in this, the hotel owners would do it. I don't think now our laws are strict enough and I don't think there's enough enforcement.

For instance, this man who works as a liquor inspector assures me that if you take out an occasional permit the chances of you having a liquor inspector drop in are absolutely nil unless, of course, the police notify the Liquor Control Commission in advance that they suspect there will be an excess amount of drugs, or that they expect rowdyism. I think the liquor inspectors have shown up to two or three of these occasional permits, the functions where they are using an occasional permit in the last year, out of hundreds of thousands. I would be very very careful not to play into the hands of the Hotel Association and reduce the number of occasional permits because any group that has a monopoly always wants to tighten its monopoly or near monopoly on selling of alcohol. I think it's a legitimate function to let social organizations and community groups and ethnic groups and private individuals have these occasional permits and I would fight to make sure that they continue to have that right, but I think we have an obligation to enforce the laws and that probably means if we take out an occasional permit you should expect to have a liquor inspector drop by and make sure that you're living within the law.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member will have 15 minutes when this subject next comes up.

The hour of being 5:30 I'm leaving the Chair. The House will return at 8:00 o'clock in Committee of Supply.