

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 16, 1972

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 30 students Grade XI standing of the Miles McDonell school. These students are under the direction of Mrs. D. Lowden. This school is located in my own constituency of Kildonan. We also have 19 students of Grade XI standing of the MacGregor Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bender. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. And we have 44 students Grade XI standing of the Princess Elizabeth High School from Shilo. These students are under the direction of Mr. Balkwill. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Industry and Commerce. And we have nine students of IX standing of the Sansome Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Forsyth. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of reports. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement on unemployment in Manitoba. I have copies as required -- Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and this one for the Independent caucus room.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to my colleagues in the Assembly that Manitoba has the lowest unemployment rate in the whole of the Dominion of Canada. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the national rate is 6.8 percent of the labour force; Manitoba is 4.6 which is a reduction of 1.2 percentage points over one month ago and a reduction of 4,000 in the total number of unemployed in Manitoba. We have now unfortunately 18,000 unemployed, the same number as we had a year ago. However, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the total labour force in Manitoba, April over March of this year, indicates 7,000 more employed or in the labour force in Manitoba for the month of April than over March. And also, Mr. Speaker, that there are 15,000 more in the labour force in Manitoba April 72 over April of 71. Press releases today indicate that the total number of increase in the work force in Canada was only 19,000. I'm sure Manitobans will be proud of the fact that while the increase across Canada was only 19,000, here in this Province of Manitoba the increase was 7,000 or more than a third of the total number of increase. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that when members have an opportunity of looking at the statistics they reveal contrary to the doom and gloom picture painted by many Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, we thank the Honourable Minister for his statement of fact. We have to understand of course that these statements of fact have to be compared with other statements of fact made in the last four months. If we were to examine, Mr. Speaker, the statistics of unemployment in Manitoba over the last four months and compare that with the previous period of time in previous years, we would find that the statistics themselves in some respect are incapable of interpretation because they have shown variations that could and would not have taken place in Manitoba and the Minister of Labour is acknowledging that. All this suggests, Mr. Speaker, is that the science of determining the statistics of labour force in unemployment is not exact that in fact errors have been made; that in fact we can only hope that it reflects the true situation with respect to those who require employment in this province.

I think we can also state, Mr. Speaker, for the record, that Dr. Weldon in his presentation before the Standing Committee on Economic Development indicated that the figures in reality as far as Manitoba was concerned were probably two percent higher because they would include those of Indian ancestry who were not included in the statistical information - and when the honourable members opposite say all provinces, they disregard the fact that there is a higher proportion in terms of percentage of those of Indian ancestry who could in fact and should

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . be included in the statistical information that is presented. In addition, those who in fact work on the farms are not necessarily included in the statistical information so that a measure of how the economy is doing, it has to be considered in that kind of perspective.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we can say that we are happy that we have some indication of something better than it was last month. I think it's rather astounding that of 19,000 that would enter the labour force in Canada, 7,000 of them would come from Manitoba and I think that sort of boggles the imagination and would suggest that there is maybe a bit something wrong with the statistical information that has been printed.

However, having said that, Mr. Speaker, again we repeat our basic position. We have congratulated the government on the program of public works with respect to creating employment during the winter period and the effects of this are still being felt at the present time. We are unhappy with the fact that they have not taken regard of the private sector as other areas have in an attempt to try and stimulate the economy even further. We also feel that this does not necessarily reflect the needs of many of the students who will be looking for an ability to be able to finance themselves next year by having a job during the summer and much more yet remains to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports, Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister can confirm or tell the House if Mr. William Kelly has resigned as President of Saunders Aircraft.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the latest information I have is that Mr. Kelly is still associated with Saunders Aircraft.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not answer the question. Has he resigned as President of Saunders Aircraft?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

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

MR. PATRICK: One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister let the House also know who assumed the position as President of Saunders Aircraft.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister give us any information as to the state of the negotiations regarding the boundary dispute between Whitehorse Plains School Division and the Lakeshore School Division?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any disputes between any two divisions as to boundary. I am aware however, of a number of areas within a number of school divisions who feel that education could better be served if they were associated with another school division but in accordance with the provisions of the Public Schools Act matters of this type are referred to a Board of Reference and I, not knowing which particular area the honourable member is referring to, but I may indicate to him that there is an area within Whitehorse Plains which has referred this matter to the Board of Reference and which will be dealing with it shortly with the Northern part of Whitehorse Plains.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question to the Minister. Is it correct that the Board of Reference will be holding hearings tomorrow with regard to the area in the Oak Point school?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to suggest that I have repeatedly asked that members should give the courtesy of informing Ministers if they have intention of asking questions which have to be referred. There is no way persons can keep everything in their mind as to appointments and everything else in regards to a running of a Ministry. I'm not trying to defend Ministers but I'm indicating that if a courtesy would be extended would facilitate the question period. The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I may, Mr. Speaker. When the Board of Reference holds a hearing

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . it does give notice thereof in the local publications serving the people who may be affected by its decision or its recommendation to me for action; and this in fact had been done in this case and I feel quite confident that all of those having an interest in this matter have been notified and have notice of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In that case I would indicate that the question was out of order since it was public information. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Education - was notice published in Manitoba Gazette as required by the Public Schools Act?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I am not aware of a requirement within the Public Schools Act making it mandatory for such a notice to be published in the Manitoba Gazette. However, if there is such a provision then I'm sure it was complied with; and if the notice did not appear in the Gazette, then I'm equally certain that it is not a requirement of the Public Schools Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

#### ORDER FOR RETURN

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an Order for Return, Return No. 19.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS (cont'd)

MR. MACKLING: And while I have my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to a couple of questions that have been asked. One by the Honourable Member from Thompson who was concerned about drawing to my attention the fact that the employment practices in respect to stewardesses on aircraft may in fact involve some contravention of our Human Rights legislation. This matter has been drawn to the attention of the Human Rights Commission who advise that they co-operate with a Federal authority since it's the Federal authority that has jurisdiction in respect to aircraft in Canada.

In respect to the question asked by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland regarding complaints with regard to dry cleaning establishments, I have a report from the Consumer's Bureau which indicates there have been a total of 82 complaints received against launders and dry cleaners. Of the 82 complaints 39 were settled as satisfactory, compensation was arrived at; the individual compensation amounts recorded ranged in amount, the highest being \$111.50, and there are 24 cases that remain unsettled. There were a total of nine particular firms that had two complaints or more and there were 11 sundry claims. The complainants are listed; I don't know whether particular information is required - I think that gives a general answer to the honourable member's concern.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Could the Honourable Minister inform the House of the present water level of Lake Winnipeg?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable member for giving me prior notice of this question. I checked with our Water Control Branch and the latest Lake Winnipeg levels at Gimli are as follows: For Sunday, last May 14th, the level of the lake was 715 feet point 94. On Monday, May 15th, the level was also 715.94. On Tuesday, which is today May 16th, the level on Lake Winnipeg was 716.63. --(Interjection)-- Now some of this -- (Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, some of this level was caused by wind and therefore we have made an estimate --(Interjection)-- we've made an --(Interjection)-- we've made an estimate of the --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the department has made an estimate of the level eliminating the wind effect, and therefore with the wind effect eliminated the level of Lake Winnipeg as measured at Gimli today is 716.30 feet.

MR. GOTTFRIED: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honourable Minister inform the House if the ice has now melted and if the damaging effect of the wind will now be added to the extremely high water level?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. A point of order by the Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider the eligibility of the import of these earth shaking questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, briefly my information is that the ice on the lake south of the Narrows has melted although there is still some ice in the northern portion of the lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker, ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to inform the Honourable Member for Riel there is no possibility of another member asking a supplementary question. He can ask his own, otherwise I shall have to rule after three supplementaries that particular topic is done and I don't think the members wish that. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Attorney-General for his question so far, by the way a question which I gave notice as well. I would like to ask him a supplementary question to the one I asked the other day whether there's any particular firm which stood out in terms of the severity of the complaints involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a complete listing and I think to be fair to all concerned I would read the list. The complaints received were as follows: Easton Cleaners 24, Perths 19, Quintons 8, Flash Cleaners 6, Scott Cleaners 6, Martinizing 3, Laundromat 3, Whitehall 2, and 11 sundry claims.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: On a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General advise us as to the satisfactory settlement of claims?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I indicated of the total of 82 claims that had been presented to the Consumers Bureau; 39 of those cases were settled and there is still unsettled 24 cases; that others I assume just not were proceeded with as unjustified.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and ask him if he could give the House the levels of the water at the Shellmouth Reservoir for last week?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the honourable member was in the House when I gave the good news as it refers to the Shellmouth Dam and the levels of the water; and it was very good news indeed and I suggest he read Hansard and find out about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Could he tell us where the levels were taken, at what points and whether markers are placed in certain places so that the public can read and satisfy themselves on their own on the water levels.

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I explained to members of the House many weeks ago there is only one location on the lake that we have daily readings and that is in the Town of Gimli - and as I indicated in my answer, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I believe, the readings that I quoted were for the area of Gimli. Other readings are taken but less frequently and of course anyone in the Province of Manitoba, in fact anyone in the world, if they wish can go and look at the indicators. But I am satisfied that these are scientific readings taken of the lake levels of Lake Winnipeg, as they have been done for many a decade in this province.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to speak on a point of order and then I would like to, with your permission, to ask a question later. My point of order is that I do not think that your admonishment that members should give notice to Ministers is really an order. I consider that a matter for the member himself as to whether or not he should give notice to a Minister and that is my point of order. Now my question is directed to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. On the point of order I should indicate that I indicated it was only a courtesy. There is no procedure that calls for it but I do think that if we want to process and proceed in this House efficiently that it wouldn't hurt to have a little more courtesy. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie;

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is he not aware that Mr. Tom Ault of Flyer Coach Industries Limited has been appointed interim President of Saunders Aircraft?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether awareness is in order or not. However, I can advise the members of the House that we are using the very expertise abilities and many years of experience in the transport business of Mr. Ault to assist in the management of Saunders Aircraft.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the same Minister. In view of the fact that this gentleman is president of one company of which the Province of Manitoba has the majority interest, or at least a large interest, and that he is now interim president of another company --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I hope the honourable member isn't going to make the question argumentative.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is. Is Mr. Ault receiving salaries from two companies in which the Crown has a large investment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, in order to allay the honourable member's fears as to whether there is any precedent for having a Board of Directors appoint a person as a provisional or interim president of one corporation while he is also serving as president of another public or quasi public, partly public corporation, I would simply point out that in 1968, Norman McMillan was president of Canadian National Railways and interim president of Air Canada. So there is really no point in my honourable friend starting to induce himself into a state of concern.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister to whom I directed the question would care to answer the question.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ault is paid one salary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General in view of the statement he made regarding the Human Rights Act. I wonder if he is telling this House that the Federal Government can violate the Manitoba Human Rights Act, which I admit is not too workable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker, if violations of our Human Rights Act occur by any authority it will be drawn to the attention of the Human Rights Commission and the complaint will be processed accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question. Could he indicate to the House when he'll file with the Clerk here the transcripts of the testimony of the Rex Grose Hearings which he promised here last week I believe?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I have taken that question under advisement. The complexity of the evidence so far indicates a rather enormous cost factor however, and it's not budgeted for. However, I hope to be able to obtain a copy of the transcript in the near future and have it placed in the library. The cost to date of just one set of the transcripts would be around \$7,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General inform the House under what section of what act did the Courts grant authority to the RCMP to search the premises and seize the books of the Bio-Science Lab?

