

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 17, 1973

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 95 students, Grade 6 standing of the John M. King School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Thiessen, Mrs. Johnson and Miss Haig. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

We also have 60 students of Grade 8 standing of the Bruns Collegiate hosting the Polyuante Ulrich Huot from Quebec City. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Guilbault, Mr. Nazarewich and the guests Mr. Denis, Mr. Hammon and Mlle. Turcotte. The host school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel.

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; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development, relates to the Main Street project in the LIP program. Will the provincial government consider supporting the Main Street project in the event funds are withdrawn by the . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement that the LIP program funds are in fact going to be withdrawn, will the government be considering the possibility of funding the Main Street project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Official Opposition posed a question this morning that was quite general knowledge becoming more specific pertaining to individual groups that have applied and have been accepted for LIP grants, Main Street projects. The Main Street project itself has been informed that their funds will end on May 31, 1973. They've asked for an extension. I equally have made representation to the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare, asked for an extension for that program and if it is refused by the Federal Government the Provincial Government will have to look at its priorities and availability of funds and so on.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Health and Social Development can indicate whether the government considers the Main Street project a worthwhile undertaking?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, after having attended quite a few meetings with the board of Main Street Project itself and having the director of one of my boards, I'm aware of the good work that's been done by Main Street Project by the, I believe 38 staff man-years involved in the project itself and I do have a member of my staff now with their officials evaluating the program itself, in view of the extension that could be possible on the part of the Federal Government or whatever can be done by the Department of Health and Social Development directly or indirectly.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether a request for financial help has been given or has been made to the Provincial Government with respect to the Main Street Project and the termination of funds on May 31st?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked if there's a request for funds that has been made by the Main Street Project. Yes, they've made a request for funds. And I did indicate that this will be considered in context with the need, priorities and in view of the acceptance or refusal of the Federal Government to give an extension.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker -- no, that's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister of Health and Social Development can indicate the amount of money that's been requested from the department?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't, for the only reason that the work being done by Main Street Project itself is composed of many responsibilities in a sense. They're dealing with alcoholics; they're dealing with those that are affected by drug abuse and so on, and they

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) have to be discussed and evaluated separately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question's to the First Minister. Did the First Minister say to an audience at a meeting I believe last night that the \$28 million of losses suffered by the Manitoba Development Corporation should be described as "peanuts"?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I did not make reference to any figure of 28 million, and any such effort to do so would be conjectural at best.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Did the First Minister indicate that the losses of the Manitoba Development Corporation suffered since this government came to office are to be considered "peanuts"?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, taken in the context of the totality of losses, operating losses in what happens to be the first few years of operation or start-up in many of these enterprises, I indicated that the amount of loss was very small, and that taken even in relation to the amount that the Government of Canada had to put into Crown corporations last year, something in excess of \$1.1 billion, that this was not an inordinate amount for the province to be able to accommodate because of the offsetting benefits of payrolls and spin-off multiplier effects of the economy.

MR. ASPER: Would the First Minister indicate some figure at which he would consider these losses to be "not peanuts"?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do have a figure in mind but it's one that my honourable friend would love to seize on in order to make some great hay about it, so I will desist - I'll resist the temptation.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. Is the MDC facing a further loss in Columbia Forest Products to the tune of one million dollars?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, all the information with regard to Columbia Forest Products have been thoroughly canvassed. Furthermore, the Chairman of the Corporation appeared before committee to deal with questions of that kind and I can't really give detailed information at this time but I would indicate that the Columbia Forest situation was previously canvassed.

MR. FROESE: Yes, a supplementary. Is the firm still losing money?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's not a good idea to talk about the immediate operation of a firm vis-a-vis its immediate prospects or its immediate problems; and I indicated that in the House previous to the honourable member, that it would not be good for a private firm to talk that way nor is it good for a public corporation to talk that way. I will say that the present situation vis-a-vis Columbia Forest Products with the operation of the sawmill only and with the high price of lumber, is much favorable than it was. But I do not like to put optimistic statements on the table which are then used by honourable members to say, "look what they said they were going to do."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could indicate whether he's going to enforce or change the Human Rights legislation which presently compels employers to give special treatment to late female shift-workers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, that recommendation was referred to the appropriate Minister and it's in his hands.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Labour. I wonder if he could indicate whether he's going to comply with their own stupid Human Rights Act or whether he's going to have it changed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): That question does not deserve an answer.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. The Honourable Member for Thompson have a supplementary?

