

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 1, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 13 students Grade 8 standing of the Stedman Special School at Fairford, Manitoba. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bjornson and Miss Geisler. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George, the Minister in charge of Autopac.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports ay Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions; Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management and House Leader) (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you proceed to the adjourned debates on Second Reading, starting with Bill No. 43.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On a point of order. I didn't hear you call oral questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I think the record will show I said "questions" and I waited . . .

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member didn't hear you then of course we can proceed with the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I direct the question to the First Minister. I don't know who the acting Minister is. Is the Minister aware that the Chairman and the Board of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission has instructed the General Manager of the Hog Marketing Commission to refuse deliveries of hogs from farmers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board is chairman of a board that is elected by the producers and presumably any instructions he gives to staff of the board would be matters of policy such as are arrived at by a vote of the board elected by the producers.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well would the First Minister make inquiries as to why farmers are refused acceptance of loads of hogs when they bring them in?

MR. SCHREYER: Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will convey that to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. I merely point out that we do not have a Hog Marketing Commission appointed by the government, we have a producer-elected Hog Marketing Board. We have considerable faith and confidence that the producer-elected board will determine policy with respect to the sale of hogs that is in the best interests of those they represent.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. I wonder if the Minister will explain the particularly acute nurse shortage that is developing in particularly two hospitals this summer, where in the Health Sciences Centre we will be closing down 60 hospital beds and in the Grace Hospital we will be closing 20 or 30. It would seem for the very first time to become acute . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable gentleman is debating the question, not asking it.

MR. MARION: Well, will the Minister advise if he has surveyed the question and what can he report on it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I have not surveyed the question. I am given to understand that every summer a problem does develop because of summer holidays. Many of the nurses prefer to spend their

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . time with their families it being summer holidays for their children and their husbands and every year there is some shortage. I believe the difference this year is in the fact that the program of studies has changed at the university and the other teaching facilities so that they'll be graduating in September rather than in June which creates a temporary problem in the fact that they'll be coming on stream somewhat later than usual. But that's, as I understand it, the reason for this year's difference. However I don't think it's fair to say that this is the first time ever that the hospitals have had to face up to the fact that in the summertime it is more difficult to get nurses to stay in the summer months than in the winter months.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the same Minister on the same subject. Are there any government measures being contemplated that would alleviate this ever-repeating situation as the Minister points out, but which is it seems growing more acute?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the only government programs are the programs that are now available for studies, for diploma nurses, for degree nurses. They are not subject to restriction; they are wide open and hopefully more students will be attracted into the profession. That doesn't mean to say that come the summertime they may not prefer to take their holidays at that time as do many doctors and other people.

MR. MARION: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister been advised that the elective surgery list will now have to be backlogged probably a further three months, and what effect will this have?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the hospitals do not make this information known to me, they are not required to. That's a statement the member made, I cannot corroborate it. There is, as I said, invariably in the summertime some slowing down of the operations of the hospitals because the summer holidays intervene and there's always a slowing down generally of the procedures in the hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister tell us whether his Department is undertaking any special assessment of the employment requirements of summer students in view of the fact that the Canada Manpower Department now has over 3,000 applications for summer jobs and the summer season is just beginning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't hear the last part of the honourable member's question. I wonder if he would repeat it.

MR. AXWORTHY: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I'm suffering the dregs of a cold. Could the Minister tell us or has he made any special assessment of the seriousness of the employment situation for university students in view of the fact that the Canada Manpower Department now has over 3,000 applications from community college and university students on hand even though the exam period is not even over?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, not any special assessment as of this moment. However, I don't think the situation is any different at this time of the year than it was a year ago; and also I would suggest to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker that in view of the fact that there are a considerable number of applications for employees in the hydro construction areas in Northern Manitoba, that a request has been made to me to consider the possibility of bringing in outside help, offshore help, that maybe this would be an opportune time to make an assessment as to the availability of those who are students and have made application for employment to be considered to fill some of the jobs that in some quarters they feel that we should bring in outsiders. I want to assure my honourable friend and the House that the point raised by the honourable member is very very valid; I will be meeting, I believe it is on Monday, for quite a session with Canada Manpower and our own Manitoba Manpower Committee to have an assessment made as to the availability of help, as to whether it may or may not be necessary to import workers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable the Member for Morris asked for certain information in respect to the accessibility to the rather longstanding fund known as the Canadian Disaster Fund, and I've made inquiries. That fund still exists; the

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . the amount involved is very approximately in the order of \$2 million. The manner in which access to that fund by those who have suffered damage to personal property as a result of floodwaters is via the Flood Assessment and Assistance Board that has been established chaired by Mr. Elswood Bole. I understand Mr. Bole has been in communication with those who are custodians of that fund and so any persons who wish to claim or have, I should say, cause to claim can do so via the instrumentality of the Board headed by Mr. Bole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, if I may. The question that I posed to the First Minister was the criteria that was set out - that before anybody could apply there has to be a certain criteria established and what I wanted was that criteria. Part of that criteria is that it must be declared a national disaster; that's one of them but I think there are three or four others and that's what I would like to have on the record.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the criteria would be similar to those criteria which were applicable in let us say 1966 for example and on that occasion the procedure was to make claim via the Flood Assessment Board office that was even at that time chaired by Mr. Bole. The river or watersheds that are in the designated areas as designated by the Water Control Branch and the emergency order which was signed here some time ago in Manitoba, approximately two and a half weeks ago, do serve that criteria. I have asked Mr. Bole to keep me informed as to what if any additional instrumentality may be needed in order to meet the criteria under which that disaster fund operates. Thus far I've been advised that there is no anticipated problem. The matter is being dealt with much the same as in 1966.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the First Minister. Can the Premier give us an indication of what assistance municipalities that have had and are still facing huge expenditures due to flood damage, what assistance these municipalities can expect to receive?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in a tentative way to the House approximately two weeks ago and I can confirm now - I should say approximately a week ago and I can confirm now - is that the province will stand ready to reimburse municipalities under a formula which covers 100 percent of the cost incurred in certain flood protection works and removal of certain flood protection works, and 87-1/2 percent of a list of approved flood fighting and restoration costs. It goes into detail very quickly. Perhaps the best way in which to handle this would be to simply provide this information in written form to my honourable friend. But basically it is 100 percent of the cost of certain types of flood protection and removal works and 87-1/2 percent of the cost of repair of damage to municipal roads, bridges, culverts, municipal properties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also for the First Minister. Would the First Minister be prepared to have the sheet prepared as to how the costs are shared and distribute it to the members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Affirmative, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. I'd like to thank him for the answer to a question I gave him on Friday in connection with the impact of the high waters in the Qu'Appelle system entering the Assiniboine River, which I take from his answer is not a serious threat. I would like to ask him in that connection if the outlet to the Shellmouth Reservoir remains closed as of this date, I know that it was closed some two or three weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did report on the status of the Shellmouth Reservoir after the question the honourable member referred to. I'll look back on that and get him a copy of that report and I'll also indicate as to the present status which I'm not immediately aware of.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I have another question in respect to water problems for the Minister. With respect to the problem now being experienced as it has been over a number of years by certain cottage owners at Pelican Lake, I would like to ask the Minister if his offer

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . of January 1973 in which he offered his services in somehow resolving the problems that related to the maintenance of those high levels, if the Minister is now prepared to again make that offer to the municipalities in an attempt to eliminate this, what is apparently a chronic problem in the spring in respect to these water levels?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't remember the exact proposal that the honourable member is referring to but we did have a planning commission set up which made a report relative to the recommended structure that was needed without prejudice in any way to the province being required to participate in that which was regarded as a municipal problem. I understand that the municipalities concerned, and this is only verbal, have now accepted the suggestions made and I gather that the Water Resources Branch will be meeting with them to discuss their proposals for implementation. I have made it clear in all of my correspondence with them that this was not a provincial problem.

With regard to the problems experienced by the cottage owners, Mr. Speaker, I am advised that it is no worse this year than it has been in the past although I did receive some rather urgent calls over the weekend. I don't think that that's a consolation to the cottage owners but it also indicates that we could not take any drastic action which would affect other people. This thing is of longstanding duration. I believe that one of the big complaints that the people have is that the provincial government prior to 1969 made a certain installation which they felt should not have been made. Since then they have made numerous representations to myself, have also gone to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman has reported on the matter without in any way criticizing the manner in which it was dealt with by our department.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management. If he could take these questions as notice and advise if he can find out how many tons or thousand pounds of chloride were used on city streets and consequently found its way into the Red River this winter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I presume that the City of Winnipeg would make that information available to us. I'll try to obtain it for my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I address this to Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and first I would thank him for the report re Oil Well Abandonment Applications that I had asked for some two weeks ago. The question is in the same field. What is the approximate or target date for a new oil revenue sharing agreement following a meeting with the oil producers last week and, secondly, will it be announced this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not anticipate ever arriving at agreement. I expect that the government will legislate something which I rather expect will not be agreed to by the oil people although the problems raised with them will be taken into consideration in whatever legislation is enacted. I expect that the legislation will be forthcoming within the next month. I think that that encompasses the entire question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for communications. I would like to ask him whether he will tell the House on what date he will make his CRTC presentation known to members of this Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make clear to the member that there is a distinction between a presentation and a discussion paper. It was a discussion paper that I had mentioned that I would make available to members of the House before that was made available to the press and public. I expect that the discussion paper will be available on the 8th, 9th or 10th of May of this month.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The question is, what authority does the Hog Marketing Commission have to refuse to buy a farmer's hogs when he's brought them in by truck right to the Commission's yards?

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question has been asked and has been answered as well. It's just a repetition to another Minister. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I was intending to rise on this particular point. I gather the Member for Portage did put the question to the First Minister who did not have a complete answer. I should like to point out to the Member for Portage that we are experiencing problems of over-delivery on given days and it is the intent of the board as I understand it to try to level those out in such a way that would result in a better marketing position for the producers.

The flood situation has created some extra deliveries which the board was incapable of handling or housing during that critical period of time. They do have limited facilities and therefore the carryover potential is not unlimited. I should like to point also that in Ontario they are having the same problems and their board also is advising producers to withhold deliveries for periods of time in order to, a) bring about greater stability in prices and, b) a more regular flow of product to the market.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Then I put the question to the Minister. For the particular farmers in question who have brought in at expense to themselves hogs for market and were refused and had to take them back home, is there any compensation for this?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm of the impression, and again I want to tell the honourable member that the Hog Marketing Board functions autonomous from the government, they are not an arm of the government. But my impression is that they have distributed material or have publicized in some way the need for farmers to withhold deliveries to some extent. Now if in spite of that advice they have been receiving more product than they had facility to handle then I presume that is a problem that they have to deal with and are dealing with as best they can. But that is a matter solely within the jurisdiction of the Hog Marketing Board, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister, and it relates to the increased price of gasoline that will affect all the people of Manitoba. When can the people of Manitoba expect an increase in their price of fuels and what subsidy do your government expect to give to the users of fuels in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with basically a similar question or series of questions in the past month. The date upon which an increase in the price of motive fuels is likely to come about is something that was announced rather definitively in the House of Commons on or about the 1st of April. At that time it was indicated that there was approximately a 45-day time period in which the price of motive fuels would be cushioned by the distributors and refiners. And that on or about the 15th of May there would be across Canada west of the Ottawa River or west of the Borden Line, same thing, basically, an increase in the price of motive fuel that would reflect the increase in price allowed at the wellhead. I have heard nothing to indicate any change in that prospect. It still looks like it will be on or about the 15th of May. And that is largely if not in fact completely, Sir, out of provincial jurisdictional control.