MR. SPEAKER: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking for a legal opinion from me and the question is out of order; but since you have permitted the question to be asked I will answer it to this extent; that the RCMP were acting pursuant to the provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I want to raise a point of order. The Minister said the question was out of order. It was no such thing. That question was a perfectly legitimate one. If the courts granted authority for the RCMP to search somebody's premises it must have been under the authority of some Act, and the identification of that Act by the Minister certainly is a proper question in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, over a week ago I asked a question of the First Minister as to when we could expect the tabling of the Leaf Rapids contract and the arrangements as far as - rental arrangements and commission arrangements pertaining thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I should think it's only a matter of days now. I realize I indicated to the honourable member that it would be soon and it will be soon, a matter of a few days. I can't specify exactly, sometime early next week perhaps.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources. It's relative to Lake Winnipeg. Can he advise the House whether the Hydro barge has yet been floated or is it still stranded at the point?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: ... and Mr. Minister of Mines and Resources and Environmental Management, if he could give the House the levels of the Red River at Morris for the past week?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had the courtesy to give me that question as notice he would have had the information today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Perhaps the Minister would take that very important question as notice and provide the answer to the House at his earliest convenience.

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

MR. EVANS: I will be delighted to take that question as notice.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Are the buildings at Brandon University insured with the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I don't know; this is a matter for the Brandon University, it is not a matter for the Department of Colleges and Universities' affairs.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question to the Minister of Finance, but in his absence I will direct it to the First Minister. The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office holds a license to sell insurance in the Province of Manitoba, and I'm meaning fire insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this was the case; whether it is at the present time I would have to look at my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs. If he's not in a position to answer we'll have to take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would take this question as notice. I understand however that there is procedures by which, now as in the past, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office can write coverage within the province.

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

MR. McKELLAR: ... the Minister of Municipal Affairs, does he know whether SGIO are licensed in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister took it as notice. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs on a related question. Could the Minister advise whether the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . Saskatchewan Government Automobile Insurance was prohibited by the previous administration from selling insurance in Manitoba while all sorts of the United States and other companies were permitted to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was a deliberate refusal prohibition against the Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance Corporation from writing coverage within the Province of Manitoba despite . . . despite --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . despite the fact that State Farm, Allstate and other American Companies were invited and encouraged to write coverage in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs a related question. Would the Minister undertake in the course of the investigation that he is going to make into that question, would he undertake to advise the House whether fire insurance at Brandon University is written by the SGIO?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: I would say to the honourable member, since we'll always receive words that we must encourage people to develop their own programs with a school, or at university level that surely it is the business of the Brandon University as to whether they insure their buildings with Wawanesa, Portage la Prairie or SGIO.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I would like to direct another related question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he confirm or deny that the SGIO now is able to sell Autopac Insurance in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, insofar as SGIO writing Autopac insurance, I've never yet heard of SGIO selling Autopac insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to that question then, is the Saskatchewan Government Automobile Insurance allowed to sell automobile insurance in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: No, not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government plans to go into the fire insurance business in the Province of Manitoba? Has the Government plans through a Crown corporation or otherwise - the plan to go into the fire insurance business in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I'm sure all our honourable members are aware that's a policy question. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the . . .

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: My question then is, are there studies under way or reports made indicating that the province will go into the fire insurance business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: There are no studies under way in this respect at all. Whether or not the Province of Manitoba enters into the fire insurance business by this government or by any other government will depend upon the service received by the people of the Province of Manitoba. And I would like to just mention very briefly, this interests me in view of the remarks during - some of the proceedings of the last year or two when in fact this government was encouraged to consider this area of development during the auto insurance debate.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would it be fair to say that the Minister's statement is a threat to any form of private enterprise in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A related question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs related to the answer he gave me, Sir, - can the Minister advise the House whether it truly is the business of Brandon University whether they take their fire insurance with SGIO?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is SGIO acting as re-insurer for Manitoba Automobile Insurance Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I would have to take that question as notice. The major re-insurer however of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is another company, not SGIO.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Was the name of the company Lloyds of London? Was the name of the company Lloyds of London?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, the announcement was made sometime ago. The honourable member surely knows that the province was informed that MPIC like so many other automobile insurance companies is using the services of Lloyds of London as the re-insurer.

I want to just further expand the question by the Honourable Member for Emerson, although I'm not aware of any supplementary automobile insurance business written by the SGIO in the Province of Manitoba, that is due to the fact that all that supplementary business is handled by MPIC.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): ... direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Since the rain insurance service is not satisfactory in the Province of Manitoba would the government be considering going into that line of insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I would be very pleased to receive a recommendation from the Honourable Member for Churchill along those lines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I understand the First Minister gave a commitment to the Headingley Action Committee in respect to the Telephone System that he would look into this personally and do some investigation. Has he completed his investigation and has he any statement to make at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's understanding is erroneous. I was not in communication with any one representing the Headingley delegation, and I gave no undertaking to proceed any differently than the way this matter has been dealt with and considered in the past and that is by the Manitoba Telephone System and its Board of Directors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Has the Minister not replied by mail that he would look into it personally?

MR. SCHREYER: Sir, I repeat that consideration of this problem will be given and dealt with in the way in which similar problems of telephone extension are requested and dealt with in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General. Earlier he indicated that authority for a warrant issued to the RCMP was issued under the authority of Criminal Code. I wonder if he could tell the House what section of the Criminal Code that authority was granted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I don't have the particulars with me, I would have to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism. I think it's the right Minister. When will the Horse Racing Commission report be tabled?

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (St. Boniface): I'll have to check, Mr. Speaker, but I believe it has been tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Thompson.



MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Resources. Could he indicate if the people who held a meeting at the International Inn last night will be allowed to present a brief to this Committee when it meets on Thursday morning.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if I've heard the House Leader correctly in the past the correct answer to this question is that it's a matter for the Committee to decide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism. Could he indicate whether it's correct that film "Stewardesses" which was in court recently has been re-admitted to Manitoba and passed through the Censorship Board?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I've asked the Censor Board to review it; they've done so. I understand that they cut about 20 minutes and it now will be presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Will the government be making a grant to the City of Winnipeg to help offset the increased taxes for 1972 that were created through Unicity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Charleswood may be aware, we had a meeting this morning with a committee of the City of Winnipeg Council. We discussed matters of mutual concern relative to city financing and it was generally agreed that the pattern of budgetary expenditures by the urban municipalities in the former Greater Winnipeg area shows annual increases since 1965 of approximately 6 to \$7 million per year, and in 1968/69 there was increase of 11.5 million - so that this increase of approximately what, 7 and a half million dollars is not to be regarded as being out of line, out of the pattern that has prevailed for the past decade.

MR. MOUG: I agree . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MOUG: The question I had - what I meant was those that had a raw increase in real property taxes as was brought out in the White Paper in the first instance.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is referring to those municipalities which show a mill rate levy change that is out of line with mill rate adjustments made in the past many years, then in that respect there is a full intention on the part of the government to proceed in a manner consistent with the undertaking that was given in the White Paper - in the position paper over a year ago. And this will require some detailed formula application, and in fact meetings will be going on tomorrow in that respect.

MR. MOUG: Could we expect then that this would be something that would be finalized before the tax bills are mailed out?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't hear two or three key words in the question.

MR. MOUG: Could we expect that this be something that would be settled before the tax bills are mailed out to the people?

MR. SCHREYER: Affirmative.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Labour, and I must make a short explanation. I've had a communication from the Manitoba Human Rights Commission saying that they would inquire into certain concerns that I have expressed to them with respect to what I call discrimination amongst male and female employees in the public service. And my question to the Minister is - whether or not a legislation covers the matter, will he look into with sympathy the idea correcting any discrimination that the Human Rights Commission would draw to the government's attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend communicated with the Human Rights Commission on the matter, I'm sure he will receive the reply from them. My honourable friend did not communicate with me as far as I am aware of the matter that he referred to the Human Rights Commission.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Another question on the same subject, Mr. Speaker, and really it's a rephrasing of the first question. Would the Minister take the recommendations of the Human

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . . Rights Commission with respect to employment in the Civil Service ?

MR. PAULLEY: The Human Rights Commission have not communicated to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Are the standard minimum rates of pay offered to dragline operators the same in Northern Manitoba as they are in the Greater Winnipeg area ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: There are two or three construction pieces of legislation which calls for the payment of wages in certain areas and as the result of certain wage agreements or collective agreements, Mr. Speaker, between labour and management. I cannot answer my honourable friend's question precisely because of that factor. If he would care to communicate to me the peculiar circumstance, I would be more than happy to give him the information that I have.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are the same standard minimum rates paid by all departments of government that utilize the service of dragline operators ?

MR. PAULLEY: As far as I am aware, what at one time was called a Fair Wage Act, now is Construction Wages Act, are applicable to the Crown.

MR. McKENZIE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, then. Are the northern allowance rates offered for dragline operators by some departments of government and not by others ?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question precisely at this time. As I indicated previously if my honourable friend would draw to my personal attention the point of concern to him I would be glad to accommodate him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Has the Minister completed financial arrangements with the Federal Government to proceed with the pilot project on guaranteed income in Manitoba ?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, we have reached an agreement with the Federal Government pertaining to the guaranteed annual income for a test project that will last two years.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. How many people are involved ?

MR. TOUPIN: The details of the two test projects involved pertaining to the people that will be involved have not been finalized. The figure of 2,500 per project has been considered seriously.