MR. BOROWSKI: A supplementary question for the First Minister. Is he going to have his Ministers comply with their own Human Rights Act or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I must point out to the honourable gentleman that repetition of the same question is not in order.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. My question is, and if he wishes to take it as notice, it will be fine. A number of farmers, particularly those producing hogs in Manitoba have been taken to court by the Clean Environment Commission. Could the Minister indicate whether any have been prosecuted or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not even certain of the first half of my honourable friend's facts so I would have to take the question as notice. There have been hog operations where the Clean Environment Commission has made orders which the operations are not satisfied with. In some cases appeals have been made, at least in one case that I know of, and the appeal is presently being considered. It's taking some time but it involves the question of policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake - a supplementary?

MR. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering, the Minister does indicate it takes some time, I'm wondering can he indicate how much longer these farmers who are awaiting the decision, how long they will have to wait?

MR. GREEN: Well with respect to the one that I'm aware of Mr. Speaker, it really is to the advantage of the particular person, the present situation. Because pending the appeal he is not required to force the order and the appeal will deal with the question, but in the meantime he is not being prejudiced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question's for the Minister of Labour. Has the Minister of Labour received a complaint from the Winnipeg Builders Group who are being struck by the Plumbers' Association, the Plumbers Trade Union, has he received a complaint with a request to refer that complaint to the Manitoba Labour Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did receive a letter from the, I believe he calls himself the Labour Relations Officer for the Winnipeg Builders Exchange asking me that under one of the sections of the Labour Relations Act to refer a matter to the Labour Board. The section deals with the opinion as to whether or not parties to a collective agreement are negotiating in good faith. Upon receipt of that particular letter I took the matter up with the members of the Department of Labour civil servants, and they considered the position that I felt was the correct one and concurred in that; that because of the fact that we had followed through all the normal proceedings in conciliation that there was no need to refer this matter to the Labour Board. We feel that this is an internal matter that can be handled otherwise; we feel that if the Winnipeg Builders Exchange and the union will negotiate in good faith one with each other, there's no need for any further procedures to be taken.

The Conciliation Officers of the Department of Labour are available and if in the opinion of one of the parties concerned it should be referred to somebody else, I exercised my judgment--and I think that I have fairly good judgment--that we should not defer the matter to the Labour Board at this time.

MR. ASPER: Thank you Mr. Speaker, to the Labour Minister. Apart from the availability of his department service he described, could he indicate to the House whether his department has taken any specific steps toward the resolution of this strike by I believe some 430 plumbers and workers with them?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the normal procedures, that I have informed both parties to the collective agreement that we are prepared to offer the services of the department in order to bring about a resolution of this dispute. Again I want to emphasize that both parties are prepared to negotiate in a spirit of goodwill the matter will be resolved.

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker. Could he indicate how many government projects are either being delayed or stopped as a result of the strike of the Plumbers'

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ASPER cont'd) Union? Are there any government projects affected by it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, none that we're aware of, although I specifically checked into our office building across the street and I'm informed that there is no effect at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate whether he's going to have the Human Rights Act changed which compels hotel operators to advertise, or denies the hotel operators the right to advertise and hire male bouncers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is asking a question which would point to some of the, shall we say, anomalies in Human Rights Legislation perhaps. Like my honourable friend, however, I am not learned in the law and so one has to take one's advice from legal counsel and the law officers of the Crown, that's the right expression. As to my personal opinion, that is something which is no law officer can convince me of the common sense of some of the provisions we seem to be trending towards.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, then can I direct that same question to the Attorney-General who is the chief law officer. Whether he's going to change that Act or whether he's going to enforce it and make sure that his own department, his own Minister live by the rules that he passed for employers?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Thompson has a very critical approach to women having effective role in society generally and I would like the honourable member to know in Manitoba we have female pilots, we have female truck drivers, and I suppose we have female waiters or waitresses that are capable of escorting other females and unruly males.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member have a point of order?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, I rise on a point of privilege. The Minister has got up, instead of answering a question he has accused me of saying something against women . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member hasn't -- Order, please. The honourable member hasn't indicated a matter of privilege.

Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, my point of privilege is that the Minister has gotten up and has accused me of making a statement that I did not make. My purpose in asking the question was to defend women rather than to go against them and I ask him to withdraw that statement which is untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside, question. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation. Can the Minister shed any light on my question of yesterday, and to avoid any misunderstanding my question was: Has the Manitoba Development Corporation granted a loan to a newspaper operation in Swan River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understood the question yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I indicated to the honourable member that the advancement of loans and their disclosure is made mandatory by the practice of this government, that the --well, my recollection is every three months, which is quarterly, and I would consider, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: I have had people calling me previously at my office, asking me whether the fund has advanced money to corporations, private people, and I have told them I consider it inappropriate to give that information because of the nature between the fund and the person but that it is mandatorily revealed by the process that we have undertaken, and I can tell my honourable friend that I know nothing of such a loan. That does not mean that such a loan was not made. --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: Are you worried about losing your shirt?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party state his point of order.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Sir. A moment ago the Honourable Member from Thompson rose on a point of privilege and made the point that in precisely the words that you read into this Chamber this morning, he had been impugned, or his motives had been impugned, which is a valid point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks the decorum in the House, as you probably noted has deteriorated but the innuendo, the slur must be stopped, Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege and the point of order that I rise on, he having made a justified point of privilege, calls on you, Sir, to recommend the Honourable Attorney-General that he withdraw the remark which has been denied. In that way, Sir, we may hope to return to what you fondly hoped this morning we might have - an amiable spirit, an amiable spirit of co-operation in this Chamber, but that cannot obtain while this kind of slur goes on unanswered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think I reasonably interpreted the indication or the tenor of the Honourable Member for Thompson's remarks, and I believe that my answer was not unfair and I think that by analysis of what I have said in Hansard, I think that will be borne out. If, however, after seeing Hansard I am persuaded that what I have said is overly critical and unfair of the honourable member, I will certainly be most happy to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder, seeing that this time for retractions has arrived, I wonder whether the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party, having perused Hansard, is now willing to retract the charge that he made that he saw with his own eyes and ears, on television, as urging people to loan money from the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, since the House Leader raises the issue, well I have checked Hansard and I would say that the statement I made in the House was in substance correct, but the detail of urging people to borrow money was specifically not included. But, Sir, the substance of what I said, that the government was spending public money to advertise public, government services, and to pat the government on the back for non-existent accomplishments, that part of the statement stands and public money is still being used to foster . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. I again am going to appeal to the honourable members of this House to co-operate with the Chair. I believe we are in the Question Period, not in what has gone on in the past. I hope we can proceed with the questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The question arises out of the editorial, the cartoon that so capably depicts him today. My question, Mr. Speaker, is--that is in the Winnipeg Tribune of this afternoon's edition--has the Minister any intention of maybe setting up a Crown corporation to sell to the farmers of Manitoba some post holes?

A MEMBER: Some what?

MR. ENNS: Some post holes.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the levity of the cartoon is enjoyable, the levity of the question is enjoyable, but if the Free Press used the same criteria for, or the Winnipeg Tribune used the same criteria for evaluating private explorations companies, they wouldn't have enough pages to publish cartoons for the moneys that have been spent without turning up a hole.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the question is for the First Minister. Has the Alberta Government asked the Province of Manitoba to keep active the Manitoba Transport licence for Continental Truck Lines Limited and has the province of Manitoba lost any money in that transaction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a recollection that there was some communication with the province of Manitoba relative to Continental Express Lines Limited, which operates interprovincially across Western Canada, I believe up to and including Toronto. Continental

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Express Lines did have a license to operate, naturally, through all western provinces but I believe that that firm went into receivership several months ago and so the P. S. V. franchise has been revoked in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan, and I believe in Ontario as well, Manitoba has not been involved financially with the firm; it was financed by the Alberta Government treasury branches, and the government of Alberta, it is reported, lost \$1.8 million. Manitoba has no financial involvement other than the public service vehicle licensing only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour and ask him if he could advise the House at what stage the negotiations between the government and the Manitoba Government Employees Association are now at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to indicate to my friend the very very amicable and harmonious and meaningful negotiations are taking place at the present time between the negotiators for the Manitoba Government and the Manitoba Government Employees Association, and I trust and hope that I have the goodwill of the Honourable Member for Morris in hoping and trusting that a resolution will be arrived at in due course.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell the House at what time he expects that these negotiations will be completed and an agreement reached.