Insofar as any possible cushioning of this price increase to consumers within our province I've indicated that to the extent to which we are able to obtain additional revenues from the producing oil fields of Manitoba, to that extent there would be an application of revenues directly and completely for the purpose of cushioning. And that I've estimated in the past could be something in the order of three cents, it may be marginally less than three cents a gallon to certain motive fuel uses.

MR. McKELLAR: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will this money also be applied to all farm fuels that are used as well and also all fuels that are used for heating, heating fuels, or is this only going to apply to motive fuels?

MR. SCHREYER: This applies to motive fuels, Mr. Speaker, motive fuels that are now subject to taxation, gasoline and diesel; and also with respect to the so-called purple fuels, but not beyond that. And it is on that basis that we estimate that it may be possible to apply three cents, or it may be in the range between two and three cents in terms of cushioning. But that will be announced in a more definitive way when legislation is introduced.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Can the Minister confirm the government will continue to fund the Parkland Regional Library Services past the July 31st date?

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, it would not be in order at this stage to indicate government policy beyond July 31, 1974 because the Order-in-Council that was accepted a few weeks ago indicated continuing support until July 31st. It is my intention by means of a study that is being conducted now to have before my colleagues and I within a few months a recommendation in regards to a more comprehensive library system in the province that would include the Parklands, and hopefully that a new policy could be adopted prior to that date and that they'll be informed of the results prior to the termination of those funds that have been made available to them. Within the Estimates of the Department the honourable member will notice that there is an amount beyond the 21,000 given to them.

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

MR. MARION: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise if he has determined what portion of the funding will be made by the municipalities within these various regions when the program is extended?

MR. TOUPIN: No, not at this stage, Mr. Speaker. That is to be part of the study now being conducted.

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

MR. ADAM: My question is for the First Minister. I would like to ask him, there appears to be some difficulty of farmers obtaining summer diesel fuel, they may not be able to obtain fuel prior to the increase, I'm just wondering if there's any possibility that the deadline could be extended somewhat on that account?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the honourable member's question correctly, he's asking if it's possible for farmers to obtain supplies of summer grade diesel fuel? Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to get more detail on that question before I attempt to answer it.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines, to do with his responsibility for flood problems. The farmers affected by the spill at the Portage Diversion, the Minister said that he expected they would be compensated. Will their compensation be 100 percent rather than by the normal flood formula for overflow of rivers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my impression is that that flooding problem would not have arisen except for the presence of and use of the diversion and the spill in the diversion. That being my understanding, the province would want to see to it that a formula applied for compensation which would deal with the loss incurred. Now there could still be an argument about what the loss incurred was but the province would like to deal with that as a separate case involving people who would not have been flooded had it not been for the flood control works being utilized.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago or about a week ago the Member for Lakeside who isn't here at the moment, but hopefully members opposite will inform him, put a question as to the numbers of pounds of turkey product that was sold to Trinidad at what they alleged at that time I believe was four cents a pound. I want to state for the record, Mr. Speaker, that we have tried to trace any transactions as between Canada and Trinidad and we find that there was a transaction away back in November of 1972, according at least to the Federal Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce but not involving necessarily any product from Manitoba, at least I'm not aware of the involvement of this province. At that time 30,000 lbs. of turkey wing tips were shipped for a value of \$7,164.26 which indicates an average price of 23.88 cents a pound, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: For wing tips?

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Virден.  
(Stand)

Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for Virден.

MR. MCGREGOR: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West. Pardon me, I'm sorry. Last day I did indicate the Honourable Member for St. Boniface had 15 minutes left. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that there were just a few comments that I had left to make, and they dealt, Mr. Chairman, with the rail relocation possibilities for the City of Winnipeg. I think that once again this matter of rail relocation has been reactivated, particularly by the federal agency which will be the basic agency funding the relocation program. It would seem to me that the legislation which was passed through second reading yesterday in Ottawa further makes the possibilities for the City of Winnipeg enticing and encouraging. I say that, because I think that the amounts of money that are being made available to those cities who want to participate in this program have been doubled to start with. I think that also some of the conditions with respect to the funding have been made even more interesting.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the City of Winnipeg was first in line for the funds that are presently being made available because of the fact that a very voluminous study was made that detailed perhaps, if I recall correctly, four basic alternatives. It was decided that of those four a number of sub-amendments could be made that would further expand the amounts of options that were available to the City of Winnipeg. It is important it would seem to me having said that there is this kind of funding available by the federal agency, it would seem to me that the Minister might take under advisement the possibilities of specific meetings between the province and the City fathers to arrive at some decisions with respect to the rail relocation program.

I realize that with respect to relocation in suburban areas, in the former suburban areas, there has not been a great deal of unanimity and I think that perhaps a great deal more research has to be done before adequate programs can be accepted with respect to rail relocation in these areas. But I do think that there is one particular area where it is not necessary to dally any further before exercising some leadership; and I refer specifically to the Canadian Pacific Railway yards right in the heart of our city. It would seem to me that here some concrete and constructive dialogue could be held between the city and the province with respect to the advisability of undertaking this program immediately.

Now I think that one of the basic reasons why the City of Winnipeg has not acted is the amount of funding available or the financial arrangement that could be made available to the city by the province itself, the role that the province would be interested in partaking in this rail relocation, particularly in this area of the rail relocation program. Now I say that because following a question that I put to the First Minister, I believe it was a week or so ago, the First Minister had mentioned that there were sums of money and I think that the amount that was mentioned at that time was some \$5 million that could be used for this kind of a program. Now I would be the first one to agree that the amount in question is certainly not going to be sufficient for even this particular relocation program if it ever is to come to pass. But it certainly would be a start in the right direction and I think that the First Minister has been one who has always listened very intently to any reasonable suggestions made by the City of Winnipeg.

I think that it is important that initiatives be taken and perhaps these initiatives do belong

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MARION cont'd) . . . . with the province because right now we're talking about the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass. We're talking about funding a bridge construction program that could become a total waste of money in a short period if ever we were to come to grips with the rail relocation program. And I would ask the Minister responsible and the First Minister, to invite the City of Winnipeg to come to some meaningful talks with respect to at least that portion of rail relocation. There are some programs that are rather interesting in the way of amusement for the people of this city and these programs have been brought to the knowledge of the city fathers by the group that head Manisphere and it would seem to me that aside from an urban renewal program in this location, and aside from the fact that there would be some arterial requirements, the kind of program that Manisphere were talking about would lend itself very very well to the parklike setting that could be created with the relocation of the rails in the CPR yards.

So I would think, Mr. Speaker, that I have addressed myself to one of the areas that is of a great deal of concern not only to the people who live in the inner city because they are more so affected, but as a resident of this new City of Winnipeg who has this kind of a divisive boundary, artificial boundary, right within its midst that serves nothing but to detract from the natural beauty that could be made were the rails relocated and we have to start this program somewhere, surely this is the most important part and the most meaningful part to the entire City of Winnipeg and I would strongly urge the Minister to give this his attention and his initiatives with respect to further dialogues with the City of Winnipeg in the area of rail relocation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, it's been a common response from members on this side that the current estimates of the Minister in the Department of Highways are if anything on the low side and there have been many ways in which the members on this side have attempted to use a yardstick on them. I see that there is approximately a ten percent increase in dollars in respect to the comparison currently with last year, and this might be in a sense a way of saying that you're spending about the same amount in purchasing power this year on highways as you did last year.

Now, examining the road tax, that is the tax on gasoline, that might be one way of comparing the increase in usage of Manitoba highways over the previous year and we might say that there is about six or seven percent increase in usage if the amount collected in gasoline tax is a fair reflection of the increase in traffic. So, Mr. Chairman, I would think that it is a fair criticism to say that maybe the department in terms of spending on maintenance and in construction is not quite keeping pace with what might be considered to be the increase in traffic.

Another general reflection that might be made on the Minister's position which I think hasn't been mentioned is one that occurs to me, that he occupies a fairly comfortable chair in the front bench in the government side, and I think that throughout the session he has perhaps had as comfortable a position in respect to the questions and the comments of the Opposition as any member, and it might be something to concern himself with that maybe it becomes a little too comfortable and perhaps the First Minister might consider a switch with the Minister of Autopac perhaps just to make sure that the Minister is fully occupied with his talents.

But, Mr. Chairman, after hearing the last three or four members discuss principally those problems that relate to the inner city, that is within the perimeter, let me take the debate once more beyond that point and discuss matters relating to roads beyond the City of Winnipeg. I am one whose fate it seems to be to travel perhaps more than 100 times a year back and forth on No. 1 Highway between here and Brandon and have a personal knowledge of almost every little bump on that road on every turn. And one of the things that impresses me, Mr. Chairman, is that in our anxiety to build modern all-weather roads the part which perhaps in features most nearly approximate that objective would be the road between the two river crossings between here and Portage la Prairie. Mr. Chairman, it is also a fact, at least from my experience, that that part of the road is the least usable in terms of weather of all of the parts of the Trans-Canada system, even though it is the latest in construction. And it seems to me that when we have difficulties in travelling due to weather on the highways in Manitoba that that stretch of road most frequently presents difficulties.--(Interjection)--The part between the two river crossings between here and Portage la Prairie, the divided highway section. Now most of these difficulties occur during the winter months and most of them are due to poor visibility, and it would appear to me that the reason is that there is no windbreak, no tree



## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . growth on either side of that road for many miles in which to prevent ground drift and thereby to minimize the drift and the restrictions to visibility. I frequently found in my experience, and I'm sure it's the experience of most people who spend a lot of their time travelling the highways, that this part of the road, the Trans-Canada system in Manitoba, is probably the most frequently tied up by reasons of weather.

Now, my question would be to the Minister whether his department in its planning has taken note of this fact, whether they are preparing any kind of planting program that would prevent and perhaps reduce the number of times that that road is dangerously impassible because of visibility restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, there is another part of the Trans-Canada system that concerns me particularly and it is the area between the west junction of Highway 1A and 1 at Kemnay, Manitoba and extending beyond the Town of Alexander. I think it is not an exaggeration to say that there are specific areas in that section that are the most substandard of any parts of the Trans-Canada system, certainly in Manitoba and possible as far west as Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, I brought to the attention of the Minister a year ago a hill in that section that's known locally as Hall's Hill and suggested that it appeared to be a hill that required a passing lane. I think the report of his engineers was that the grade did not come within the minimum which they considered necessary for the construction of a slow traffic lane on the outside. Nevertheless it continues to be perhaps an area of the road that is considered by those who use it regularly as relatively dangerous. But, Mr. Chairman, the part of the road in that area that I feel is most substandard is that area immediately west of the intersection of P. R. 250 and Trans-Canada No. 1, and in that area you have an "S" turn - I think I might describe it as an "S" turn - where there is a change of elevation on both sides of the top of the turn. Now as a result of a very tragic accident last fall I believe the Department has put two solid lines all the way through that S turn.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very dangerous piece of Trans-Canada construction. I know it is not the responsibility of this administration, this was built before the present administration came to office. I have no idea the reasons for this strange road confirmation in this area. It seems to me that it could have been made with one twenty or thirty degree change of direction and become a straight highway from the point running roughly west south west and picking up the Trans-Canada Highway just west of Alexander. I've been interested in this area because of a series of accidents which have occurred in and around that area, and I'm not suggesting that the contours and the construction and the roads conformation generally are totally responsible for those accidents. That is not the case. It must always be a combination of driver problems and perhaps a situation that makes those driver errors somewhat critical.