MR. PATRICK: Can the Minister tell the House what financial arrangements have been made with the Federal Government, what proportion of the cost will the Federal Government pay ?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, I believe that this is something that could be related and answered in this House. The financial arrangement between the Province and the Federal Government is 75 percent Federal and 25 percent Provincial.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Health on the same question that was previously mentioned. Is a designated area planned in Manitoba and if so, where would this designated area be located in Manitoba ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, again to relate to two projects. There will be at least on one project designated areas but they have not as yet been designated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLYANNOUNCEMENT

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before we start the consideration on the Estimates under review that I might make an announcement that is of importance I'm sure to all members of the House and possibly too, to the Leader of the Opposition. Some questions have been directed toward me as House Leader as to what we will be doing on Monday, Victoria Day, whether the House will meet or not; I desire to inform members that it is the intention of the government that we will not meet on Monday in order that members may have a very pleasing weekend - we hope the weather will be well.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not a response, it's more of a question to the House Leader. In the future, would he consider having committee meetings held on any days excepting Monday. It's extremely difficult for rural members to go to their home riding and spend time working there and be on duty at 10:00 o'clock Monday morning. In the past there has very rarely been committee meetings on Monday and it's extremely difficult for some of the members who have a distance to travel to be on duty at 10:00 o'clock Monday morning. The reason I mention this there has been - well I suppose it's political reference made to the fact that certain members were not in their chair at committee at 10:00 o'clock on Monday or at 9:30 on Monday morning, and for this reason I would appeal to the House Leader to use every other day in the week excepting Mondays for committee meetings.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not a proper time for consideration of the point raised by my honourable friend as he knows full well. We are not going to be meeting in any case next Monday, committee or the House, and I always listen to the words of wisdom from my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie. I'll discuss the matter with him privately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution - We're, I would ask honourable members to turn to Page 3, Executive Council, Resolution 4 (a) - The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, in introducing the Estimates of the Executive Council

...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. Could we have just a little bit less noise. If everybody wants to hold meetings I'd suggest they go out to the halls or to caucus rooms. The Chair can't hear what's going on. All I can hear is a mumble and jumble. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, could you arrange to have a table brought over here, and while that's being done I will simply carry on by saying that in introducing the Estimates of the Executive Council I shall be as brief as I was last evening in introducing the Estimates of the Legislative Assembly itself.

The Executive Council Estimates, I think honourable members can readily see, shows only a modest increase and that is not because the activity of the Executive Council is in any sense at all sort of decreasing or diminishing from the pattern of steady increase in workload that has been manifest over the past several years. The number of staff positions in the Executive Council, that is to say the Executive Council proper as distinguished from the Cabinet Committee Secretariats has been in terms of staff man-years quite constant. The increase shown under 1 (c) is because of the - shall I say, non-discretionary, although that's not strictly accurate - because of the salary adjustments made pursuant to negotiated collective agreement, and also because of salary adjustments with respect to those who although not within the collective agreement nevertheless are accorded the same salary adjustment as those that are within.

The honourable members may be interested to know that while the pattern of staff size increases in other jurisdictions has been quite evident here in Manitoba, I believe it's true to say that over the years it has been a feature, I believe of Manitoba Government that the size of the staff complement attached to the Executive Council has been relatively small compared to other provinces, provincial governments. I am reminded of the fact that at the federal level for example, whereas in the days of Mr. Diefenbaker's government the number of persons attached to the Privy Council office and the Prime Minister's office was relatively small in comparison to what it is today. I see the Member for Morris is smiling ruefully and I assume in agreement. I believe it is correct that the pattern is something as follows that in the very

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . early 1960s the number of staff attached to the Prime Minister's office in the order of 30 to 35 and today it is somewhere on or about the 100 mark. In the Province of Ontario, not so long ago during the administration of Mr. Robarts, I am advised that the staff size of the Prime Minister or Premier's office was around 37 and today that has gone to 71, and this is in a relatively few years. I believe it is some indication that those attached to the Executive Council office are certainly performing at a very high level of performance and perhaps shall I say at a high level of productivity. There is really no significant change with respect to all other items that come under the general heading of Administration, Executive Council proper. I will have a few words to say as we deal with the Planning and Priorities Committee Estimates and the Management Committee Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I hope that my honourable friends will give me the indulgence of the speaking first. I don't intend to be long and I know that the opposition generally is the one that first deals with the question but I probably will be away and therefore this is the only opportunity that I'll have to make what I think will be a small point on the Estimates of the Executive Council.

It's particularly the Member for Sturgeon Creek that I want to impress my remarks upon although of course in accordance with the rules, Mr. Speaker, my remarks are for the House. But the Member for Sturgeon Creek did more or less open up the Estimates on the Executive Council, I believe it was during the Throne Speech debate when he referred to -- in attempting to somehow discredit the government and the Premier, he said that one knows what kind of a person somebody is by the kind of team that he surrounds around himself.

And the Member for Sturgeon Creek implied that the First Minister had surrounded himself with a team of people who are not honourable people, people who somehow had been engaged in particularly wrong activities. And in order to do so, Mr. Speaker, he referred to a particular person and the remarks that I'm making are for two reasons: First of all I don't like to see any person slandered in the Legislature wrongfully, and if it's slander then it must be wrongful. Secondly, the person he was talking about happens to be a particular friend of mine and therefore I do have I admit a personal interest in refuting the remarks that were made by the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

And I'm going to try to recall his remarks and I'll invite him to interrupt me if I'm wrong. He said that one of the executive assistants to the First Minister, namely Herb Schultz, stood with a group that threw eggs at a former Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Douglas Harkness. I think that those were the words of the Member for Sturgeon Creek and I see that he's making no effort to be contradictory although he's being distracted by the Minister of Labour. But I believe that the words that he used were that Herb Schultz stood with a group that threw eggs at the former Minister of Agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting how history is made and how one can take facts which are exactly the opposite of what occurred and make history out of them and I commend to my honourable friend a book that was written by Josephine Tey on Richard III and she talked about the generally accepted fact that Richard III had two princes put into the tower and subsequently in order to maintain his position as king that he had the two princes assassinated. I know that almost every school boy in England and everybody that is aware of English history regards Richard III as having assassinated two princes in the tower and Josephine Tey does a story which indicates by going to the records of the time that the people who actually wrote this story were people who were involved in trying to displace Richard III and that in all likelihood they were in fact the ones who killed Richard III -- killed the two princes -- thereby knew most about it, but because it was such a horrendous deed they attributed it to their enemy, Richard III.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think that that often happens historically, that the people who commit a horrendous act knowing just how horrendous it was then to foist that act on somebody else. I think the Member for Lakeside gave an example of that last week when he who knew best about what happened with the manner in which Hydro proceeded under his administration with regard to the flooding of South Indian Lake -- and knowing just what kind of a colossal error the Churchill Forest Industries was -- tried to in order to save himself attribute those facts to the government. And I'm sure that they think that if it's said long enough and loud enough that history will somehow repeat those falsehoods and say that it wasn't they who did it, that it was in fact the victim rather than the perpetrator of the crime who was the criminal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there are many people in Manitoba -- maybe the Member

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . for Roblin, maybe the Member for Swan River, maybe the Member for Souris-Killarney who are convinced at this point that in an election campaign in 1957 the Honourable Douglas Harkness attended a meeting in Dauphin -- that Herb Schultz stood with the crowd that threw eggs at Douglas Harkness and I --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the Member for Swan River says, what's so wrong with it? Mr. Speaker, ask the Member for Sturgeon Creek because he said that the First Minister having chosen such a wrongful character on his team demonstrated what kind of a coach he was. So if it's not wrong -- that's the Member for Swan River's opinion and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that his argument is with the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

But that's not the worst of it, Mr. Speaker. What I say has happened in this case and what is in everybody's mind apparently on that side of the House and what they wish to continue to perpetrate as history, is that the reverse to what actually happened shall become the fact and in the Member for Sturgeon Creek that is the fact. The reverse of what happened became the fact. Because will it surprise the Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Member for Morris and the Member for Swan River and the Member for Souris-Killarney that Herb Schultz was at a meeting with Douglas Harkness, that he sat through that meeting, that eggs were thrown, that they were not thrown by Mr. Schultz but as a matter of fact the eggs were thrown at Mr. Schultz. And rather than the eggs being thrown by supporters or a group with Mr. Schultz they were thrown by the supporters of Douglas Harkness. And if you don't believe me -- you know, and there were arguments about what happened on that night as to whether, as Mr. Schultz claimed, that he arranged -- and as a matter of fact this was not denied by the caretaker -- that after Mr. Harkness' meeting was finished that he arranged with the caretaker to rent the hall and have a meeting of his own, and that after and that when that meeting started and after Mr. Harkness had left the hall the eggs were thrown at Mr. Schultz.

Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the Member for Sturgeon Creek would accept what was said, not by the Co-operative Commonwealth newspaper or even the Co-operator newspaper but what was said by the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune on that occasion. "The egg flinging" -- and let the Member for Sturgeon Creek listen for a moment because he made the charges. He chose to slander irresponsibly a member of the Premier's personal staff so let him listen to what the newspaper --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, I know that the member doesn't have to listen. I am asking him in all courtesy as a gentleman who sought to slander a member of the Premier's personal staff, to listen to what actually happened. Now if he said at that point, I don't have to listen to you, I'm going to walk out, that's his business. We will then know what kind of team he belongs to if that is what he chooses to do. But let me read the newspaper: "The egg flinging began after Agricultural Minister Douglas Harkness finished his talk at Grandview Parish Hall Monday afternoon before a crowd of about 300. Mr. Schultz started asking questions and was shouted down by some of the audience. Then a woman hurled an egg at him and the meeting ended", -- at Mr. Schultz -- "After some scuffling and much noise with Mr. Schultz on the platform. By this time Mr. Harkness had left." And if you don't believe that newspaper, Mr. Speaker, and that's the Tribune, I'll read from the Winnipeg Free Press. "As the National Anthem ended Mr. Schultz began to push his way towards the platform. Mrs. Bassaraba" -- and this isn't in the paper but I say I identify her as a Tory supporter, as a Harkness supporter -- "Mrs. Bassaraba climbed onto a bench and from that vantage point threw an egg which caught Mr. Schultz on the side of the face. The next few eggs flew wide spattering others in the crowd. The eggs were all apparently directed at Mr. Schultz and his supporters and none hit Mr. Harkness." Now, Mr. Speaker, those are the facts as reported on that day. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of order has been raised by the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I see nothing in the Estimates that says Schultz or eggs or anything else and I wonder when we are going to get to the Estimates.