MR. PAULLEY: At the conclusion of the negotiations, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: I regret very much, the Minister of Finance fed that line to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister could say whether or not it's expected that the negotiations will be completed before the end of the month.

MR. PAULLEY: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot be definitive in an answer to my honourable friend. All I can say is that negotiations are proceeding. The information that is being relayed to me indicates that there is a possibility within a very short period of time that I will have the opportunity, as Minister responsible, of signing an agreement mutually arrived at between the Government Employees Association and the Government of Manitoba, which is very fair to each side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can he inform the House of the status of the Seven Oaks Hospital since having a meeting with that Board which he said he was having?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Seven Oaks Board had a meeting with my colleagues on the HESS Committee and I, and the proposals made by the board itself are before the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and the Health Services Commission Board will decide, after talking and discussing the priorities and the needs of that area, they should be receiving the final decision by the Health Services Commission in due course.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the government planning to look towards building a hospital with a function recommended by a committee, or are you planning to build a community clinic?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, what has actually been asked by the Seven Oaks Hospital Board has been forwarded to the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and it is a functional program that will be decided by the Manitoba Health Services Commission and will not be decided by the Minister. It will be decided by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. The Member for Brandon West was in his seat; he just left. I apologize, Sir. I will raise it at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of his public statements expressing concern about the difference in rates, driver's license, under Autopac, could he indicate whether that troublesome regulation has been amended or whether the Human Rights legislation in fact is being violated by Autopac?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I take it from my honourable friend's question he is referring to the problem that was raised by the Human Rights Commission relative to the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) differential in rates, insurance rates as between male and female. That matter, I believe, was taken through considerable time and expense to some form of adjudication. I am not in a position to report. Perhaps my colleague the Attorney-General can elaborate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the concern evidenced, first of all, from some complainants who had made observations about the alleged discriminatory practice of following time-honoured sex rating for insurance rates, there was reference to the Human Rights Commission as to whether or not they would want to deal with sex rating insurance contracts generally. In the interval, my department, at my request, reviewed the complaint and in their opinion there was no violation of the Human Rights Act by Autopac. However, I have indicated to the Human Rights Commission that it is our intention to secure an opinion of outside counsel, that is outside of the Attorney-General's Department, to determine whether or not a reference ought to reasonably be made to court to determine whether or not there is any discriminatory practice, and if the answer is that there should be a reference to court, the manner in which that reference should be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance and it relates, --if you don't mind, Sir, I'll have to describe what it relates to--it relates to the answer he gave in this House on May 15th, Hansard Page 2735, relative to the payment of some \$38,000 by the province of Manitoba to an organization called Praxis Institute for Research for Social Reform, or Social Change, and the answer is contained on Page 2735. Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister of Finance now tell the House, what is the People Opportunity Service Demonstration Project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, that project came under the responsibility of the Department of Health and Social Development, is one which I know has been in existence for some years. I am certain that it has been discussed at Estimates time, time and again in previous years, and I believe that there may have been reports in publications, I am not in a position to answer it other than from my general knowledge. I doubt very much if the Minister of Health would be able to deal with it at this stage, because I know it's an extensive program which has been in existence for some years, and I am under the impression was formed quite a long time ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health, who the Minister of Finance referred to as the Minister responsible. Could he tell the House what the People Opportunity Service Demonstration Project is about and what was paid \$38,000 to Praxis Organization to do for that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I could take the question as notice but that was a grant that was made by the Federal Government, like the Minister of Finance indicated the other day, of \$33,000 paid to a firm in Toronto and \$5,000 paid to a temporary office that they had here in Winnipeg, that they made the study, they made the evaluation. It was the Federal Government, yes. POS was related directly to the Department of Health and Social Development and Care Services. They were experimenting new types of service, health and related social services. Since POS the experiment was over, most of the services that were offered through that office had been integrated within existing services through the Department of Health and Social Development. We've looked at some. We haven't totally rejected the ideas that were presented within the study itself but, like the Minister of Finance mentioned the other day, the report was not made to this government, it was made to the Federal Government, and that experiment is over. It was over, I believe in late 1971. I'd have to check the date.

MR. ASPER: The Minister of Health - can he now confirm that it was the Provincial Government and not the Federal Government which initiated the engagement of this Praxis Organization?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Executive Director of that study group was not answerable to my department - was not answerable to me; he was answerable to the Federal Government, did not make their report to me, they made it to the Federal Government. We did not

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd). . . . hire the people in that study group; they were hired by the Federal Government, since they answered to them and made the report to them.