I wrote to the Minister in October in an attempt to determine just what the frequency of accidents was in that area. Mr. Chairman, these letters were written on my behalf to the Minister in October of 1973 requesting the breakdown in the number of reported traffic accidents in the area from Brandon to Virden. The latest letter from the Minister's Department was October 26th in which it was advised by one of his engineers that during the period January 1, 1968 to January 1, 1973, there were 295 reported traffic accidents occurred between Brandon and Virden. Now the only other figure that he was able to give me was that there were a total of 2,149 reported accidents on the Manitoba portion of the Trans-Canada Highway. So that I'm unable really to get a figure which would enable me to compare the accident frequency on that particular area of Trans-Canada with a comparable length of highway elsewhere in the province. But while it is difficult to obtain these figures I would expect, Mr. Chairman, that they are obtainable and I would very much like to have a complete answer to a letter that was written to his department in October of 1973 so that we might really understand what the accident frequency is and in some way try to relate it to this area of highway which in my view is considerably below the standard of other parts of the highway.

Now again, Mr. Chairman, the department is working I think within the limits of its budget to extend the divided highway as rapidly as possible across the whole of Manitoba and I think it is your projection to perhaps reach and pass that difficult and dangerous McGregor turn perhaps by the end of this year. I'm assuming that's it, I think there was something in that connection reported by the Minister last year.

Mr. Chairman, I would be interested to know whether or not it's the Minister's intention to proceed westward with the divided highway or whether he would then jump to another urban

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . area, specifically by the Brandon area and perhaps extend the divided highway on either side of Brandon say 20 or 30 miles. Again my experience on this highway is that as you approach the larger urban centers the density of traffic rapidly increases and it's likely to be relatively free of traffic between McGregor and Carberry, and then from Carberry to Brandon and I suspect from Brandon on to Virden the density would again increase.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is not already programming that kind of highway development for Trans-Canada No. 1, I would commend it to his attention that there be an interruption perhaps of the divided highway west after he passes McGregor and then perhaps jumping to the urban area of Brandon and begin extending on either side of Brandon so that the high density areas can be relieved as quickly as possible within the limits of the Minister's budget.

Mr. Chairman, the other matter which I would like the Minister to explain or perhaps comment on is one that relates to departmental policy and the use of government vehicles by employees. I'm talking now specifically about the Department of Highways and the use of government cars by the employees of the Department of Highways, and I'm particularly interested in the policy as laid down by the Minister for the use of those vehicles by employees off duty and on weekends. I would also like the Minister to explain whether or not fuel is supplied for these cars by the department when they are used on other than government business. I have no reason to believe that such is the case but there have been questions which have come to me by taxpayers who are anxious to know what the defined policy of the department is.

I would also assume, Mr. Chairman, that the department has a policy which is consistent with other departments of government in this respect. If this is not the case of course again perhaps he would use the opportunity to explain what government policy is; and perhaps as a member of opposition I should know and understand that completely but I must confess my ignorance. I'm not clear on what the policy of this government is, precisely in respect to the use of government cars by government employees.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are really the major points. I am not suggesting that the second point in which I mentioned the use of vehicles is a major one. I am more interested in the relationship between safety and the construction of modern highways in our province and to know what the Minister's plans are with respect to the further extension of the divided highways on Trans Canada No. 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess as one of the last speakers, Mr. Chairman, I'll be repeating quite a few of the things that the other members have spoken about; however, each member I believe in the rural, and everywhere else, have their own little hang-ups about what particular pieces of road they would like to see improved. We certainly are quite aware of the fact that budget won't permit as much as we would like to see; the only thing that we can hope is that we do get our fair share and that our road system inevitably increases or it becomes better. This is one of the departments that we certainly will not be complaining about the size of the money or the amount of money spent. We'd be only too happy if the province was in a position whereby it could be doubled. But this again will not be coming to pass.

We in the rural area are especially concerned now with the fact that next year we are going to have the rail abandonment take place. I think we're reasonably sure at this time that a considerable amount of our rail lines will be abandoned, many of our elevators will be closed down. This in turn will mean that we will have to be putting bigger trucks on the road carrying heavier loads, and it's going to put another strain on the existing roads. We would like to see some of our main arteries upgraded, possibly even paved if this is possible, because in my own particular area any of the roads that are paved they seem to hold up very well. The soil texture in many areas is quite sandy; it will really hold a road.

I think No. 4 Highway between Neepawa and Gladstone is one example, and another example would be the 260 road from Plumas to No. 4 Highway. This is one particular stretch of road that I would like to see improved and if possible a continuation of the blacktop from north of Plumas on 260 where it terminates north, even as far as 261. This is one of the areas of my constituency where people are going to have to haul their products further and that road, as I think the Minister and the department will be aware, is very hard to keep up. It's quite sandy, it blows away, and regardless of whether you clay and gravel it, it still seems to be an awfully hard road to keep operating.

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd)

Another road that I would like to see a bit more work done on, and one that I receive considerable complaints about, is maintenance on No. 352. This again is a road that's built on the . . . ridge. It has a gravel base and it's extremely difficult to keep the washboard under control. I don't know whether even an oiling or something to this effect would hold it in the worst spots but it can be graded and if the traffic is very heavy within 12 or 14 hours it's right back to where it was before, and it's awfully hard to keep a vehicle intact on it I can tell you. And I'm receiving many complaints to the fact that the trucks can't keep their tail lights working, etc., and they get on the highway and they have the fellows with the yellow stripes writing tickets for them.

Another think that I would like to bring up, Mr. Chairman, is the right of way. My good friend from Brandon West is trying to talk the Minister into stopping the construction of the boundary of my constituency and bringing it to Brandon, but if this comes to pass it comes to pass I suppose, but I would like to see the land acquisition, the planning and design through on the right of way so that the people that are involved can relocate their buildings. There are several very concerned people on this route. I've taken it up with the Minister and he has been most receptive to the suggestions, but again the staff possibly is not large enough to complete these deals, and in many cases there are considerable negotiations have to take place before the actual purchases can take place. I think that this would be one of the things that I would really press the Minister for, would be the fact that all the right of way can be purchased as quickly as possible and the relocation plans given to the people so that they can if they have to build new houses, new barns, etc., that they will get this done with a minimum of upset. The spring of course is when, and during the summer season, is when this would have to be done because basically they don't want to be moving and building in the wintertime.

I don't think I have anything more I would like to say at this time, Mr. Chairman. Those have brought up the few points that are of immediate concern and would hope that the Minister would take a look at them and do what can be done to improve the circumstances. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's not my intention to be very long at this stage of consideration of the Minister's estimates. I just want to put one or two remarks on the record. I apologize for the fact that they may be regarded as heavily parochial but I think the Minister may go along with me from the point of view that it is necessary of course, Mr. Chairman, from time to time to register the particular points of view of one's constituents as effectively as possible on some of these questions and make them available for the consideration of the government. If they sound parochial, they're not intended to be; that's all a part of the process that we all understand.

There are three specific topics that I would like to make reference to and on which I would like to underline the concern of the constituency of Fort Garry in large part and those, Sir, are Highway 75 from the Perimeter Highway south of Winnipeg to the United States border, and the proposed St. Vital-Fort Garry Bridge, and the whole topic of railway relocation within the perimeter and within the Winnipeg city limits. They're subjects that are of considerable concern, as I've said, to my constituents, and on two of them in particular I would just like to urge the careful attention and the conscientious attention of the government. Those two are the St. Vital-Fort Garry Bridge proposed and the question of railway relocation.

The other subject, Highway 75, is perhaps not the subject of quite as much controversy but I would like to import the government once again to do something as soon as possible about a widening program for Highway 75 south to the border, because it is one of the most important routes from the point of view of the tourist industry that exists in our province, and it is badly in need of widening so as to accommodate traffic safely and efficiently.

We are all aware of the importance of the tourist industry. We are all aware of the kind of promotion we direct from a tourist and travel point of view to the upper mid-western United States and the citizens of that part of that country. And from that point of view Highway 75 becomes crucial and of the utmost importance to the kinds of things that we want to do in the tourist industry field. That being the case it seems to me, Sir, that a ready-made argument exists for continual supervision of the condition of Highway 75, for continual upgrading of that artery, and for continual emphasis on improvement and good repair. The route is for most of its course, as the Minister knows, a two-lane highway, and in view of the fact that it is of such

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . importance in terms of bringing tourists in here from the United States, I would ask, as I've asked in the past, that he and his departmental officials address themselves as soon as is practical and possible to a widening program that would extend that highway to four lanes and make it not only efficient but safe.

I think the point here, Sir, is not simply that the highway is not particularly efficient from the point of view of accommodating incoming tourists because of its limitation to two lanes, the point here is that it's not particularly safe because of that condition. There are times on that highway when traffic is moving in an almost bumper to bumper stream in both directions. There are certainly pockets of activity along the highway in which there is that kind of proximity of vehicles at many times during the summer, and at many times during weather conditions when driving is relatively hazardous. Such as in early and late winter periods. And I think that the suggestion of four-laning that highway commends itself to the Minister and this government without my having to re-emphasize and repeat the argument, and I feel certain the Minister would agree with that, and I hope therefore that he will find it possible in the very near future to act on it.

Now the other two points, Sir, are points of controversy with my constituents, as I say, and I would only ask this, that insofar as they are concerned the Minister and his colleagues and his departmental officials sit down and listen to the people who would be affected by the two developments I'm talking about, and conscientiously take their viewpoints into consideration. Those two are the proposed St. Vital-Fort Garry Bridge and the entire subject of possible rail relocation within Winnipeg.

On the first of those, the proposed St. Vital-Fort Garry Bridge, I am fully aware of the arguments that can be made for that kind of a structure and the beneficial effects it would have as far as traffic flow is concerned upon the whole transportation picture within metropolitan Winnipeg. But I would just remind the Minister that there are many residents in the area on both sides of the river who would be directly affected by this kind of a development, and who are deeply concerned about the effect and the impact that such a bridge and the attachments in terms of egress and access routes would have on their neighbourhood and on their property and property values, and on their lifestyles, and on the safety of their children.

I think in the main their concern is an economic one. What kind of effect, possibly devaluing effect, would that kind of development have on their properties? But that's a legitimate concern for people to have, and it may well be that some of the proposals for a bridge in that area are more elaborate, call for a more elaborate structure, call for a more elaborate spaghetti, if I may use that term, than is necessary. I simply urge the Minister to have impact studies undertaken, thorough impact studies undertaken, before granting the approval of his government to any such development, and to listen to the concerns of the residents who would be affected.

The other subject, Sir, is the one known as rail relocation, and on that point I would remind the Minister of the many meetings that have been held by residents in that part of Fort Garry who would be affected by one or two of the railway relocation proposals. He is aware of meetings that have been held by residents throughout the metropolitan area on this subject, I know. I would just remind him that some of those meetings have been held by people who live in the University Heights area of Fort Garry, many of them being fairly expensive homes and properties, and that some 400 of them felt exercised enough about some of the impressions that seemed to be developing on the subject, to make an appearance at Winnipeg City Council Chambers last year to state their case and to register objection to relocating a mainline railway artery in their area, as proposed under one of the relocation plans.