MR. GREEN: The staff of the Executive Council. Mr. Schultz is an executive assistant to the Premier as identified by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Having slandered Mr. Schultz -- I know that the Member for Swan River apparently would like to continue the slander by not having the facts come out. That would distort history by making it true. But, Mr. Speaker, these are the newspapers; this is my understanding of what has happened. I say that fully all of the members on the other side knowing better are convinced that at that meeting Mr. Schultz was involved in an egg throwing incident against Mr. Harkness. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . the Member for Sturgeon Creek's are slanderous. I say that my remarks if they are wrong are equally slanderous. If it wasn't Mrs. Bassaraba who threw the eggs that is equally slanderous. I am willing to remove my legislative immunity and let Mrs. Bassaraba, a Tory supporter, sue me and I ask the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek if he is convinced of his facts to remove his legislative immunity and subject himself to a suit for slander at the hands of Mr. Schultz for the remarks that he made about him in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am -- as a matter of fact I will go one step further. I will say that Mrs. Bassaraba threw the eggs, that she is a Tory supporter and insofar as saying that she is a Tory supporter -- as far as that is concerned I will completely and without condition, and I don't ask the honourable member to make a deal with me -- I remove my legislative immunity insofar as saying she is a Tory supporter and if being a Tory supporter or saying somebody is a Tory supporter slanders her I'm willing to pay damages on that account, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I take it now that the discussion on this item -- members on this side of the House will be able to do a number of things. First of all we'll be able to rewrite British history; we will be able to discuss Southern Indian Lake; CFI; we will be able to discuss many things. We will be able to bring -- since the Member for Inkster dealt at some length with the question of eggs I presume that the Egg Marketing Board now is open for discussion. I also believe that in the light of the rather wide latitude that was offered to the Member for Inkster that the discussion is now open on a wide variety of subjects. In fact, Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order being discussed is no -- you cannot have two points of order at the same time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. You can rise on a point of order after the Member for Morris is finished with his point of order.

MR. GREEN: He was speaking in the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . yes.

MR. GREEN: And I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, fine. Point of order.

MR. GREEN: I deny, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that what my honourable friend is saying even if it's being said in jest will not open the debate to matters which are not within the Executive Council. My remarks -- if my honourable friend says that the analogies that I used were far reaching, I will admit that but my remarks related direct to an item which is paid for under Executive Council and that is the First Minister's personal staff. I will appreciate the fact that my honourable friend perhaps doesn't like my style in debate but it was in order and I would urge the Chairman to keep the rest of the debate in order.

MR. JORGENSEN: As I understand the point of order now raised by the Member for Inkster, is that he insists that he has special privileges in this House and that he can enter into a rather wide-ranging debate on a variety of subjects but that opportunity is not going to be made available to other members of this Chamber. Now, Sir, I don't intend to open that debate. I don't intend to do that. I simply want to deal with some of the remarks made by the Member for Inkster. And since he made those remarks I presume that I am going to have the right of reply.

Now the most amusing part of his talk was the rewriting of British history and he has done that himself in the case of the Dauphin incident. He said that the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Harkness, during the course of an election campaign in 1957 had eggs thrown at him; and, Sir, he has rewritten history already because Mr. Harkness was not the Minister of Agriculture during the election campaign of 1957; he was not a Cabinet Minister at all because the government of which he became a member was not elected until 1958 and this is a classic example, Sir, of how history can be distorted. I'm simply pointing out how history can be distorted. The Honourable Member from Inkster was talking about how history is distorted and he has just done it now. If that remark was allowed to be on the record it would have been a distortion of the facts and I know my honourable friend from Inkster would not want a distortion of the facts to remain on the record. I am simply attempting to put history straight. The incident took place during the election campaign of 1958.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to speak to the particular

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . point of discussion except now the Member for Morris has succeeded in making two statements that are quite inaccurate. Number one, he said that the Honourable the Member for Inkster had just said that Mr. Harkness had eggs thrown at him. With respect I don't think the Member for Inkster said anything of the kind. In fact he clearly read from the Tribune account. The second point -- and here I blush for my honourable friend, and I say blush for him -- because the Member for Morris has said that Mr. Harkness was not the Minister of Agriculture for the reason that the election campaign in question was in 1958 and that Mr. Harkness was not yet a Minister. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Harkness became a Minister of the Crown on June 10th, 1957.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, it shows how carefully the First Minister was listening when I was speaking. I was referring to the remarks made by the Member for Inkster who said that the incident took place in 1957. I said it couldn't have taken place in 1957 because he was not yet a Minister. He didn't become a Minister until 1958 and that during the election campaign of 1958 -- the incident took place during the course of an election campaign and there was not another election campaign after Mr. Harkness became Minister until 1958. But this is all beside the point. --(Interjections)-- I don't know why my honourable friends are raising such an issue about it they know what the facts are, I'm simply . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: I am simply attempting to put the record straight and in my endeavours to do that, in my endeavour to put the record straight, Sir, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In my efforts to put the record straight honourable friends are attempting to distort it again. And if we were to listen to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster, it wasn't Mr. Schultz that threw the eggs at Mr. Harkness, quite the reverse; Harkness threw eggs at Mr. Schultz. That was --(Interjection)-- well, I'm as much at liberty to misinterpret facts as the Member for Inkster and this is somewhat the impression I got. He said because just the reverse was true; he said Mr. Schultz did not throw eggs at Mr. Harkness. The reverse was true. So are we to believe that Mr. Harkness threw eggs at Mr. Schultz. The Member for Inkster has given us a classic example how distortions can be made in this House, and I don't want to carry the subject any further because I hope that the record is straight now and that history will not be distorted in the fashion that my friend from Inkster attempted to distort it. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the debate and I am rather surprised at the Member from Inkster getting so excited about a statement that I made during the Throne Speech, and I would refer him to the statement he made himself. There have been many arguments and debates as to what happened that night and what has happened here in the House at the present time proves the very same thing. You just --(Interjection)-- the Member from Inkster who gets up and says and completely twists around what he says happened, what somebody else says happened, really bases on what he does in debate in this House. Take any statement anybody else makes completely twist it around to the way he wants it, and at the same time admit there had been arguments over the years as to what happened that night. Frankly, it doesn't bother me one bit. Apparently I have hurt a friend of his, but -- doesn't bother me one bit either so really let's get on with the Executive Council Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, although many arguments took place tonight . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. We can only have one member speaking at a time, not 56.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, what the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has just indicated is that it doesn't bother him when he distorts something. The Honourable Member for Morris said that I said -- Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris said that I made a mistake, I used 1957 instead of 1958. I agree with him that's a mistake and I'll correct it, it should have been 1958. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says there were arguments -- I'm suggesting that there was nobody arguing about it, who got the eggs thrown at him. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek prefers to leave his statement on the record without correcting it, knowing that it's wrong, knowing that it's wrong without correcting it -- that Schultz stood with the group that threw eggs at the Minister of Agriculture. Having been told that it's wrong, having had it demonstrated to him that it's wrong and that there was no argument

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . about the time; he says it doesn't bother him, then, Mr. Speaker, we know that it doesn't bother the Member for Sturgeon Creek that he will mislead this House, that he will mislead the people of Manitoba, that he will mislead the people in his constituency and that he will mislead everybody -- that doesn't bother him, that confirms my opinion.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I just came in for the closing remarks of the Member for Inkster but it's remarkable that a Member from Inkster should be worried about misleading people in the Province of Manitoba. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I'd just like to say a word. This is very interesting debate, but I remember so well when the Honourable Member for Inkster was Legal Counsel for this honourable man that we're talking about now back in the good old days. And I wonder if he'd be retained today to be Legal Counsel in defence of the honourable gentleman whose name has been mentioned this afternoon. Because I remember so well the debates that went on, not only on that end but on between the Farmer's Union and the MFAC at that time, many days gone by. But I'd like to say the whole thing could have been saved if the Honourable First Minister hadn't appointed his brother-in-law. While it's not legally wrong to have relatives in my opinion in your own office, I think it's morally wrong and this is about all I have to say on this subject. I think you leave yourself open for debate, for discussion, confusion such as existed here today and the one way to eliminate such debate as gone on this afternoon is to keep relatives out of your office, out of your corporation or any other place that you might work. That's always been my thinking on it - whether it's government or whatever it may be and then you've stopped the debate that's gone on here this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the Honourable the Member for Souris-Killarney that I do accept as a general guideline and general operating principle that it is not a desirable practice to involve in any way in appointed position members of the immediate family. And I think the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney appreciates the fact that those within the immediate family -- I'm referring to my many brothers -- that none of them, but none of them have in any way been involved with the any appointed position in the Crown even ones that might be you might say regarded as Dollar-a-Year, and that thought has occurred to me in certain specific cases but because of the same general attitude as the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney has just expressed I have refrained from so doing.

Now as to whether or not in-laws are to be regarded as immediate family is something that I really am not sure about, but before the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney gets too exercised about what may seem to him to be incipient nepotism, I tell him simply that I have more than just a few examples of where in years gone by at both the federal and provincial level there have been some involvement of near relatives in various echelons of positions in the public service and if it can be justified on the basis of competence, availability and so on I don't see any great problem. And then how is one to treat a practice, phenomena, such as the fact when the man whom I much admire I must say, the former Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker went on his trip around the world that he took his brother Elmer with him and I don't know whether Elmer went at public expense but I rather suspect he did.

Well now honourable members can check that, but there are many shall I say borderline cases where one is genuinely disturbed or genuinely hardput as to know whether it's really right or really quite wrong. So rather than arguing at great length with my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney I would ask him to simply avoid the temptation to read too much or to make too much of the fact that I do have employed in the Executive Council a person who is related in an in-law sense, but who I am satisfied and was satisfied at the time did have the competence, the background experience and was available. So I really have no apologies to offer to my honourable friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm rather surprised at the whole matter of development here this afternoon. We start off with the First Minister's Estimates or the Executive Council for which the First Minister is responsible and the first thing we hear, we hear this matter brought up about one of his assistants. In my opinion I think the Member for Inkster should have been the last one to get up in the House and speak on this occasion. Is he not participating in this particular branch of government on one of the planning committees? --(Interjection)--



(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . Is he not? Well if he's not then I certainly would like to be corrected because this is the understanding I heard, that he is in charge of research. --(Interjection)-- Oh. So we have to distinguish - if I'm wrong then I certainly . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well to help my honourable friend allay his concern, he's quite wrong, quite wrong.

MR. FROESE: Well then I certainly will retract that, because it wasn't only I but I think many people in this province are disturbed or were disturbed that the Honourable Member for Inkster was so closely involved with the Executive Branch of government especially in connection with research; and that the Waffle Group so to speak would have so much influence and be so close to the Premier's position; and certainly that this I think prompted a certain scare and a certain apprehension on the part of many people in this province that this government would now go much stronger, would receive much more direction to go to the left. And that part -- even though it's not -- if he's not working for the government, if he's working for the Party -- but certainly if he has that position, I think a certain amount of that will take place; that we will see a much stronger direction of the Party to the Left and I think this would not be in the best interests of this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): I don't see how the comments of the Honourable Member for Rhineland have any possible connection with the Executive Council under debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think the point is well taken. I think the discussion that has taken place before was taking place on an executive assistant employed by the government. The topic that the honourable member is now speaking about is something that was within the caucus of the New Democratic Party.

MR. FROESE: . . . if it's improper to comment on this I will drop the subject matter and come to some other points.