MR. ASPER: Is the Minister of Health indicating to the House that the Federal Government initiated the engagement, as opposed to the payment of the Praxis Organization?

MR. TOUPIN: Oh I don't know that. I don't know that. All I did say is that there could have been a group that applied for a certain, you know, a certain grant, and they got that grant. It wasn't a grant made by our government. It was a certain amount allowed for a study that was paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government, and the report was made to the Federal Government and not to us.

A MEMBER: How much money did you make?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Yes. My question is to the Minister of Finance. Why would the accounts of Manitoba show a payment that was made by the Province of Manitoba for \$38,000 if the Minister of Health is correct when he says the Federal Government paid it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to help steer the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party through the procedures involved in proper accounting and proper reporting. When the provincial government is required under any sort of agreement whatsoever, contractual or under legislation or otherwise, and does make a payment, it must be reported, Mr. Speaker, by the Provincial Auditor. When the monies are paid out by the provincial government, and indeed they are recoverable from another source such as the Federal Government, they are collected and the moneys when collected from the Federal Government are paid into Consolidated Revenue so that they form part of the revenue of the province.

The Province of Manitoba paid this amount. I am informed the Province of Manitoba recovered 100 percent from the Federal Government. I also believe that there is still outstanding the question, if indeed it can be answered, as to what role the Federal Government played and what role the Provincial Government played in either the hiring or the approval of the hiring of this body. I don't know the answer but I stated earlier I believe in that very statement referred to, that I assume either they were hired by the Federal Government or their employment by the Provincial Government would have been approved by the Federal Government since indeed they paid 100 percent of the cost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Finance. In view of his statement that we have apparently in the past debated the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question. Question.

MR. ASPER: . . . the People's Opportunity program, could the Minister of Finance could the Minister of Health or could the First Minister or could anybody on the government side tell us what is the People's Opportunity Program?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, as a resident of North Winnipeg and as a representative of St. John's Constituency, that I know that there was a man, a social worker who I believe at one time was Chairman of the Social Workers of Manitoba named Lee Glasgow, who I believe was an employee at one time of the City of Winnipeg, that he was responsible for a program to try to involve the people who are on welfare in a self-help program in order to provide an intensive job of job creation, of baby sitting, of all sorts of useful social volunteer work, and that this program, which I believe was a very rich one, was an experiment which I believe was sponsored by the Provincial Government and by the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I believe I have no right to go into it to the extent I did but it was only in my great desire to help educate the Leader of the Liberal Party. I think I was out of order going to this extent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Health. Will the Minister of Health indicate whether he has any idea of the contents of the report that this Praxis organization filed, and if not will he undertake to request the federal officials to give the report to him so that it can be tabled. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to indicate that a request for papers should be put formally if that's what the honourable gentleman intends.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. ASPER: This is a question to the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. --(Interjection)-- Order please. It is referring to another level of government and in order to get permission that has to be done formally, not just by oral questions. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Does the government have a copy of the report filed, and if not why not?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did receive a copy of that report, I believe that if the Honourable Member for Wolseley or the Leader of the Liberal Party hasn't got a copy, the previous Leader of the Liberal Party--oh that's right, there wasn't any previous leader. But anyway his caucus may have a copy of the report and if they haven't we could obtain one for them.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise now on the point of privilege I referred to in the absence of the Honourable the Member for Brandon West. He is reported in the May 15th issue of the Brandon Sun as having said a number of things which I cannot properly comment on, but there's one statement in that article, Sir, which I must refer to because it is in direct relation to Citation 145 of Beauchesne. The honourable member, if he is quoted correctly, said this that--quoting me, Sir. The Honourable Member for Brandon West is quoted as saying, "He said, 'I place power ahead of principle'." Sir, that was suggested in this House as having been said by me a few months ago and at that time I rose in my place and, with respect to Citation 145, I indicated that at no time had I ever made a statement of that kind or even resembling it in substance, and it was dealt with at that time. Now my honourable friend the Member for Brandon West repeats something which I at a previous date have entirely repudiated having said. He repeats it again and I must therefore, Sir, ask you to take note of Citation 145 of Beauchesne, Page . . .