I know that there are residents in other parts in Winnipeg who have suffered from the proximity of rail lines for some time, and I sympathize with the kinds of effects and impacts that that situation has had on their lives. It's not as if people in Fort Garry are not aware, or not exposed to that kind of thing because there is a rail spur heavily utilized by freight trains that runs on the west side of Pembina Highway, parallel to Pembina Highway, throughout almost the entire length of Fort Garry, as the Minister knows. And so people in my constituency have had some exposure to the proximity to rail lines and know what it's all about and, as I say, they, and I, sympathize with those in the central and north central parts of Winnipeg who have had to put up with that kind of inconvenience for many many years. The question that we ask, however, is what merit, what sense is there to any plan that would take a railway line out

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . of one residential area and move it into another residential area? There seems to be no logic and no common sense to depressing and devaluing a residential area that has not had to experience that kind of an effect up to this point in time. It's admittedly unfortunate that some areas have had that depressive effect, but it seems very illogical and unreasonable that any movement, any relocation of railway lines should contemplate taking a line out of one area that is residential and moving it into another area that is residential in which the property values are quite substantial, and as a consequence devaluing and depressing that area. This is what would happen under one of the proposals that calls for relocation involving the University Heights area of Fort Garry. I just want to register once again for the record the strenuous concern of many of my constituents on that subject.

It's not just the people who live in that particular area, Sir; I think that people in Fort Garry generally, and in the south end of Winnipeg generally, are agreed on the illogic of moving a rail line, any rail line, into that residential area, or any residential area, that currently is free of such an inconvenience.

We would like to propose that this government, insofar as its role and its responsibility in this matter is concerned, take the position that rail relocation to be rational, to be justifiable, must call for relocation outside the urban area, outside the developed urban area of what is known as Metropolitan Winnipeg, and I would apply this proposal to any urban area in the province facing the same question. Hopefully the government and the Minister will proceed from that rationale, that it is highly undesirable and appears to be nonsensical to relocate within the urban areas.

Some people have suggested that it would be good enough to opt for relocation outside the perimeter highway. Unfortunately, and here I suppose my parochialism comes into it once again, I can't subscribe in full to that argument because it's conceivable that you could relocate a rail line outside the perimeter highway and still be within the urban constituency of Fort Garry. So I have to urge the Minister to go even further and not simply to go beyond the Perimeter Highway, but to go beyond the built up settled urban areas in any such program.

So that's the substance of the remarks that I want to make at this juncture, Mr. Chairman, and I recognize that they in substance perhaps have been made before by other speakers in other years in consideration of the estimates of this department, but they have to be made again because all three subjects are still the topics of study and consideration. There are still pending developments with respect to all three of those areas to which I've referred, and so I feel constrained to register those perspectives once again for the record and ask the Minister to take the feelings of the people concerned into consideration before giving the support of this government to any program involving any of those three subjects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a few brief comments on the Department of Highways and the Minister's estimates, and to start out by congratulating the Minister on the handling of his portfolio; and also congratulations to the staff, and particularly on the - I know that the department is faced with a great number of problems because of the heavy spring runoff this year, and I understand as of last Friday there was something close to 90 provincial roads closed or out of operation because of washouts and other problems. However, I think that the department, and particularly in my constituency the Dauphin Branch, has been doing an excellent job in trying to get these roads back open again and as quickly as possible. Some of the problems however are - the water is so high that they have to, they do have to wait until the water recedes a bit in order for them to put some of these bridges back over the creeks and rivers that are swollen because of the heavy runoff.

I'm just wondering, some of the - I'm thinking of the road to Crane River. Now there's two bridges that are washed out, and I'm just wondering if it's because the bridges were not anchored properly, or how they were constructed in the past, or were they just sitting on piers or what? But it seems to me that a little bit of water comes along and away the top of the bridge goes. I'm just wondering if there isn't some method that we could anchor these bridges down a bit so that they could stand the heavy runoff.

I know there's about 15 families there that are isolated between 276 and the six-mile corner leading into Crane River. Now Crane River was completely isolated from the - they were unable to get out from the south through Eddystone, but that has since then - there's a temporary crossing there somewhere and they're able to get out from the south, the Crane River

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . are able to get out. But the last word I had from the engineer at Dauphin was that the 10 or 15 farmers that are east of Toutes Aides are unable to get out, and the last information I have is that they were going to try and put in a couple of pipes over the First River east of 276 as a temporary measure, and later on they would reconstruct the bridge, and I hope that somehow they can anchor them down that they can stay a little better.

We do have a few problems as far as plowing in the wintertime. There seems to be some difficulty there, whether it's the different jurisdictions, different departments - I recall, I believe I brought this to the attention of the department last year insofar as 261, Highway 261 was concerned. There's three jurisdictions there and there seems to be a lack of co-ordination between the three districts, Minnedosa, Portage la Prairie and Dauphin. I would like to bring this again to the attention of the Minister and see if we can't get some co-ordination insofar as getting this road plowed out in the wintertime.

I'm pleased to see that the department, and we are going to start land acquisition right-of-way on 261. This is certainly a road that has to be upgraded. I feel that Ste. Rose constituency is now getting at least a reasonable share of the highway construction and maintenance in the Province of Manitoba, particularly since 1969 there's been a good improvement there, and I'm not saying that we're getting any more than anyone else but we're certainly now getting our share of . . .

Now you know we are quite content to leave the Member for Fort Garry have the - what is that big building up here? - the Arts Centre, the museums, and all those facilities. We're quite happy to contribute towards those things for the people of Winnipeg, but we out in the country, we want our roads; that's a big thing.--(Interjection)--Well, I see the Member for Morris is agreeing with me. Roads are a big thing in the country because people are isolated; they live far apart now, and they're further and further away from one another and they have to communicate. So we're quite happy to--(Interjection)--Well, the No. 1 Highway is a federal road; I believe the Federal Government is contributing to No. 1. Nevertheless, I'm quite happy, particularly in the last three years the amount of construction that's going on in our constituency.

One of the problems that we do receive quite a few complaints on of course, and I'm sure the Minister is aware of it, is the Red Deer Point Road, and I don't know what we can do about that road, but we are getting complaints on it on plowing and maintenance on that road. So maybe we can come up with an answer on that one.

One of the things I would like to suggest to the Minister, and I know - I see we have a new chairman. Congratulations. One of the problems that I see, that we spend thousands of dollars every year, the department does, in picking up beer bottles off highways. This is sad because you know that the people who throw out bottles as they're driving along in cars are paying thousands and thousands of dollars to have men pick these bottles up. I know that some people drive along the highways and pick up bottles, private citizens, but by and large you have to send a crew out to pick beer bottles and other bottles, of course, cans, and what have you; but this is costing the province thousands of dollars. I would like to suggest to the - I know it's very hard to police; it's very difficult for the Law Enforcement Officers to police the throwing of bottles. There's not supposed to be drinking while they're driving, but it's done, throwing bottles out, and I'm just wondering if the Minister would perhaps impress on the Liquor Commission to increase whatever it is on the return, the bottles, the empties anyway. I don't know what they get now, maybe 30 cents a dozen, but I think that should be increased to 60 cents a dozen. And perhaps these bottles at least have some value, maybe the fellows won't throw them out, maybe they'll keep them and return them in, because I know that this is costing the province a lot of money and we could better spend that money on maintenance and construction of roads rather than hire people to go up and down the highway every summer picking up bottles; that's just ridiculous. Perhaps the penalties for anyone doing this or caught throwing bottles out on the highways should be increased as well and maybe that might assist the Law Enforcement Officers to stop the stupid practice of doing this. Not only is it dangerous, some of the bottles don't even roll off in the ditch; they stay on the road and you run over it with tires, and it's a dangerous thing. I'm sure everyone will agree that something should be done.

However, these are only the few comments I would like to make, and once again I want to thank you, Mr. Minister, for giving us Ste. Rose people a little consideration. Thank you very much.

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a few remarks on the department. And first of all as a newcomer to the Legislative session it's rather strange for me to see departmental estimates moving along so smoothly and hardly a harsh word being said to the Minister, and this must indicate something, that he's either a good Minister or else it's a very non-controversial department. And I would think that he certainly deserves some credit for the manner in which he's putting his estimates forward.

I think possibly the thing that has toned down some the criticism that might have been coming his way was the fact that he gave out some information prior to the opening of his estimates and let the members have a look at it. It certainly makes for better informative discussion, and cuts away some of the doubts the members may have in their minds, so with that, I would certainly offer my congratulations to the Minister and the officials of his department. They seem to have been doing very well up to this time.

But I just want to mention something that has been brought to my attention. I have no concrete proof that it will develop, but I've had indications, and that is the Grant Avenue possible expansion, or . . .

A MEMBER: . . . allegations in here without proof, you know that.

MR. PATTERSON: . . . development. Well, the Honourable Member for Morris, I appreciate the information. I'm certainly always glad to receive your advice and guidance and I certainly take cognizance of it at all times.

But the Grant Avenue proposals, as I've listened to them from people in the constituency, and there is some concern about it, I've heard of widening Grant Avenue, constructing an elevated expressway, etc., and as these projects are usually funded municipally and provincially, it does become of some concern to the Department of Highways in the Provincial Government, and I just want the Minister to take note of that. If there's any plans in his books for Grant Avenue, I would certainly like to become aware of them.

I know there's been some talk about building a bridge across the Red River at the foot of Grant Avenue coming out into St. Vital, and out on to No. 1 Highway that way, and it would seem to me that this is a possible necessity. The traffic in that area is starting to congest, and I think that in the not too distant future that there has to be some consideration given to a bridge across the Red River at the foot of Grant Avenue. So we'll watch for the developments in that area. The bridge is something that the people desire, but the development of Grant Avenue is something that we're concerned about because of the things that I mentioned.

Also I would like to second the concern presented by the Member for Fort Garry on Highway No. 75. This highway has been a problem highway, I would think, since it was built, and I helped build it in 1948 and '49, and I had good and bad memories about building that highway. I don't think it was a year old or so before we started getting complaints about the highway. I really can't recommend to the Minister anything that would be economically feasible to improve that highway, but I think it's time that we did give some serious consideration to building a second highway in conjunction with Highway 75, have a boulevarded highway. We'd have a four-lane highway, one going north and one going south, and then the argument would be, which one would go north and which one would go south. Do we want the tourists coming in to have the good road, or the tourists going to have the good road? Because to make Highway No. 75 a good highway would be a tremendous cost, and I don't know if it would be the best thing to tear it up completely and rebuild it, or to try some type of resurfacing of the highway. But I'm sure the Minister is aware of this problem, and I am quite aware that the officials of his department are knowledgeable of the cost involved, but I would think within the not too distant future that we must do something with Highway 75 if we are to promote and have the tourist industry of Manitoba continue to grow because this is where a large part of the tourist industry of Manitoba comes into the province and surely we have an obligation in that area.

In regard to rail relocation, whenever it does come about, and if it does come about, the province is going to be involved to a certain degree. But I would suggest to the Minister that this is an area that I recommend that we go slow in. I don't advocate a quick jump into rail relocation. I don't want the public purse to be picking up something that the railways should be responsible for themselves. I think the railways have a plan, and I'm not sure of the number of years involved, but they're looking at relocation themselves, and if we're going to help them, or do it for them, then that's just relieving the financial burden on the railways. So I'm one

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . . that says go slow in the relocation of rail lines within the City of Winnipeg because of the tremendous costs it would bring on the public purse. I think everyone's well aware of how much public money has gone into the railway operations in this country up to this point in time, and no doubt we're going to continue to put money into railway operations, but in this area it would seem to me that the railways have to pay somewhat more of a share of the cost load than what has been indicated up to this time.