I am very interested in the Premier's position as to when he goes to the Dominion/Provincial conferences. No doubt we've had a number since we last met and I would like to hear from him on the progress, that the House get a progress report. What is the situation presently and have there been any changes in regard to positions taken by any of the provinces in connection of the domiciling of the British North American Act? With the different aspects of delegation of powers? -- I think this was one of the crucial points. Surely there were others that I think some of the provinces took exception to, but on the main I think it was Quebec at the time that was the province whereby proceedings could not advance, and where the -- well I shouldn't say the matter was dropped, but certainly it was halted. Is there any progress being made at this time? Are there any discussions being held with the Federal Government or any other provinces in connection with this whole matter or is this just dormant at the present time? I for one am interested in this aspect -- and certainly this is the prerogative of the Premier who represents this province when he goes to these conferences -- I think I should first like to hear from him on this one point before I make any other comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister,

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the Honourable Member's remarks and his wondering out loud as to the relationship of the Honourable Member for Inkster and any possible appropriation under this item, I can tell him very quickly in just a few words that the relationship -- the Member for Inkster with respect to research -- has to do with the caucus and the caucus monies available for the purpose of research, in the very same way as the Honourable Member for Rhineland is in receipt of \$500 from the provincial purse for purposes of caucus research and general caucus support, and we assume that the Member for Rhineland in a sense as the Social Credit caucus will use his good judgment as to the disposition of those \$500.00. Similarly it is with respect to the New Democratic caucus.

With respect now to the other part of the honourable member's remarks, he asked what is the status, what is the current circumstance with respect to the efforts of last year to attempt to patriate the Constitution? I tell him simply that as he now knows very well, the entire effort was aborted at the Victoria Conference because of the stance and the position taken by the Province of Quebec. I am not optimistic at the moment that this effort to patriate the Constitution will be successfully revived in 1972. It is, really one might say, in a state of suspended animation. I don't want to say that it's as dead, that the prospects are as dead as the dodo because as the Honourable Member for Rhineland knows, Duff Roblin said in 1962 that

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . the sales tax was as dead as a dodo and four years later it was implemented here in this province. So I think it would be rather perhaps unwise to say that the prospects of patriating our Constitution are as dead as a dodo. Let's say that they remain in abeyance for at least another year. And then I'd rather suspect that there will be a renewed effort made to attempt to get agreement consensus of all of the provinces with respect to an amending formula and patriation itself. I should tell the honourable member too that at least practically up to the middle of the last day of the conference it did seem as though we had achieved success and that it would be possible to bring the Constitution home but the whole thing of course floundered because of the position Quebec took on the matter of social services and jurisdiction relative to social services. If the honourable member has some more specific questions I'll try to deal with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry on a point of order.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I'd seek your direction as to whether it's a point of order or not, Mr. Chairman. It refers to a suggestion made by the First Minister a few moments ago with respect to the question of whether or not Elmer Diefenbaker, the brother of the former Prime Minister, made a world trip with the Prime Minister of the day at public expense. I rather suspect that the First Minister would not want to leave a suspicion on the record if it were inaccurate and I have in the intervening few moments had an opportunity to check that point out. I was going to rise at the time but didn't because I wasn't sure of my facts, Mr. Chairman. My information divulges that the trip was made at personal expense in the case of the Prime Minister's brother and I think the First Minister would want to know that.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, of course I'm more than happy to accept that except that I do point out that if a person is transported on a government vehicle or aircraft there is certainly no provision to my knowledge for charging any civilian individual citizen any charge or fee or ticket price for being transported round the world on a military aircraft or one used by the government service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I would just like to perhaps help the First Minister in this instance because I don't want to see him put statements on the record that he can't back up either. He said that there was no provision made for an individual paying on a government aircraft. I can assure him that there is because I have paid. I have been billed for transportation on government aircraft, not the transportation itself, but the meals and all the other incidentals that go with travelling. Now since the plane is flying in any case it's presumed that there is no additional transportation costs other than the meals that are involved, at hotels and things like that. Mr. Elmer Diefenbaker paid all those expenses himself.

Now, my honourable friend the First Minister knows that when government aircraft are taken -- and I am sure he has done it himself -- on many occasions he has taken the news media with him. I don't know what difference there is taking a personal aide along in the person of one's brother, than there is taking the news media along. Their transportation expenses are paid as well or at least they are paid by their newspapers. But for him to make the inference that there was somehow or another a load on the taxpayers for this particular trip is one that I am sure he would not want to remain on the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, no problem, Mr. Chairman. I have already said that I certainly have no general quarrel with the practice of the administration of Mr. Diefenbaker with respect to the general expenses accrued by the operation of the Office of the Prime Minister. I've already said that. All I was trying to demonstrate to honourable members is that in a number of instances one does come to a rather undefined, unarticulated grey zone with respect to just precisely what is right and what is not so right with respect to use of public property by persons other than those in the public service. I certainly accept the honourable member's word for it -- both the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Honourable Member for Morris -- that expenses incidental to the trip around the world with respect to lodging, food, etc. were no doubt, as they say, no doubt assumed by Mr. Elmer Diefenbaker himself.

But I do say once again that with respect to the cost of the aircraft travel, the air travel involved I find it very difficult to understand how there could have been billing since that is not the normal practice of Federal Government Aircraft Comptrollers to do. And the Honourable

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . Member for Morris wonders out loud if there is any real difference between having a civilian aide in the person of a brother, any distinction between that and having newsmen along. Well the only difference is that I believe newsmen from time to time -- well perhaps I shouldn't say any more.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I have been quite interested in the debate so far, Mr. Chairman, and I suppose it is necessary but we seem to get so involved in issues sometimes. Eggs and things. But I wonder if I could perhaps share an apprehension of mine in this item and the next one. I've expressed this before and I would like to go on record as expressing it again. Things being what they are and me being a member of the government doubtless I will support the estimates of the government, but at the same time I want to go on record as perhaps screaming in the wilderness again that in this department and the next department, we are because of expansion of funds, putting into the hands of government more and more power.

I of course have faith in the present administration and I think the problems of Manitoba have been well served by the staff of the Planning and Priorities Committee of the Cabinet and the people that head up this particular function of government, but nevertheless in the past I have expressed the need for us to address ourselves to what we are doing in this regard. We are putting more and more power in the hands of governments. I have expounded in the past that we establish data and information in the public domain. I brought forth a concept three years ago, I called it the Human Resource Research Council. Of course every time I stood up everybody said here he is going again beating his drum for it. I am still beating the drum for it. Because in the past three years that I've been a member of the Legislature the things that press upon my time, for me to make any kind of a pretense of making a contribution to deciding in the interests of my constituents, it is going to be necessary for me to have more immediate access to the information that is being taken in in the decision-making process.

You have all been exposed to such things as Bill 36. You have all been exposed to the debate in the Hydro flooding, 714, 856 and all the rest of it, but this information has been presented to you as legislators long after the time that it has first been fed into somebody's mind to make a valued judgment; the valued judgment in the sense that this will be looked at or this will be discarded. And I would suggest that what we are doing is continuing on a path that in my view is leading us down to locking ourselves more and more into a bureaucratic system.

From my experience, Mr. Chairman, in this Legislature I think that every member that's in this House regardless of political philosophy tries to make the best decision possible as far as his constituents are concerned, but I think that you will all agree with me that it is becoming more and more difficult. For an example, here we have been in session two months and I would hazard a guess that we are going to be here until at least the end of August. But being a member of the government caucus and I criticize my colleagues not, I think that participatory democracy with this group has perhaps been more of a reality than it has been in the past, and I don't mean this is a criticism of past administrations or past governments so much, but it has been a younger group, the lines of responsibility haven't been entrenched and as a result they have been able to approach problems perhaps with an openness of mind. Over the years doubtless, if this same group stays in here, they will fall into habit patterns.

Mr. Chairman, I see here a request of the government for the authorization of expenditures of \$1.2 million, an increase from \$1.1 million, and an increase from \$1 million to \$1.3 million. This in my view is, if you will look at it you will realize, these two functions of government intend to do more. Because they intend to do more they are going to have more of an effect on all of us. We did in the last session pass a token, at least in my mind, a token amount, that each one of us as members would get \$500 as a research allowance. And I would ask you to be realistic. How much research can you as an individual purchase for \$500.00? When you as members of this Legislature are asked to pit your \$500 against the \$1.2 million of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet; and you are asked to pit your \$500 against the \$1.3 million of the Management Committee of Cabinet, what does this mean in realistic terms? Now I'm not really talking about party politics, or anything else, I'm talking about your position as a legislator and my position as a legislator vis-a-vis the Executive Council. And realistically if we are going to evolve a meaningful evaluative system of the Executive Council's performance of their responsibility then I would suggest it is necessary for us to look for other means than the ones we have evolved so far in history.

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)

I have in the past, as I repeat, suggested that it is necessary to place in the public domain the mechanics of which we should address ourselves to. That all data which is collected is placed in the public domain so that anyone can take their value assumptions and put it through the data that's available and you will know the assumptions that they took into this data. You will have access to the data yourself so you will be able to evaluate their conclusions relative to the conclusions that you may want to make in a much more intelligent manner.

Mr. Chairman, I may be slightly out of order in this regard but nevertheless there is no other opportunity for me to discuss this issue during this present session, and I would repeat, I think I have used the parallel in past contributions that when Aristotle stuck a stick down the well in 500 B. C. it took 2000 years before somebody got the guts to go and see if the world was round.

I would suggest gentlemen and the Member for Fort Rouge that we haven't got this time and if we are going to be responsible to the citizens of the Province of Manitoba then we as legislators, not as members of government or members of opposition, but we as legislators have to address ourselves in the necessity of evolving a system whereby people can make more meaningful interpretations of the information that is available. Rothschild said sometime ago that if he controlled the economics of a country he didn't give a tinker's damn about the politics. What we are moving into, Mr. Chairman, is a realm of data distortion. That those people who control the data, the information in our society, are the ones that are going to determine our lives in the future. -- (Interjection) -- Cabinet? The Member for Morris says Cabinet. Well it's this Cabinet or another Cabinet, politicians come and go, but if we had locked it into there what we are doing really is locking it into the bureaucracies under the Cabinets. And in my view, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I didn't draw this to the attention of the members of this Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4 (a) -- passed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly listened very intently to what the Member for Winnipeg Centre had to say and I certainly agreed with him to a large extent that we are putting so much money into the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet and the Management Committee. Why don't we have a greater distribution between the various members of this House so that we can ascertain certain things for ourselves. We know that most of the legislation, practically all of the bills coming forward are coming forward from cabinets of government and I'm not saying that this shouldn't be so, because this has been the practice for so many years. And also because so much responsibility has been placed on cabinet as such, being responsible on behalf of the government party, and therefore naturally they take the position that they're responsible, and they are responsible under our laws and as a result they bring forth the various measures of legislation. But whether we shouldn't have more change in this regard, that more bills and more legislation should come forward from different sources and be considered and agreed to.