The McGregor Street Bridge: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface mentioned that, and he kind of indicated that we should not proceed with that project. Well I can't altogether agree with that assumption. Possibly we would be standing here ten years from now and saying the same thing, that we shouldn't build the McGregor Street Bridge because of the rail relocation. Well I think the people of the north end deserve somewhat a better fate than that. I would think that the McGregor Street Bridge should be built, and in fact it should have been built before now. Because even if we relocate the rail lines there's still going to be need for some type of transportation between the north and core center of Winnipeg. It doesn't necessarily mean to say just because we move the rail lines out of there that public housing, or what have you, is going to fill the gap. There could be other types of things where we still need the overhead transportation. So I would suggest that we get on with the building of the McGregor Street Bridge and make it a structure that would fit into the future, not be a structure that would just be something that would be built as a temporary nature to relieve the traffic congestion in that area at the present time, because if anyone travels to and from the north end on a daily basis they can appreciate the need for the McGregor Street Bridge.

There has been much mention of commuter trains. Well at the present status of the railway facilities in Winnipeg, commuter trains would not be feasible at this time. There just isn't the rail lines; there just isn't the organization within the railway structure to put commuter trains on. You will recall - what was it? - five or six years ago the commuter train to Transcona was discontinued because of poor support from the public for one thing, and the other was the cost of maintaining the commuter train. So unless the railway system has a vast overhauling of its policies and thinking and lines that would be built that would be feasible to commuter transportation, in my opinion it's something that we can't consider at this time; it's certainly something that the province can't take on to start building and financing commuter trains. So I would hope the Minister wouldn't pay too much attention to that particular argument.

In public transit, this is a problem that Winnipeg is faced with and the province as well because it is the joint effort of moving people within a heavy populated area, but in order for public transit to be of any success at all, number one, it has to be relatively cheap, the fares have to be low, the service has to be fast, the service has to be on a continuous basis and available pretty well 24 hours a day to all areas of the city. So when you're looking at an improvement of our public transportation system and considering those points the cost is staggering. The public transportation system is not an easy one to solve because of the want for the people to drive their cars back and forth to work. It's a convenience to drive your car to work, and if that convenience maintains its economic viability then it's going to be very difficult to get the public transportation system into operation that would be able to move the citizens of Winnipeg on a daily basis. I'm sure that the Minister hasn't allowed too much of the funding of the department to be allocated to that particular aspect at this time because there just doesn't seem to be any concrete proposals to make our public transportation system what we all think and hope that it should be. I think possibly the fact of operating an automobile will bring about the improvement of public transportation more quickly than anything else. If the price of gasoline goes up, if the cost of insurance, the cost of repairing, and the general cost of operating an automobile becomes prohibitive for the average citizen to drive back and forth to work, then that's the day I think that you will see the public transportation problem become more real. We will be able to solve it; we will be able to allocate the funds to improve it without the great public backlash against spending huge sums of money on public transportation.

I would just in closing like to request the Minister to take some cognizance of the trash and garbage situation along our highways. I know we have the orbit cans situated along the highways but I have often wondered as I drove along our highways and byways what kind of a program did we have to empty the trash from the cans. Was it too costly to implement a good regular service? Was a good regular service able to be maintained? Was it always the responsibility of the Provincial Highways Department to attend to those trash containers? Because



## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . . I've seen them just overloaded with trash sitting around them and on top of them, and what have you. But I'm sure the Minister will take note of that and advise us of the policy in that regard. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): I just have one brief question, Mr. Chairman; I thank you. Regarding the petition, I'm sure that it came from people along P. R. 482, the Dropmore community. It's dated the 11th of April and directed to the Minister, whereby they asked - I think your plans are to improve 482 to the Shellmouth Dam - and in this petition the people wondered if it was possible to extend it up to the Village of Dropmore, three miles, I think it's another three miles. Maybe the Minister would comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, at first, coming on the second time - the other day it sort of caught me short anyway. Firstly I'd like to compliment the Minister on his style, and I think that this could well set a pattern for future Ministers in their estimates because it certainly reminds me of years gone by when our Highways Minister went through his estimates and never got up until everybody had had his crack at him and wanted an answer. And I think this would indeed speed up the hours if our purpose here is to try and speed this up.

One of the problems that I missed, and I don't believe anyone has touched, is the load limit. In talking to interprovincial truckers this is a real problem. When they come to the Manitoba border they have to cut their loads down, and I'm thinking now mainly of No. 1 which most of the truckers, a lot of the truckers use.

The other thing yesterday morning I was at my hotel and a Dr. Kelly that works within the Department of Health in Northern Manitoba was staying at the particular hotel I stayed at, and he had phoned in the night before for airport limousine service - and this has to do with Unicity - and as I walked along he was getting in and he got out of the cab, and I never told him who I was - he doesn't know to this day - but apparently Unicity now almost doesn't have limousine service. It was the seventh time he had phoned in for limousine service to come the next morning. They came with a cab but not a limousine, and I think this is - that gentleman took the bus rather than bother with the cab, and I heard the hotel man phone back to both witnesses. So that's a problem I think that could be straightened out without a great lot of work.

And also where is the route from Thompson to Gillam? I understand there's clearing there, and is the money for this clearing hidden in Capital Supply? Where is the spending of the \$10 million in Capital Supply? This is not in the estimates. Is this a slush fund? Why is the Highway Department building roads to haul hydro projects? Is this indeed maybe in the agreement?

A road that's fairly close to me is 259. While over the years I've got a fairly good share of the expenditures and I can't complain, I am not getting very much or the Virden Constituency's not getting that much this year, and I'm thinking now of 259, that chunk of highway west, Provincial Road west of the Rivers Airport known as Oo-za-we-kwun, because there is many expanding industries there and not all their load and their traffic comes east; a good part of it goes westwards onto the paved end of 259 through Virden and westward on No. 1. This road, that part of it that isn't hard surfaced, certainly is, probably not the worst condition, but it is in very bad condition. While there's nothing this year, I would hope in the not too distant future the Minister would see fit to extend that blacktop from 21. It goes three miles now onto Oo-za-we-kwun. I think that's all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, I just have one or two comments to make. I wouldn't want the Minister's estimates to go through without having asked him once again to give consideration to the construction of the interchange and the overpass at Roblin and the Perimeter. The members on this side are complimenting him for the fine job he's doing with the department. I think that he must have missed a meeting when they were setting up the budget because he got a very small increase of \$6 million, where Health and Social Development is \$50 million or 25 percent. I think if some of that money was put on to our major transportation in the province - a big problem we have not only throughout the City of Winnipeg but on every highway that you head out in any direction from the City. And if we expect Tourism and Recreation to be the big money drawer in our province I think we have to cater somewhat by giving them highways to drive in and out of our province on. Not only the

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. MOUG cont'd). . .construction but the maintenance throughout all the recreation areas is terrible. There's washboard on most of our roads into our lakes that scares a person to take a car that's drivable in there.

One thing I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is if he would explain one-half of the increase of his budget went into one department, Driver Licensing and Vehicle Registration. It's up over \$3 million from six hundred and some odd thousand dollars. I'd ask for an explanation on that because I think that department is looked after by the Minister responsible for Autopac, and if this is another \$3 million that should have been with the Autopac loss it is something that I'm sure we're all interested in finding out..

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I must say that I'm rather shook up today, or ever since yesterday really when I saw the estimates coming out, and I saw that Rhineland at long last had received some recognition - I hardly know where to start. We're not used to any road building going on up in our area. So it's rather difficult for me to begin.

But there are some areas that I would like to comment on and one of these is that the No. 75 Highway has been creating quite a few problems, and one of them is due mainly to the large amount of traffic that there is on this particular highway. Now there is one way that we could eliminate a lot of this traffic on 75 and put a little bit more onto the No. 3. At the present time most of the traffic from Winkler, from Plum Coulee, and the whole area south of that area, is taking the No. 75 because to take the No. 3 they have to make a detour. If we were to concentrate on the 248, extend that over to the No. 23, which already is a concrete road, and take the No. 428 and do the same thing with the No. 428, and then the No. 336 which goes from Kane to Sperling. If we would take those roads we would be eliminating very much traffic away from the No. 75 Highway and putting it on to the No. 3, which is a good highway at the present time.

I would also like to make another comment at the present time on the condition of the highways. The No. 14 is in very bad condition, and No. 3 is in bad condition from the junction of No. 14 and No. 3 to Carman; and the No. 30, which is the highway from the border past Altona and up to No. 14. I would hope that the Minister would consider putting in concrete roads on these roads. At the present time, again we are in this situation where we have road restrictions on these roads, and so very much of your produce coming into the city is handled by these roads, and what you have again, now, is you have two trucks going out to where the concrete starts at Rosenfeld and they load it on to one truck, the other truck goes back. The same thing when they come out from the city, somebody has to go out there and meet them and come back. Now with the volume of traffic and produce being hauled out of that area, I am sure that this would warrant your consideration.

We are talking here a total of 60 miles of concrete, which really isn't all that much but you sure would be doing a lot to alleviate the situation. I know moneywise that it may seem like quite a bit, but I hope that the Minister is going to take this under consideration because this is needed and it is urgently needed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Just briefly, I know the Minister wants to reply, but if he hears somebody allude to the overpass in my constituency, I just would like to put a few comments on the record at this point in time. I wish that this thing could be resolved. For 16 years it has impeded progress in my particular constituency. But nevertheless, my inclination at the moment is not to be too enthusiastic about a McGregor Street overpass. Unless there are better arguments made in the future, while the Minister is making up his mind about provincial participation in that particular endeavour, than have been made in the past, I would be inclined to oppose it.

One of the things that I would like to draw to colleagues' attention in the Legislature is one of the reasons that we moved to implement the City of Winnipeg Act was to establish in the area communities, and hopefully within these communities that the services that people had to travel through the core area would be established in the communities, for example the Seven Oaks Hospital. If that ever gets into place it will relieve the congestion somewhat.

The movement towards rapid transit. It seems regrettable to me that in some areas we have to, you know, like lemmings rush into the sea, we don't take advantage of the experience gained in other areas to avoid some of the mistakes that have been made. The Toronto experience

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BOYCE cont'd). . .with the Spadina Expressway is one of them. Now, coupled with that, there is of course, as everybody's aware with the energy situation, that people are really reassessing their transportation modes and the need for alternatives. So that I am still at this point in time rather reluctant to go along with the McGregor Street overpass, but nevertheless in the interests of the people in that particular community I wish a decision could be made one way or the other, because, as I say, since 1958 redevelopment of Urban II has been frozen, and one of the reasons it has been frozen is because of rail relocation and McGregor Street overpass and a few other problems. And at this point in time it would be desirable if we could ignore the two impedences and proceed to redevelop the community the way it is, and allow for future change should it necessitate a McGregor Street overpass or the CPR relocation. But nevertheless, because one of my colleagues did more or less support the McGregor Street overpass, I just wanted, as the representative of a community that's going to be chopped up in half by spaghetti works if this thing does go into it, I at this point in time oppose the concept. But nevertheless, I don't want to get myself in a box if the government introduces a bill and as a backbencher I have to support it, because unless some better arguments are brought to the fore than have been used in the past, I would oppose the McGregor Street overpass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek;

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Chairman, I would just like the Minister, when he gets up to make his comments, to comment on whether his department has considered, I guess they're called timers, that you find ahead of an intersection in B.C., and in some areas that have a bad intersection. The one that I have the most experience with driving back and forth is on Highway No. 1 and the by-pass at Portage la Prairie. And in some places in B.C. they have, I believe it's about a mile or half a mile before the intersection, there's a light there, and if you hit that light when it's orange, you know, if you travel the speed limit that you will make the green light on that intersection, or if you hit it when it's red you know that you're not going to make that intersection and it gives you an indication of slowing down; possibly it could be used on some of the bad intersections on the Perimeter and areas where we have had several accidents on intersections such as the one my colleague from Charleswood brings up. So I wonder if the Minister could comment if the department is looking at that system that is used in B.C. in some of the bad intersections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of comments made on the Department of Highways Estimates and I've got pages full of notes that I would like to - questions asked and opinions given - I would like to reply to, but I notice I've only got about three or four minutes, so I would suggest if it's agreeable to the House that we call it 4:30 and go into Private Members' Hour, and we'll begin tomorrow full speed ahead, if that's agreeable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we call it 4:30? Somebody suggested. . . While we're waiting, I just might remind that the extension time for filing Income Tax has been extended to May 21st. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee has considered certain resolutions, has asked me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

. . . .Continued on next page.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 26

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. The first item is Resolution No. 26. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris:

WHEREAS the Civil Service Task Force Report recommended changes in the Civil Service Act,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba give consideration of the advisability of amending the Civil Service Act to:

- 1) Give women the opportunity of serving on the Civil Service Commission;
- 2) Undertake an aggressive, "affirmative program" to ensure equal employment opportunities within the Civil Service;
- 3) Restore full authority to the Civil Service Commission and staff members, with records and facilities existing in management committee in regard to government employees transferred to the Commission;
- 4) Provide more adequate budget and staff for the Commission, including equal employment opportunity, officer positions, in the areas of recruitment, selection, classification, development, and training.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is a little hesitant in accepting this in respect to the fact that we have already had discussion and debate, and decided in principle in respect to the Civil Service. I would like to have guidance from the floor. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the point that you raise I think can be dealt with in the knowledge that the proposed resolution that is now before the House contains suggestions and amendments to the Civil Service Act that are not contained either in the Speech from the Throne or the Bill that is currently before the House. The proposed suggestions in this resolution do not in any way conflict with the bill that has passed the House just recently and is now slated for Law Amendments Committee. The rule of the House, of course, is that amendments to the Civil Service Act, to the existing Act that is before the House, can only encompass those amendments that are contained in the Bill itself, and if we were dealing with something that was dealt with in Bill No. 7 then of course the resolution would be out of order. But since this particular resolution is dealing with matters that are not included in Bill No. 7, I feel that the resolution should be in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I appreciate the honourable member's point of view. I haven't had any from the other side. But our Rule 58 says a motion shall not be made if the subject matter thereof has been decided by the House during the same Session. Now I believe the Civil Service Bill, even though it was an amendment, did include the fact that people could discuss the principle from one end to the other, and that was the latitude that I allowed during the debate on that particular amendment to the Civil Service Act, and this resolution again introduces the same topic. Would the Honourable House Leader care to comment on that?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did note the resolution. It is not covered in the Throne Speech but I think that you're quite right in suggesting that the real question is whether there is opportunity for debate and whether the issues have been debated or are within the rule which permits debate to take place, and if they are then the resolution would not be in order. I'm not making a strong pitch on it but if Your Honour is of the impression that the matter was within the purport of the bill that was introduced in the House and could be dealt with by the honourable member, then it should not be ruled in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before you make a decision on this I would hope that you would consider the way in which our rules have operated and the way in which we have operated within Committee, particularly Committee of Law Amendments, where most of the bills find their way. The practice now, and this was not the practice in the past, was there is no ability on the part of a member of the committee to bring forth an amendment to a bill that does not

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . .deal with the substantive matters that have been brought by way of the original substance of the bill itself. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the position now taken in Committee is that no member can move an amendment that does not deal with the substantive sections of an amending bill. If a bill is brought forward amending a particular Act, then the only matter which we can deal with in Committee is the substance of the bill and, if I may, I will recall and bring to your attention the fact that the Auto Insurance Bill was brought back for consideration and there were attempts to try and amend other sections, and the ruling at the time was that the decision was that we can only deal in those matters that were before us, those substantive matters. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while there may have been the opportunity to debate in principle, because this bill is in fact a money bill and will affect the Consolidated Revenue of the province, there is no way in which the members opposite are in the position realistically to introduce amendments dealing with the spending of money with respect to this particular bill. And the opportunity that has been presented, Mr. Speaker, by this resolution, is the opportunity for the House, if there is agreement on this principle - because this principle is not the same as the other principles that have been brought forward - if there's agreement on this principle, to show its resolution on that matter by passing it and by indicating the consensus of the House, and that consensus, Mr. Speaker, would then give the opportunity for the government to take whatever direction it feels it should take from that passing, or the passing of the resolution, and the consensuses that have been expressed.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if a ruling is made that would suggest that you cannot deal with any other matter, or any other substantive matter, in connection with an amendment to a particular act, but only can deal with it on the discussion of the substantive portions or the principle of affecting other acts without the ability on this side or our ability to be able to amend other sections of the act, that you penalize the opportunity for this House to be able to express its consensus and for this House to be able to debate matters. Now the problem, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the equality of the Civil Service for women, was not one issue that was dealt with in the Act itself, and unless there is this opportunity for some kind of resolution to be resolved at, the government I believe will not have the direction that it should have from this House, and there is no ability on our part to be able to amend the existing Civil Service Act in Committee when the present Civil Service Act comes, because the Chairman, following the procedure of the past, will rule that out of order because it has not been brought forward in a substantive way by the government amending their present bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Well again I want to indicate that the Chair has no hesitation in allowing as wide a latitude in debate, but let me indicate that one of our rules is that there shall be no repetition, and I also read Rule 58 that a motion shall not be made if the subject matter thereof has been decided by the House during the same Session. Now, when we were discussing Bill 7 there was total latitude in respect to principle. I can agree with the honourable member that there was no mention at that time in respect to amendments, but those who were debating could have mentioned that there were omissions in respect to amendments that should have been made. But to again go through the exercise of debating it under a resolution is the question that I place before the House, and if I get no real direction then I'm going to have to let it go. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I offer a suggestion for what it is worth. If the wording of the resolution were changed slightly to say: "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of," and my substitution would be: "making it government policy to"--"making it government policy to."

MR. SPEAKER: Well, since I'm not getting a direction, the Honourable Leader may proceed.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have before me the report of the Task Force on Equal Opportunities in the Civil Service of Manitoba. It was published in January of 1974, and I will make considerable reference to it in dealing with this particular matter. But I must indicate, Mr. Speaker, and I indicate at the very beginning, that the same Task Force report produced by the government also referred to a study undertaken by the Secretary of the Planning and Priorities Committee of 1972, which was to examine the relative positions of more than 10,000 men and women employed by the Manitoba Civil Service. The purpose of the study was to determine the effects of sex on employment within the government service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that report - that report, Mr. Speaker, has not been given to this

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . .House. We do not have that information. We have, Mr. Speaker, the information of the Task Force report; we do not have the report of the Secretary of the Planning and Priorities Committee; and I think, Mr. Speaker, that is important, because I think this would add to the information that would be available to us for some decision as to where we really stand and as to what. . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I on a point of privilege. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: In reference to the point raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, there was an Address for Papers - I believe that that was the motion of the Honourable Member for Swan River - for the production of this internal document, and it was decided by the House that it wasn't in effect actually an Address for Papers, but I gave to the Honourable Member for Swan River, and to the House, or--yes, to the House, an undertaking that after the document that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is referring to had been considered by Cabinet, that as a courtesy to the House that that document would be forwarded to the Honourable Member for Swan River and for the information of members of the House. So my privilege really, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition, is that he's really incorrect; it's not the withholding of information. And it was agreed to by my honourable friend, if I understand correctly, my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, that he accepted that I would defer producing this internal document until such time as the Cabinet had an opportunity of considering the same. It's not a deprivation of the contents of the document, but rather the timing as to when it will be made available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, in reality the Honourable Minister's debating at this point the--(Interjection)--Well, I think that the information only confirms what I said. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this report, which he now indicates is being considered by Cabinet, which was a report completed by the Secretary of Planning and Priorities Committee and which was referred to in the Task Force report, is not available to us, and it. . .

A MEMBER: It is.

MR. SPIVAK: . . .and it makes it--it will be available. It is not available. . .

A MEMBER: It is.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, it is not available to us now--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member may mention his point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: that it is not a requirement under the rules of the House that I, as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, has to table that particular document. What I have done is out of courtesy to the Honourable Member for Swan River, to say to him that this information will be available after consideration by Cabinet. There's a difference between that and what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is trying to imply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There's a difference of opinion. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. You know, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would have been happy if we, as government, would have dealt with the Hedlin Menzies report that they demanded, in the same way that he talks about. I wonder if he would have been happy, Mr. Speaker, if we would have said, "Well, that Hedlin Menzies report that everyone is asking for on that side, was really something that we'll undertake to give after we in Cabinet have dealt with the matter." Would that have satisfied him? No, Mr. Speaker. No, because that's what happened.--(Interjection)--If. . .had asked for it, it would have been fine. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says that would be fine, but the fact is that that was exactly what was happening. That matter was being considered by Cabinet. . .

MR. GREEN: No. No.

MR. SPIVAK: It was so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he doesn't know what he's talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader state his point of order.

MR. GREEN: The position of the Conservative Government at that time was that the document would not be made available to the members.

## RESOLUTION 26

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the point that I made is that it was being considered by Cabinet, and the position that would have been taken, it was being considered.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister, you know, keeps repeating the same record. That's not the point. The point, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Government of the Day would have taken the position that the Honourable Minister of Labour did today, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would not have said it would be okay. That's hogwash. That's pure hogwash.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I never even said, at the time, that it wasn't right for the government to conceal that report or to retain it if they wanted to, only on the basis that they have presented a bill to ask us to become part of the administration.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the point that I tried to make right from the very beginning is that in dealing with this particular matter, until that information is supplied it makes it difficult because it's a . . . battle, it--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Labour, who we have to suffer under, will at least allow me to make a presentation and I will allow him to make his presentation, and I want to assure him that, unlike him, I will not interrupt for a very good reason today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Now, I want to refer, if I can, to Page 2 of the Task Force Report, and it says and I quote: "In its recent major policy document, The Guidelines for the Seventies", -- does anybody remember The Guidelines for the Seventies? Yes, that was announced before the election. Three volumes, several hundred thousand dollars. Well, "In its recent major policy document, Guidelines for the Seventies, the government indicated its acceptance of this role." And I quote from the Guidelines: "As a major employer, the Manitoba Government and its various agencies must set a clear and decisive example for the private sector by employing significant numbers of the disadvantaged in socially useful and individually meaningful jobs."

Mr. Speaker, the government, realistically, here in Canada, in the other provincial and federal public service, have followed the trend that was indicated in a report in England, which essentially stated that it has really been influenced by the trends outside, and it has not in reality, in terms of its attitude to women employees, set trends itself. And, Mr. Speaker, I think in dealing with the Task Force Report and the onus on the government with this report, we now have reached the point where it is important, I believe, for the government to act and to set a particular trend. You cannot ask for equality and for opportunity for women with respect to employment in the private sector, without first putting your house in order. The report of the National Civil Service League states that there is a relative lack of women in high level positions. "A much more ambitious effort must be made to help women achieve their goals. The problem of equal opportunity for women is far more fundamental than merely filling posts at the top, though." Mr. Speaker, it is at the middle and lower echelons of the Civil Service - and I'm going to indicate some statistics in a few moments that are available to us - when grave disparities between the number of women and men occurs, and I suggest that it will take a concerted action on the part of government to reverse this imbalance.