I have always been interested in the system of our neighbouring nation here whereby legislation is being considered on the basis of its merits and not on the basis of the party system. We, if the government here loses a major piece of legislation, if they don't get the support the government is considered as having lost confidence and therefore elections are called. I know we had a bill introduced, was it two sessions ago, by the now Senator Molgat, to vary this to a certain degree. This bill was then referred to committee, that the committee came back with an answer as being not in agreement and probably couldn't be fitted in under the system as it now is being operated so that nothing came of it. However, I think this shouldn't preclude that nothing should be done and that we shouldn't be looking forward toward improvements as the Member for Winnipeg Centre pointed out. I certainly would go along that more money should be made available for research purposes for our members individually and probably combined and not have all the monies under the executive branch of government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 (a) -- passed. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On 5, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're still on -- I have to pass the Resolution first. 4 (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; (d) -- The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, on Administrative Salaries. The First Minister in his introductory remarks spoke of the many assistants that the Prime Minister had and the many assistants that the Premier of Ontario had. He did not mention how many he had under this

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . item. I wonder if he would inform the House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the number is 19, which encompasses both the Premier's office and the Executive Council office exclusive of the two Secretariats. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Swan River is aware of the sort of bifurcated nature of the Executive Council office in that it has also the Premier's office staff included therein? A further breakdown would be that of the 19 it would be in the order of approximately seven and twelve or six and thirteen, I'm just not quite sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) -- passed; (e) -- passed . . . the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Just one question on (e), Mr. Chairman. It refers to government hospitality and presentations in the amount of \$40,000, it's rather intriguing, I just wondered if I could ask the First Minister where was the Opposition when the government hospitality was being handed out?

. . . . . continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do believe that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has a wrong interpretation as to just what is meant here by "government hospitality". It is not a slush fund for friends. It really has to do with those organizations from Canada, national organizations which meet here in Manitoba from time to time. If a national organization and/or an international association or organization chooses to meet in Winnipeg or elsewhere in Manitoba for an annual convention obviously they do make inquiries and among the inquiries they make is with respect to the tendering of a luncheon or a general grant to assist in terms of hospitality and this then goes to a committee -- I say this for the honourable member's information -- it goes to a committee which is comprised of the Clerk of the Council, I believe one of the Assistant Deputy Ministers in Industry and Commerce and possibly one or two other people. They then make a recommendation as to whether or not the inquiring group is eligible and if it is then a hospitality grant or luncheon is tendered. And to cover this we have this item which I think is a long-standing one, of \$40,000.00. I believe this practice has been going on for close to a decade if not more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e) -- passed . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: When I speak on (e) I'm not speaking so much on government hospitality but rather on presentations and maybe the matter I'm referring to probably doesn't come completely under this item, but from time I receive letters and I'm sure other members must be receiving letters from schools, whether we haven't got a pin available that I could, as a member, could give to the school children. I know some years ago I distributed some and I bought some and ordered some from one of the departments. But I never got the order, I never got the pins. I feel that this is one thing that we should do. Certainly --(Interjection)-- No, 500 pins.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, this is one thing that we can do and we should be doing to create pride in our province, and when the Minister of Tourism is spending a lot of money in advertising in other provinces I think the least we can do is provide a little pin for our school children in the province. We had the golden buffalo pin I know some years ago. Why can't these be made available to members so that they can be distributed? I feel that this is an item that should definitely be provided for in the Estimates. I know the other day we had a school here from across the line; they sang some beautiful songs. The Attorney-General spoke to them and later on he presented them with some kind of token. I don't know, I didn't see them personally, just what kind they were but surely enough if we can do this to people, students coming from outside the province we certainly should have this available to students of our own province. I as a member would be prepared even to pay for them if necessary as long as this government makes them available so that we can get them. This was the sorry point, that I couldn't even get them for the students.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the honourable member's sentiments although I confess that as to the detail as to whether or not they are available or readily available or excessively available I really can't say offhand. My impression however is that if the honourable member were to contact the Secretary attached to my office or the Clerk that arrangements have been made -- just as an example, the honourable member mentions school children. There was for example a group of school children from the Virden area and I believe that the Member for Virden did arrange for presentation of pins and the same with respect to Churchill. So the Member for Rhineland should not be shy about it and simply make inquiry. He'll I'm sure agree that in 1967 -- well I can't say for sure, about 67 but I assume it's correct -- 1970, during the two Centennial years there was really a good deal of presentation of provincial emblem pins and crests to school children and really in a very pervasive way throughout the whole province and even visitors.

Now there are different kinds of pins, the buffalo emblem in brass, the buffalo emblem in plastic and each cost different amounts. I say that the honourable member will perhaps be a little surprised to know that the cost of a metal type pin is not insignificant so that one really should not be distributing them indiscriminately. However, his point nevertheless is well taken and I simply advise him to inquire at the Secretary's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, on that subject just a brief word. I support the Honourable Member for Rhineland and for the edification of the First Minister I tried the other day ,

(MR. BILTON cont'd) . . . . to get a half dozen and it's kaput. You just can't get them, that's all there is to it. I went to the source that he speaks of and it didn't work.

MR. SCHREYER: I can look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e) -- passed; Resolution . . . the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, further to that subject, I might say that I went to the same source that the Honourable Member for Swan River speaks of and prevailed on the party and I got enough to supply him with the six that he wanted. But I was given to understand that the supply wouldn't be provided to me in future; it was a very special favour and they just weren't available so . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4 in the amount of \$280,000 -- passed; Resolution (5) (a) (1) . . . The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be in order then to make some brief introductory comments with respect to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet and its Secretariat. Honourable members can no doubt infer from the title itself this has to do with the policy-formulating mechanism for government and also has to do with the administrative support staff needed in order to do the economic analysis, in order to do all of the research and advice necessary to policy formation.

Of course the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has already alluded to the process of policy formulation in modern times and contemporary times and there is no question but that the nature of the decision-making process is changing, is changing for many reasons, Mr. Chairman, but primarily because there is recognition that the nature of government becoming more complex and more and more issues and problems that have to be grappled with are really not simply that of one department or another and so more and more program development really consists of inter-departmental evaluation and inter-departmental co-ordination.

I think honourable members would be interested to know that the Government of Ontario has in the last two years given a good deal of attention and monies really for a very painstaking analysis of the nature of government organization and ways and means of improving on government organization. And one of the things that the committee on -- as they call it the Productivity Commission which really has to do with government productivity and organization -- one of the many things that they recommend is that there ought to be more, shall I say sub-committees of Cabinet or committees of Cabinet, each dealing with policy fields and each policy field in their opinion would be about four or five in number, each of these really is to encompass the operations of in turn three or four departments.

Now I am not so optimistic or naive as to think that restructuring of governmental organization and administration will solve problems in itself or that it will have some dramatic effect on problem solving, nevertheless there are certain lessons that stand out quite clearly, and that is, among other, it is that more and more program formulation to be done properly has to be done on an inter-departmental co-ordinated manner. Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet was an attempt initiated not really very long ago, three, four years ago, an attempt to bring about more inter-department liaison in policy decision making. And I think that it should be said too that until 1970, really the latter part of 1970, the Planning and Priorities Secretariat was quite skeletal in nature and we have been in a modest way fleshing it out with certain appropriate staff appointments to give it an increased research capability so that it can carry out its function of helping to articulate - really researching and helping to articulate what government policy is to be. There are also very good reasons why when programs are entered into it is necessary to follow up in a systematic way to evaluate just how effective and how efficient programs are and how they're operating.

There is by the very nature of things a close inter-relationship between the planning and prioritizing process and Management Committee or Treasury Board because if Planning and Priorities' function is to in a co-ordinated fashion come up with policy proposals and prioritizing, it is the function of Management or Treasury Board to look very closely at the cost benefit or the cost utility of programs and also to advise Cabinet on the efficiency of operations of the various departments of government. It is through Management Committee that government is able to keep a detailed account of administrative procedures, staffing patterns and procedures, pay scales and the like.

I should perhaps anticipate honourable members' questions with respect to staff complement. Under Planning and Priorities we have really - until very recently we had two

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . secretariats. One having to do with the planning function as such, the other having to do with co-ordination inter-departmentally of the many different Federal-Provincial shared cost programs such as ARDA, ARDA III-A, ARDA III-B, FRED, The Pas Special Area and so on. Because these programs are inter-departmental in nature they are co-ordinated through the aegis of this secretariat and this committee of Cabinet.

In terms of staff there is a total of 26 engaged in the planning function, Planning Secretariat, and 36 in the Continuing Programs, part of the operations which really has to do with co-ordination of Federal-Provincial shared cost agreements, some of which are very detailed in nature. The Pas Special Area Agreement involves a great deal of detail as does the FRED Program. Perhaps I should break that down further by explaining to honourable members that there are 11.5 staff man-years taken up in the FRED Program which is joint Federal-Provincial, three staff man-years engaged in The Pas Special Area and four relative to the ARDA Program. Then of course some parts of these special area programs are carried out, implemented by the several departments of government and there would be staff man-years deployable or allocated within each of the respective line departments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his comments. I wonder if I'd be permitted to put some broad questions dealing with all the various categories under this Resolution?

Could he inform us as to what extensions have been taking place under the ARDA-FRED and the various agreements because when discussing the Agricultural Committee estimates we never got to the point of ARDA. I don't know whether we'll be getting to those points in other departments because by the time that we get to the point the time has lapsed and since we are now on it, whether he can inform us what the total programs are, to what extent they have expanded and also enlarged if so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rhineland perhaps would have to be a little more specific. I should advise him that the ARDA Program is quite diffuse in nature. It is true that ARDA III-A General is dealt with under the Department of Agriculture. However ARDA III-B is not dealt with in the Department of Agriculture but can properly be dealt with here under these estimates. FRED and ARDA III-A General are dealt with under Agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Some of the information that the First Minister has given us would appear to be information requested in an Order for Return that we had and I assume that we'll be receiving the Order for Return shortly, would we?

MR. SCHREYER: If the honourable member is referring to an Order for Return that was filed during the session, I would expect that the Minister of Agriculture will be tabling the Return some time soon. I'll check with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5 . . . the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I certainly would not want to put my First Minister in an embarrassing position so I would just like to get it clear that my comments before and the few remarks I wish to make now are not a criticism of the government. If I had a criticism it is that they are doing their job too well perhaps. But nevertheless, as everyone who has been in government for a while realizes as a backbencher I see the Estimates at the same time as any other member of the House, and I think we would be naive if we thought the advisors to governments don't have an influence on their thinking. What I had suggested earlier, and I would ask the members to consider my remarks as being made by a member of the Legislative Assembly and not the member of a government or a member of a particular political group, that I think that some of our responsibilities transcend these relationships and the remarks I made earlier I would ask be considered in that light.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5 . . . the Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre and the fact that the Planning and Priorities Secretariat will be unquestionably increased in size and in research and analysis capability over the years will simply bear out the contention being advanced by the honourable member.

I think honourable members might be interested to know what some of the more specific duties and functions of the Planning Section are. There are really a number of



(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . subsections of endeavour and research. There is, for example, a section that works on analysis and evaluation of present-day Federal-Provincial housing and urban development studies and there is an interface here between the personnel, admittedly small in number, between the personnel working on housing and urban development with the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. There is also a subsection of endeavour having to do with economic research and analysis, the preparation of econometric models, input-output analysis, etc.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland might be interested to know, the Member for Riel I believe also, -- have made suggestions that there ought to be some easily identifiable locus in the government for energy policy research and determination, and certainly it is through the Planning Secretariat that we have initiated some admittedly modest but necessary studies into the cost benefits of certain hydro developments etc. and I do believe that there is some responsibility on the government to develop a more systematic arrangement and capability to evaluate present day energy policy generally with respect to export policy of fossil fuels and all related matters. So this capability will be expanded under the Planning Secretariat.

The winter works -- honourable members many of them are interested in the effectiveness and the criteria that are used in our provincial employment program PEP, our winter works program. The fact that the Minister of Labour was able to rise in the House here today and state that Manitoba's unemployment rate was among the lowest in Canada of all the provinces, in fact the lowest this current month, is I think due in some substantial or significant part to the fact that under the aegis of Planning and Priorities we have been able to establish a small task force, an administrative capability to co-ordinate -- first of all to conceptualize a winter employment program and then to follow up with an administrative overview of the many applications that started to come in. And my figures may be out of date a bit but the latest information I was given is that through the provincial PEP program it was possible to generate 12,000 man months of employment under these programs this last winter. It is intended to maintain the capability in Planning and Priorities to respond relatively quickly to contingencies of winter unemployment, regional-abnormal, regional-unemployment, etc. The Pensioner Home Repair Program, that too conceptualized and administered through the aegis of the Planning and Priorities Secretariat. So this is the nature of the work of this part of the governmental administration and in carrying out its many faceted research and evaluation it has at times divided itself into various working groups in order to evaluate present programs and to come up with new program proposals.

There has been for over a year now, about two years actually, a northern working group of staff personnel working on northern development policy, not just economic development but human resources development, and in order to perform effectively it did not take us very long to see, and we saw it very clearly, that it's necessary to bring in not one department or two but literally, virtually, half to three-quarters of all of the government departments in existence and to co-ordinate the evaluation and research through the mode of a working group. There has also been one on purchasing policy. The honourable members opposite will appreciate that purchasing policy of the Crown and the manner in which purchases are made can be very important, not only in terms of attempting to get the best possible purchase or buy on the many things that the Crown purchases but also in terms of trying to relate government purchasing needs with the industrial development potential inherent in many of the supplies that the Crown purchases.

Then too there has been a working group on manpower particularly with reference to northern Manitoba. Before the Honourable Member for Rhineland becomes excited as to why we are focusing on northern Manitoba I will tell him it is primarily because Canada Manpower has a reasonable presence in southern Manitoba, and without any insult intended to Canada Manpower I must say that in the north, in the smaller communities of northern Manitoba Canada Manpower has not had any meaningful presence. And in an effort to try to do something about that gap or that lack of presence the province has developed a skeletal form of a manpower corps and in order to get the many different component factors properly evaluated in developing a northern manpower corps and policy it was necessary to establish a working group, inter-departmental working group focusing on that.

And then finally there has been also a working group on urban development and urban transportation. And in that connection these people have been involved with the rail

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . rationalization study representing the Province at the officials' level, the City and the Federal Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, again I wish to thank the Minister for the information that he has been giving us. When we talk of the various items, the various programs, shared-cost programs with the Federal Government such as the ones that are listed here, the ARDA, the FRED and the DREE agreements what I was really after was whether there was any expansion taking place in any of these programs.

Then too I'm also interested in the question of Medicare. When the Medicare agreement or Act was passed in the Federal House there was a stipulated time period to that agreement. Have any negotiations been taking place by the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government as to the continuance of Medicare and to what extent? Have considerations been given to enlarging the scope of Medicare, and if so just what are the implications? What would the increase in cost be if there were certain items added to the program. No doubt negotiations must be taking place between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government because I think the program, the initial program under the first Act that was passed I think are running out - is it this year or next year? - I think it was for a five-year period - and is it going to continue on the same basis as heretofore or can we expect any changes over the next period of the agreement?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't really presume to give the honourable member any definitive answers with respect to the prospects for alteration or adjustment in the present Federal-Provincial agreement on medical and health care.

The honourable member I'm sure is well aware that the Federal Government has put forward a proposal many months ago in terms of trying to hold the line on cost increases in health care and they have put forward a formula which is related to I believe gross national product and many of the provinces have expressed great concern or reluctance about accepting such a formula since it doesn't take into account some pretty hard or harsh realities in terms of health care costs. So the whole matter -- and this is really, many hundreds of millions of dollars are involved here nationwide and even in the context of Manitoba alone there are many many millions of dollars involved -- the process is still, it's a process of negotiation. Negotiation will go on for some time yet and I don't see at the moment any sort of definite answer on the horizon as to what the nature of our new agreement will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5 (a) (1) -- passed . . . the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I was interested in listening to the explanations of the First Minister on the expanded functions of the Planning and Priorities Committee, particularly his estimate of present staffing. I took it to be a total of 62 roughly including the Continuing Programming that is being done and I wondered at the time how that compared over the last three years with staffing. What the rate of increase has been in that department. And I was interested enough to look back to the estimates of the previous administration for the year ending March 31st, 1970 where the spending estimates projected an amount for Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet of \$306,000 roughly. Now we have a total of \$1,245,000, an increase of roughly 400 percent. Now we have had explanations about an expanded function here but really this is an astonishing growth in a committee of Cabinet and one that I think exceeds most other rates of growth. We have become accustomed to expanded costs and rate increases over the years but really, Mr. Chairman, this amount of growth seems to me to be somewhat astonishing and I wonder how staffing compares with the staffing of Planning and Priorities during the last year of the previous administration. Has there been a 400 percent increase in staff for instance during that time? Has the total function provided by that department of Cabinet increased and expanded really in terms of the total dollar costs?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's really no need to be astonished because I have already explained to honourable members that the whole nature and function of Planning and Priorities has undergone a very definite transition in the last three years. I think there is no secret about the fact that Planning and Priorities was established only relatively recently in the last 60's, I can't swear to it but I suspect 1967 or 68 -- 68 it was actually established -- and so naturally in the first year it would be only insipient and would

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . have staff man-years much less than in the second and third year and so on. So that's one explanation.

The other is that until 1970 there was no northern working group to try to co-ordinate and come up with new policy proposals with respect to northern economic development, northern transportation development, northern manpower, there was no working group, therefore there was that much less need for staff size. There was no inter-departmental working group on purchasing policy nor was there one on urban development and urban transit. So if one were to roll back all of -- to back away from these various new policy research and policy evaluation capabilities one could go back to a staff size of I suppose two staff-man years, a director and a secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Before we pass the complete item, I don't want to hold up individual items when we come to them, but the Minister has mentioned a number of things that have been the concern of the Planning and Priorities Committee. What about Crown Corporations? To what extent are these being considered by the Planning Committee? For instance the -- I always forget the name of the one dealing with mineral or resources up in the north, the company that was -- the one that was set up. No doubt this just didn't come out of thin air and most likely there was a lot of planning done before it was set up and I imagine that this was one of the considerations given by one of these committees. Therefore I am asking the question about Crown Corporations. No doubt so much of the financing is being done by the Development Corporation and the Department of Industry and Commerce more or less is in direct concern and relationship with them, but to what extent does this particular committee and committees deal with Crown Corporations.

I also had one other question and that is in connection with the Harbours Board. I think this is a Federal matter, but no doubt the province must have an interest in Churchill and in the harbour there, and has the province been negotiating for any increased facilities at the port? What is the state at the present time? Can we expect further development by the Federal Government of the Port of Churchill? I am very interested in this aspect and maybe the Minister can throw some light on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could direct a couple of questions to the First Minister. Since Planning and Priorities has been dealing with the question of heavy water I believe there was mention of it in some report commissioned by the previous government; and since that time there has been a great deal of discussion, some I believe with Ottawa and I understand that Planning and Priorities has been dealing or is dealing with. I wondered if the Premier could let us know at what stage we are, or is this a pipe dream, or is there some real possibilities for the north of this billion dollar - so called billion dollar heavy water plant?

. . . . continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Member for Thompson is referring to the chapter in the TED report which was devoted to oh - some very cursory analysis of the prospects of a uranium enrichment plant as distinct from a heavy water plant. And since the publishing of the TED report back in February, I think it was of 1969, I know that some members opposite - I think three or four honourable members opposite have had a continuing interest in this notion that Manitoba could get in first with a bid, you might say, to get approval of the Government of Canada and in turn to get the technology from a United States Atomic Energy in order to build a uranium enrichment plant. In fact the Member for Riel about a month ago was asking questions in this House relative to the prospects of proceeding with a uranium enrichment plant.

Mr. Chairman the Honourable Member for Thompson - his question affords me the opportunity to make it clear that the prospects for a uranium enrichment plant anywhere in Canada are extremely remote and will remain so for the next five to ten years and there is no exaggeration attendant to my last statement. In the first place the Government of Canada is not particularly anxious to have anyone in Canada proceed with uranium enrichment since the whole technology, all the millions of dollars spent by the federal purse since 1945 through Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has been on a different avenue altogether. Not of uranium enrichment, but millions of dollars have been spent on heavy water and natural uranium.

Now in the second place it has to be said that a uranium enrichment plant involves capital investments well in excess of a billion dollars. It will require - it's a high energy consumer, and will require something in the order of one million to two million kilowatts of energy; in other words an entire Kettle Rapids plant would have to be devoted just to the uranium enrichment plant itself, and the requirements would be according to the information I received from the federal authorities of another plant of equal size as firm standby, so we would have to dedicate two Kettle Rapids type plants just to provide the energy necessary for the operation of uranium enrichment.

Then in addition to that of course that means \$600 million in investment in Hydro generating plants. It means - I don't know what in terms of the investment in the uranium enrichment plant itself. And on top of all that in order to hit this on the head properly at least for a few years it has to be said that the technology for uranium enrichment still remains a - if not a closely guarded secret of the United States Atomic Energy, it certainly is confined, the technology is confined to a very tight circle.