Now from the Task Force Report - and most of this is contained on Page 19 of the report itself: Women comprise approximately 44 percent of the Civil Service, and about half, 49 percent of the female civil servants hold administrative support jobs as compared to only 13 percent of men, and all but six percent of the women in administrative support are in the clerical series. Only seven percent of women are in the professional category as compared with 25 percent of men, and even fewer than half of one percent of women are in managerial category as compared with six percent of men.

Now this is from the statistical data that we have, and this indicates, Mr. Speaker, the imbalance that occurs. "If you look at the distribution in another way, it appears that almost 75 percent of the administrative support positions are held by women and almost one half of the service jobs are held by women; and it is clear that women dominate the lower occupational levels of the Manitoba Civil Service. The medium annual salary range of women is about \$4,000 to about \$5,400 or \$5,500.00. The medium annual salary for men is about \$9,000 to

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . .about \$10,000.00. Men and women in the same job classification do not receive equal remuneration." And that, Mr. Speaker, is found in the Task Force Report.

There's a reference on Page 29 of the report to the Human Rights Commission, and it states that the Manitoba Human Rights Act, passed in August 1970, forbids discrimination on the basis of sex and employment practices and advertising.--(Interjection)--Page 29. I'm sorry that the Attorney-General's not here. It would appear that we haven't had meetings of the Human Rights Commission for the last six weeks. It appears as well, from the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, that there have been requests to the Human Rights Commission that have not been dealt with, correspondence has not been maintained, and that's taking into consideration the strike; it has nothing to do with that. And one has to question whether realistically the Human Rights Commission addressed itself to the Human Rights Act as it applied to government; and then of course one then goes back to the time of Mr. Trevor Barrie and the problems of his either firing or leaving the Human Rights Commission, and the allegations--(Interjections)--and the allegations and charges that were made with respect to that.

On page 11, Mr. Speaker, of the Task Force Report, the National Civil Service League, who assisted in the preparation of this report, recommended that: "The present divided central authority for personnel administration should be integrated by restoring to the Civil Service Commission the powers and functions for a total personnel program in the Manitoba Government. Further, the staff members' records and facilities of the Management Committee should likewise be transferred to the Commission." And it refers in the same page, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of that paragraph, and it says that the virtues of the Civil Service Act were somewhat diluted by a transfer of certain Civil Service Commission powers to the Management Committee of Cabinet.

Wherever practical, Mr. Speaker, departments should arrange for promotion boards to consist of both men and women, and that, I believe, would break down the anti-female attitudes, and that is one recommendation that I believe should be incorporated. The Civil Service should have a woman on the selection committees.

"The Manitoba Government should provide for a more adequate budget and staff for the Civil Service Commission, especially in the area of recruitment, selection and training in connection with new programs, and provide for affirmative action on equal employment opportunities."

"The Task Force recommends that the government, through the Civil Service Commission and the operating department, should design, implement and evaluate more innovative programs."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on quoting from the Task Force Report. I only have five minutes left and I'd like to, if I may, deal with what the government has done with this report so far. This report is far-reaching and it has significant implications in an age and a time when there are many woman activists who want to see change and who are looking for leadership and are looking for the signs of change in attitude by employers and by society as a whole. And government has a unique opportunity here, a unique opportunity to lead; it has the unique opportunity to demonstrate that it means what it says, and that reports and studies that are furnished are not really left to lie on the floor, as are too many of them at the beginning of the session, or to lie in dust upon the desk of some Minister.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one has to mention the fact that we've had a White Paper on Health that for all intents and purposes has not been dealt with by the government. We've had a White Paper on Corrections that has not been dealt with by the government. We have the Guidelines for the Seventies, that has not been dealt with by the government. We've had a Kierans Report, followed by a Task Force Report, and for all intents and purposes that report wasn't dealt with. We had a Barber Report on Welfare, and that wasn't dealt with. And so, Mr. Speaker, having said all of that, one has to at this point say to the government - and this is the purpose of this resolution - this Task Force Report should not follow, you know, the path that other reports and other studies commissioned by it have. It should not be ignored. It deals to a large extent with, you know, the necessity of fundamental changes that will be difficult within the Civil Service structure. But, Mr. Speaker, instead of addressing themselves, as they are, to many foolish programs and policies, instead of wasting the time that they have on some of the things that they have undertaken and instead of addressing themselves to the problems that they can cope with, they have at this point not demonstrated the kind of leadership that I believe should be demonstrated here.

Now the Honourable Minister may say that this is before Cabinet and that decisions will be



## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . forthcoming, but we have had one change with respect to the insurance benefits, which was applauded by this side and has been applauded by the community, and that change came about as a result of the recommendations contained here, and many other changes could come, provided, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to deal with them. And I don't think it was necessary, Mr. Speaker, for this session to be passed by before we dealt with the kind of proposals that I've suggested. There will be some difficulties, and I have no doubt that there is not a consensus within their own caucus, but having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate to put on the record--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is no consensus in their caucus, they must govern, they must deal with the report; I would be interested in hearing the different points of view that I believe do exist within their caucus, at least expressed here, so we'd understand at this point why this matter hasn't been dealt with. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, and I say this again, that the government on the basis of this report should allow this to gather dust. I think if they had shown initiative, had been concerned, that action could have been taken in this Legislature, and it may very well be that the Minister will stand up and say "we're going to do all of these things." Well, why not do it now? If we're going to do these things, do it now. If you're going to bring about these changes, let's start to cause them now. If we're going to deal with the problem - and we say that this problem is one which we accept as being identified correctly - then let's act now. And for once in their lives, let them at least take some initiative instead of letting events basically shape their policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I admire about the Leader of the Opposition and that is his ability to stand up in the House and say, "Let us do it now." I know that my honourable friend objects to some of us on this side of the House suggesting rather than, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, let's do it now, he objects to some of us on this side of the House saying to him and to his party, "Why didn't you do it when?" And I suppose that's in the game of politics a fair stance for the likes of the Honourable Member for River Heights to take. He had the opportunity, when he was one of the front benchers of the Conservative Party, to establish a task force to consider the matter of equal employment opportunity for women and the disadvantaged in employment, and they didn't do it. And I note my honourable friend is leaving the Chamber because he doesn't want to hear replies to his criticisms, and it could be that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has a far more important engagement at this hour than he has here in this Chamber. I understand that there is some dinner or some social gathering with a bunch of Conservatives this evening and it's far more important, I suppose or perhaps--I shouldn't say "suppose", but maybe perhaps, for the Leader of the Opposition to vacate his seat in this Chamber and listen to what we are doing insofar as attempting to bring about equality of employment opportunities within the Civil Service, it may be far more important for my honourable friend the Leader of the Conservative Party to get out of here so that he can get on his tux so that he can attend a meeting of the Conservative Party of Manitoba and maybe meet some of the other characters with whom he is associated politically and who have a lesser degree of concern insofar as equal employment opportunities of the Civil Service in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has been kind enough to refer to the particular meeting that the Leader of the Opposition is going to, I wonder if he would give the name of the hotel and the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know. I believe an invitation was extended to me, which I have rejected on a matter of principle, to attend the gathering. And I'm sure that my colleagues on this side of the House, and I would imagine even the caucus of the Liberal Party, would say, "Thank the Lord, Russ, you have more common sense than go to a gathering such as that," that I was invited to.

But my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition suggested in his rambling remarks the possibility of a Task Force on Equality of Employment Opportunity gathering dust on the desk of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service of the Government. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and members of this Assembly, that this isn't so. Very graciously - and sometimes the Leader of the Conservative Party can be gracious, and it's so infrequent that when he is, of course, we have to recognize that - very graciously, he did say that we did bring

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . .about equality insofar as male and female are concerned insofar as life insurance premiums and policies and coverage is concerned. I appreciate his graciousness. He didn't say, Mr. Speaker, that since we became government we have brought about equality in payment to nurse's aides and nurse's orderlies. Oh no. His memory very very conveniently forgets those sort of things. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition very conveniently did not refer to the fact that more women have been promoted to more responsibility within the Civil Service today than at any other time in the history of the Civil Service of Manitoba. My honourable friend did not refer to the fact that the very involvement of a task force within the government to consider the matter of equal opportunities for employment was meant to be a directive to the government as such, and also through that to be an indication of our desire that private industry follow our lead.

That is one of the basic factors of the whole purpose. I know it's so nice for we mere males to stand up in this House and rant and rave about equalities of opportunity for our counterparts, the female sex. We know, we know of the report of the Commission that was established on the Status of Women at the federal level, but we went beyond that, Mr. Speaker. In the terms of reference of the task force established under the jurisdiction of this particular government, we really attempted to give to the task force a directive that this didn't merely discuss the matter of equality of employment opportunity between the male and the female. We went beyond that, recognizing that there were other people who are not being treated equally, or haven't been historically, not been treated equally insofar as employment opportunities in the Civil Service of the Government of Manitoba or in other public services as well, and in the industrial segment, the private segment either.

So the instructions and the terms of reference to the task force was not just simply to consider equal opportunities as between male and female, but to take into consideration those who were less fortunate than we happen to be, physically and mentally and all other aspects, and that was the terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, that was given to the Task Force on Equal Opportunities of Employment within the Civil Service. And I don't want to blow smoke up my own kilt, but I laid down, I laid down as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, that terms of reference should be broad enough to take into consideration all aspects of the community, and the terms of the reference, Mr. Speaker--and incidentally, "blow smoke up my kilt" is an old Scottish phraseology. --(Interjection)--And so it is in Ukrainian too. I think I could say it in Scottish but I doubt if I could say it in Ukrainian. But anyway, the terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, were to review the present employment practices within the Manitoba Civil Service; to determine the extent of the problem - that is the problem of equal opportunities of employment; to consult with groups who have an interest in the problem of equal opportunities of employment; to recommend any operational and administrative changes that may be necessary to facilitate equal employment opportunities; to recommend action programs required to assure equal opportunities in the Civil Service of Manitoba; to recommend and evaluate procedures to monitor progress in those areas where general policies have been agreed upon; and to take into consideration all aspects of equal employment opportunities within the Civil Service.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that many have commended the present government because, for the first time in history of this province, a government has been prepared to have an assessment made of its directives and its employment policies. I would say to my vacant, or absent Leader of the--well vacant from some place up to some place else - I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would say to the absent Leader of the Conservative Party that they had had the opportunity to make a self-assessment of their employment practices, but it was never done. --(Interjection)--Yes, I would say to my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek their talk's tough when you talk about empty chairs, but Mr. Speaker, aren't they even tougher when you talk about occupied chairs with vacant heads? And, as a matter of fact, that is one of the problems that we're having at the present time when we take into consideration resolutions such as have been suggested by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

In his resolution, Mr. Speaker, he makes reference, "To give women the opportunity of serving on the Civil Service Commission." I know that I cannot refer to past debates; I suggested a methodology by which this could be done, which was rejected by the Conservative Party. He suggests we should undertake an aggressive affirmative program to ensure equal employment opportunities within the Civil Service. That is one of the recommendations that we

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . are prepared to accept. Then he goes on to say, "To restore full authority to the Civil Service Commission and staff members with record facilities existing in Management Committee, in regard to government employees transferred to the Commission." Mr. Speaker, the legislation that was passed was legislation that was concocted by the Conservative Party of Manitoba when they were in power, and forgive me, Sir, and may the House forgive me, that as the Minister responsible for the Civil Service, I adopted and introduced, after an abortive legislative session, that legislation. Forgive me. I acknowledge the error of my ways. I should have considered a little deeper at that particular time. But today, Mr. Speaker, by the introduction of this resolution by the Leader of the Opposition, that he too should take the same stance as I now have taken and ask forgiveness for the error of his ways.