In the meantime, the hope that European countries would be interested in buying enriched uranium is falling by the boards for the reason that European technology is developing gaseous diffusion technology with respect to the uranium enrichment and they will have little need for purchasing quantities from North America. So for every reason, practically every reason conceivable I can tell my friend the Member for Thompson that this is pretty close to being a pipe dream.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5 A (1) passed - - The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, as my final contribution on this item I would just suggest to honourable members, if they would like to go into some of my proposals in depth I'm down to my last 100,000 copies of a paper I prepared in this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5 A (1) - - passed; A (2) passed - -

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rhineland asked a question which I would like to try to answer. He was asking whether Manitoba has any involvement with the operation of the harbour at Churchill. Certainly Manitoba has had over the years an interest in seeing greater use of the Port of Churchill; and we have through the Department of Industry and Commerce rather more than through Planning and Priorities endeavoured to keep in touch with the federal authorities in order to try to promote greater use of the Port of Churchill. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland is suggesting that the province should be anxious to assume part of the financial responsibility of what is now carried by the Federal Department of Public Works, the National Harbours Board, I would really fail to see his reasoning or understand his logic. It would be somewhat the same as his proposal that the Province of Manitoba should put \$50 million into the building of a railway from Gypsumville to Wabowden. I suggest to the honourable member that if the Canadian National Railways is not prepared to extend railway lines, they are doing so no doubt for reasons of economic reality and Manitoba would not want

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . to get involved with the building of a Pacific Great Eastern type of railway. As the honourable member knows that the Province of British Columbia - no fault of the present administration - had to write off the books \$92 million that was initially invested in that railway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, certainly when I made the suggestion was not that nothing should come out of it, that we should just create a big white elephant. Not by any means. But because when we had the Agriculture Committee hearings up in the Interlake area, what did we hear from the people there? That rail lines were being abandoned and that they wanted the railways to stay, - and if we are going to develop the Port of Churchill to be of use to Manitoba farmers then we must have a connection in Manitoba, otherwise we will just see Saskatchewan grain being shipped to that port. Manitoba grain will never go to that port. So I feel that - Oh I certainly would welcome the Member for Churchill to participate in debate - but I feel that having a seaport and we're the only prairie province that has one certainly we should try and develop it. That doesn't mean to say that we wouldn't want to have the Federal Government share in such a program. I'm sure that we should have this on a shared basis - that the Federal Government should be interested and contribute toward it, because we already have storage facility there for wheat and we are increasing the shipments of grain from that port almost every year, and I would like to see this increased and certainly it would be to the advantage of the Manitoba farmer.

And then if I'd speak of connecting the railway with the one going up north, certainly I envisioned that it could be used for more purposes than just shipping grain. Certainly it could be put to other uses. Well let's develop our resources up north, I'm for it so that we can derive some revenues as a province from our natural resources for the benefit of the people of the province. I am sure that British Columbia is certainly developing the north. They're extending their railway, they're extending it again this year and they're going to put use to it; I'm sure they are not just extending it for the purpose of extending it. They want to make use of it and they are making use of it, and it's not a liability any more. It's making money; it made close to a million dollars net surplus last year; it's no longer a white elephant by any means. And when I make a suggestion here in this House, certainly this would have to be gone into; we would have to have studies made on this and see whether something could be made, and then also increase the facilities at the port so that other things than just wheat could be shipped - that we could also have other shipments brought in, not just having it a one-way street.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the other part of the honourable member's question was as I recall it something as follows - whether or not the Planning and Priorities Secretariat was engaged in any studies of the feasibility, the economic feasibility I assume, of Crown Corporations in one or another sector of our economy. And in that connection I can tell the honourable member that the government does not have any dogmatic attitude whatsoever with respect to the operations of the various sectors in our economy; and if there appears to be a gap in the performance of our economy; if there appears to be some evidence that there could be a presence of a plant or an enterprise of one kind or another, then if that checks out it's a case then of determining whether or not it is more - shall I say more logical to proceed by the instrumentality by their private corporation or a public corporation or some combination of both. And certainly I would hope that in the 1970s nobody would get hung up about this old shibboleth - about private enterprise or public enterprise. I have often said that in our day and age we can not afford, nor should we want to kneel at the altar of private enterprise nor should we genuflect at the altar of public enterprise; that on the basis of the evidence and the cost benefit ratios upon analysis, but and only after analysis is the decision made as to whether it is private, public or some combination of both. The Honourable Member for Rhineland may find that somehow at variance with his thinking but I say to him that even in the bastion of private enterprise in British Columbia there are more than a few public or Crown operating entities, many of them I think quite justifiable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5 - - The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I will try to be very brief. I am glad my friend from Rhineland spoke up. I was going to let it slide by but I suppose we can spend a few more minutes, specially on the Planning and Priorities because I think there is a particular difference of opinion between the Member for Thompson and myself and I had hoped that I could follow him but he outwaited me.

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)

First of all we've embarked on an Urban Renewal Program of \$11 million which I think is good; and I believe that probably the Member for Inkster best explained it when he said that no people should be forced to live under the circumstances and the surroundings that the people of Churchill had to for so many years. So I think that without going into it much further than that we could almost hang our hat on that part of that particular program because it is one in which finally the two governments have come together. They are spending the monies to help see to it that the program is a viable one as much as possible; agreeable one with the people of Churchill themselves.

And it's a question of which comes first, the chicken or the egg I suppose; the Member for Thompson and I can't just really get down to deciding which is the chicken and which is the egg. I feel that you have to have good conditions to encourage people to come and stay; so consequently the living conditions have to be comparable to those in which the people are leaving. And not only that but they have to be one which entices the wife and the family to come and join the men that are moving to Churchill to live, and that is very important. There are some even in this unholy Chamber that have lived there for years and really they didn't suffer too much during that time.

But then we come to one stage that all Manitoba governments have paused and reflected and really not got off the deep end - and that is policy. Manitoba policy for Churchill and the development as a resource. And while the First Minister said, surely you don't want us to get involved in what is an economic responsibility of the Federal Government, and I agree with that, but that doesn't stop us from having a policy and a plan, and I think that in itself is very very important. I think that it is something that we have to consider and we have to consider more and more as time goes by, because now that we have decided that we are going to establish Churchill as a community that will have a long time establishment in that particular area then we have to decide what is going to make it a viable area economically. And there are things that are good. I look at it and say it's an ideal spot for a medical referral centre. Certainly it's ideal in that all those people in the North, in the high Arctic will have to come out for the more sophisticated medical attention that will be required. And as the population in the high Arctic grows so will the demand for more and more of that type of medical attention. And then it will have to be used just the same as the American Army recognized the value of Churchill and they built a hospital many years ago to do that very thing, use this referral centre to bring those wounded prisoners over before they sent them on back to the United States I would say that those that are ill would - it would be an ideal place and I know that the government are considering spending a great deal of money on a medical centre in Churchill and I think that it should have a wide horizon and a high one if they're looking at that area.

I think that the Port development is one which we must look and look very long and strong at because it's one of the natural resources that we do have there and yet we're reluctant to get out publicly and say anything about it. And while governments apparently are willing to deal quietly with the Federal Government on the Port of Churchill and say well, why don't you do these things or what's happening here, the public don't hear about it. And as far as I'm concerned when nothing happens for 40 or 50 years, then it's about time that it was made an issue, a public issue. And if we can't stand up to the things that are local, then publicly, then we're not doing our job. We've waited an awful long time patiently to deal with the bureaucrats, and I say it must be the bureaucrats in Ottawa, then we should take the bull by the horns and say these are our policies that we think are important and these are the things that we think should be done and make sure that the people of Manitoba know, the people of western Canada know and of course, people of Ottawa know. And now more important than ever, the people of the Northwest Territories know. So they know that we are willing to back up the development of the Port facilities. Certainly industry in the business world within Manitoba itself should know so that they're able to prepare with the thrust that must take place if they're going to get along with the development as the Prime Minister paints it in his speeches.

And then the other field. There's the science council and the higher education field and I have not called to the university as they have in the past because it seems to be a goal that is fairly high and it's a longer way off a than most of us would care to look at, but certainly the science council in studying marine life, in studying permafrost conditions, in studying the movement of the animals and the birds and the floral conditions, are important. They're more important today than they were two years ago or five or ten years ago. They represent the

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . ecology of the Arctic and certainly the environment is one of the important things that people are disturbed about in their minds today. There are some that would say in overstating their case that we're afraid the treasures of the high Arctic shouldn't be developed because it will disturb the ecology of a third or more of Canada, and of the world in many cases. They overstate their case but they do have many important points. In what better place can they start to study than Churchill. I think they have a good place to start, they've got modern conditions, but they also have an area that sits on the very frontier of the ecology in which they want to study.

One of the other important things of course are the rivers that run into the Hudson Bay. I remember just two or three weeks ago I sat and listened to the Admiral that was in charge of the sovereignty of the North and the waters that surround Canada itself and he was very concerned about the pollution of the ocean sea waters, stated that one in every 250 ships that sail, sink - that over 250 ships a year sink, and he said that's a great pollution. But he said the real problem is that everything that you dump in your rivers whether it be in your little home town or wherever else means that that eventually ends up in the sea. And what better place would it be to study it than in the Hudson Bay where many of the rivers in the North American continent end up in the Hudson Bay. I think there are many of those things that we can take advantage of. Certainly - I wouldn't want that taken in the wrong context either, but we have a wonderful building up there that the Premier had a foresight in purchasing some few years ago or salvaging. We've got the naval base that could be used for such a building. So the buildings are there, all we have to have is the manpower. We have the setup in Ottawa, in fact I understand some of the officials from Ottawa have been up there very recently to study it.

Going on to the last one. We have of course Churchill as an ideal transportation and communication centre for the North. Regardless of what you say about the sophisticated communication systems that are talked about as far as satellites, etc., I understand that still they'll require the communication system that Churchill has to keep the high Arctic in touch with the rest of North America. So that is very important. The transportation centre. Having the railroads and such a wonderful airport facility and with the harbour facilities then with these we can offer any type of transportation that would be required.

Certainly the Colonel or General whatever it was at the Armed Services that is in charge at the expedition that's up there now expressed it much better than I could when he said that he chose Churchill because it had all the types of services that were required to service an army of a 1,000 men and to service vehicles and the planes and offer the medical attention and the food services, etc. that were necessary to keep the Army going. It was his choice. So Churchill has a lot to offer but it needs a policy and it needs a plan and it needs somebody to love it a little and give it a little push. I think that Churchill will be a guiding light sometime for the people of Manitoba to not only laugh at but to be very proud of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30? The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.