And then go on from there, "To provide more adequate budget and staff for the Commission to do the job to bring about equal opportunities of employment in the Province of Manitoba." I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that more people have more equal opportunities of employment in the Province of Manitoba under this jurisdiction than they ever had before. I would suggest that more women - just to use the fairer sex as an illustration - have been appointed to more responsible positions and higher positions under this administration than has ever been so in the history of the Province of Manitoba.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, it's so nice, it's so nice for some members, I presume, to go home at night and see their wives and say, "Darling I've tried to bring about equality between your sex and my sex and the likes of that," and gee, isn't that nice to be able to get a little more butter on your bread at night after you've said that? That is the stance, Mr. Speaker, of the Conservative Party, and I want to say too that I believe it's the stance of some of the members of the Liberal Party, that it's so nice to butter up the female sex, but there are more than just male and female who are requiring and need equal employment opportunity. There are the disadvantaged; there are the physically, mentally handicapped, and if, if the full purport of the recommendations of the Task Force, which is before us now, are adhered to, then all of us, males, females, physically, mentally handicapped, will be able to take their place in the world and will be able to have an opportunity in accordance with their ability to make a contribution to society.

That is the basis on which this government is on course with, Mr. Speaker; that is the reason for the terms and the recommendations made in the references to the Task Force. Sure we brought in, sure we brought in a few consultants from Washington, D.C. who had gone through this problem, who knew the problem of how many disadvantaged people because of race, colour and creed have been deprived of being real full citizens of the community. Our objective is not to try and butter up one segment, or one group in society, but bring about equality of employment opportunities within the Civil Service of Manitoba, and hopefully as a result of our actions and our thrusts that the public, the private sector in Manitoba as well, will realize that people are people and we are equals even though our capabilities may be somewhat different or somewhat off-scale in certain areas. This is the whole purpose of this and for the Leader of the Opposition to stand up and say what he said, and then like the Arabs leave the tent, I suggest is an injustice to the citizens of Manitoba, an injustice to the Civil Service of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this resolution is something that has already been debated several times in this House. I think we have had the opportunity, certainly during the discussion on the Minister's Estimates, to raise in fairly full and comprehensive fashion many of the proposals put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, and similarly the same kinds of comments were made during the debate on Bill 7. And I think it's a useful exercise, Mr. Speaker, to in many cases recant a little bit some of the discussions, and in many cases the exchanges, that took place during that period because I think they begin to reveal something that is of a peculiar character in this nature of the debate about women's rights in the Civil Service or equal opportunity rights.

To begin with I'd like to say that because of the nature of this Legislative Chamber any discussions that are made about women's rights places us in somewhat of a peculiar position because it's quite obvious to the naked eye that we are all males in this Chamber, and therefore it sets a certain degree of, I think, special stewardship. For one who is partially responsible for that condition I would say that that creates, --(Interjection)-- I speak of members who are allowed to debate in this Chamber - it puts upon us I believe a peculiar and perhaps even special

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . .responsibility to approach this matter of women's rights perhaps in a far less combative and far less insulting way than is the normal standard of debate during Private Members' Hour.

For that reason I think it was unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition in presenting this resolution preferred to take the tack in presenting it of attacking the government for what it's not doing, and for hidden reports, rather than trying to raise, I think, in a more open and more constructive way some of the problems involved in implementing the recommendations and bringing these kinds of conditions about. I don't think that the many women of this province who are concerned about the status, female employees in the Civil Service, would particularly give us much credit if we were to allow this debate simply again to degenerate one more time, or perhaps we should say back to the daily kind of good guys versus bad guys, or as we sort of like to say, you know there's the villains in the piece, and there's the heroes in the piece, and someone's always to blame, or someone should carry the burden of guilt.

Well I think in this kind of debate we all carry some burden of guilt. I don't think that it is in any way something that can be any one group, or any one political party can absolve themselves of any responsibility for not having pursued this matter with greater diligence in the past. And I think it's probably a matter of our own historical development that each generation, or each decade, sees a certain group in the population begin to mobilize, become conscious of discriminatory practices, begin to protest the condition under which they exist, and eventually seek some resolution of that.

And the strange thing that has happened I suppose in our own society is that in many cases the largest minority, and I maybe shouldn't use minority anymore, women, who compose 50 percent or better of the population, are just now in that peculiar cycle of developing a consciousness and awareness and now beginning to organize and mobilize or demand. I think what is particularly important at debate in the Legislature this year, and in the years following, is that we are now at a stage when the concern over women's rights I think has gone past, or moved beyond the stage of simple protest, or simple anger, or simple sort of cries of anguish at the condition, and now is beginning to seek out far more constructive ways of bringing a redress of those grievances.

For one, I guess, who has had to contend because of the nature of my constituency, with a number of organizations of women, and who has had to listen, I have noticed myself an important change beginning to take place in the development and evolution of the Women's Rights movements. That increasingly it's becoming a movement of specific proposal and specific sort of program, that they're no longer simply interested in saying, this is the outrage, this is the breach of faith. They're now saying okay we are - I think they are saying to us, we believe that we've established a sense of communication, that we now have an understanding going that there is a reciprocity between those who are on the discriminatory side and those of us who have been the discriminators, and they're now prepared to say okay, the communication has now been opened, what are you going to do about it?

That's why I think the kind of debate we enter into should not be one that is ceased particularly with partisan advantage, and to that degree I am in accord with the comments of the Minister of Labour. But I think he went on partially to contradict himself because he said, let's reason together, and then proceeded to attack the Progressive Conservatives for not wanting to reason together. I don't think that that was fair. Because I think if the Minister, at least in the case of debates coming from this group in the House, went back to Hansard he would see that we are not simply talking in this group about the distinctive problems of women but we have also talked about the other groups that are mentioned in this report, and have talked about ways that their problems can be resolved as well. --(Interjection)--That's right, I think that we can sort of take some credit for this group that through the leadership of the Member from Assiniboia we have been able over the past several years to establish a pretty firm position of the requirement within the Civil Service of Manitoba and beyond that throughout the whole employment system of the province to establish a fair basis of employing their practices.

But I'd still like to emphasize to the Minister this, that while I agree with him that it's important not to overlook the problems faced by other groups, it would still be wrong for us by doing that to de-emphasize or to pull back from the specific concentrated concern of women. Because that is an issue now, and I'm prepared at any time to debate and discuss the problems of other groups. But the issue that faces this Legislature, and faces this community right now,

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . is women are saying to us, we've had enough of discrimination in employment practices and right now not enough is being done. I am not standing up to say that I don't think that the government is unaware of the problem or being indifferent to it. I think that they are fully aware and attempting to do what they can. I'm simply saying that maybe one of the results of this resolution, and by comments made by other members of this House, should be to speed the process along; that if a Minister needs more support amongst his colleagues and his caucus, then he should have it.

A MEMBER: Oh they're with him.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well if they're with him then I think we should say, okay. If the Minister's statements are true that he has full consensus, then I think it is quite possible to expect that within the next month, or six weeks, or two months, however long this session may last, that we can see a number of these recommendations implemented, not talked about but implemented. I think that the important thing to be concerned about, is the implementation. Because I believe very strongly that what is required now is to get away from the rhetoric and get into the action; that what women's groups in this province are asking for now is specific acts to demonstrate our good faith. They no longer want lip service paid to their concerns; they no longer want simply people to listen, they want action. And that's what is being called for in the next six weeks, is action.

To that degree I don't believe that the Leader of the Conservative Party's resolution goes far enough--(Interjection)--It's the same thing. I think he misses one of the important mechanisms that should be employed to insure that action is brought about. And that is to provide for an outside body with a formal attachment to this Legislative Chamber that would be able to advise and comment, review and assess and monitor the progress being made in the implementation of the rights of women employees in the Provincial Civil Service and in fact in the employment system throughout the Province of Manitoba. I would point for example that in the Province of Ontario, and in Quebec right now, they have set up an advisory council on women, who are distinctly given the responsibility and prerogative to comment, to assess, to monitor and to report to the Legislature progress made, and if progress is not being made they will say so. That if it's the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who is not bringing it up. . . their management structure, or who is not eliminating the rug-ranking procedures, they will say so and we will know so we can take action. I think that that principle was well established by the Federal Government when after going through the reorganization of the Civil Service to bring about a greater degree of equity on language problems, they set up the office of the Commissioner of Languages under the auspices of Mr. Keith Spicer, who has been able to provide, whether you like the policy or not, a very honest appraisal as to how well that policy is being implemented, and has been able to spur much of that along.

I would suggest that in this area that is something that should be added as part of that package of amendments to the Civil Service Act; that there should be a council on equal opportunity in employment so that for the next year or two years, and maybe after that we don't need it, because if a millenium is achieved then we don't have to worry anymore. But until that millenium, until sort of the Minister of Labour is prepared to appear with a burning bush in his hands to say that, Sir, that the Valhalla has arrived, then we perhaps need someone to insure that we simply don't have to always take his word, and I'm prepared to take his word most of the time, but to have someone outside saying this is the degree of progress that is being made. And that's why members of this group feel that we feel some additions should be made to those proposed amendments that we'd like the government to consider, and that is the establishment of a council on equal opportunity that would report to this Legislature and be able to set out certain of the guidelines that are required. To be able to access whether the different departments are living up to their obligations under those guidelines, and in fact whether the training programs and the classification programs are being properly administered and being affectuated.

I would even like to see us go even one step further than that and not simply restrict it to the Civil Service that comes under the auspices of the Civil Service Commission. That one of the major areas of employment in the provinces are the Crown corporations, Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Telephone System and other of the major Crown corporations, and they should be subject to exactly the same rules and the same obligations and the same responsibilities. A council such as we would like to recommend would have the ability to comment

## RESOLUTION 26

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . .upon the progress being made by the Crown corporations, because I believe that they, and the Minister could correct me, now employ upwards of fifteen or so thousand employees in the province, and I'm off my numbers. But in fact if they were included under the auspices, that I think that we would be able to add even one more element.

So in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the resolution as follows: That the resolution be amended by adding an additional paragraph to read, and this would be point (5) under the No. 4. in the body of the resolution:

(5) and establish an advisory council on equal employment opportunities to report to the Legislature annually on the progress of equality of employment in the Civil Service in Manitoba.

And we have copies provided for those members as well as for Mr. Speaker.

That is seconded, by the way, from the Member of Assiniboia.

MOTION on amendment presented.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you'd give me an opportunity just to look at the original resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I just read it. The honourable member can have a look at my copy.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no the amendment, I have, Mr. Speaker. I'm just wondering whether you'd give me an opportunity of looking at the original resolution. It's okay, I do note that the original resolution is in the abstract that the government give consideration to the advisability of amending the Civil Service Act which might imply some expenditures of money. I wasn't sure that that was there so that we could take into consideration the advisability of the establishment of an advisory committee, which would I'm sure. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre will have an opportunity the next time.

The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)