MR. SPEAKER: 126.

MR. SCHREYER: Well you have a different edition, Sir, yes 126. Which goes on to say, among other things, that a statement made by an honourable member respecting himself and peculiarly within his own knowledge, must be accepted. And it goes on to say further "a statement made by a member in his place is considered as made upon honour and cannot be questioned in the House or out of it." So, among the other things said in this article, Sir, which I cannot under the rules deal with but I will take an opportunity at a future date, but this one statement, Sir, does come fully within the purview of this House and Citation 145. That it be clear, I repeat once more that statement, "I place power ahead of principle," I have never made, nor do I intend to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege which the First Minister has raised, the general tenor of the article is essentially as it was given. The First Minister has from time to time, I know, in this House objected to the way in which he is reported in the press. I don't intend to make any such objections except that I of course do not write the headlines in the papers. The Minister has referred specifically to one quotation. Mr. Speaker, I based this assertion upon a report in the Winnipeg Free Press dated Wednesday, October 29th of 1969, where there was a front page article reporting the First Minister in his speech to the national NDP convention, and the Manitoba Premier, just back in Winnipeg after his three-week to Japan, told the 1,000 delegates their prime objective should be winning elections even if it meant bending their principles a little. Mr. Speaker, I interpreted that report by the Free Press as a fair one because I didn't recall at that time any objection having been taken by the First Minister to that interpretation, and I therefore interpret that remark to mean that when it comes to a question of gaining power in an election over a question of principle, then the people who are real politicians and not saints, or whatever other words the First Minister used, are inclined to consider the gaining of votes as No. 1. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that in the opinion of the First Minister is not a correct interpretation, then I have missed his explanation, because I still feel that he as a politician puts ahead of the basic principle involved, the question of impressing the voters with his position.

Now, my interpretation of his remarks at that convention was that he placed the gaining power ahead of the principle involved. And, Mr. Speaker, that was the purpose and that was

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) the reason for the statement, I did not make the statement that the headline indicates, which says: "McGill says Schreyer a man without principles." That is editorializing on the part of the reporter, but I did say those things which the article has indicated me to say, and if I have misinterpreted the Premier's position in respect to the job he considers to be No. 1 as a politician, that is gaining votes over the principles involved, then I would like him to again inform me that my position is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when I raised this I well understood, and understand now, that the Honourable the Member for Brandon West is not responsible for the headline. I also hope he's not responsible for what is put in actual quotations here, because that is the point at issue. Mr. McGill is quoted--the Honourable Member for Brandon West, sorry--is quoted as saying, and I quote. "He said: 'I place power ahead of principle'." Now that's not a headline. It is put here as a direct quotation and that is what I am raising under Citation 145, because, Mr. Speaker, I said in this House once before, also under Citation 145, that I made no such statement at that convention or meeting back in October of 1969. It is true that I did not make any correction of the article at the time for the simple reason, Sir, that the House was not in session.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. SCHREYER: And when the House is not in session, and even when it is in session, I confess I do not always have time to read all newspapers, so the first one that I don't read, if I don't have time, is the Free Press, but that's by the by, Sir; that's beside the point. The House was not in session, but about two months ago I did raise the same point of personal privilege and it was disposed of by you, Sir, under Citation 145. If my honourable friend really must know what I did say, I was referring to the context in which oftentimes ideological theory has been placed ahead of practical working results. That is the context in which I was speaking. At no time did I use the word "principle" or "bending principle" or "power", and therefore my honourable friend has taken a wrong paraphrase and compounded it by presuming to quote directly something that was even paraphrased incorrectly in the first place, and so under Citation 145 I ask him to take note of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I rise on a point of order. The former Premier of the province, Mr. Walter Weir, is the executor of a will which he is trying to turn into a foundation and wishes to pass a Private Member's Bill. I presume that the bill would be brought in for the Member for Minnedosa, and the time for Private Members' bills having elapsed, I wonder whether without prejudice, whether or not he will get this passed or what will happen to it, that the time limit at least be waived by unanimous consent and that the Member for Minnedosa be given leave to present the bill at first reading. I'm not saying what will occur in relation to the bill, but certainly we would have no objection to it proceeding.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable House Leader have agreement? Agreed? Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm on a point of privilege, Sir. It is not clear to me the way in which the point of privilege under Citation 145 and 114 has been disposed of. I think it merely requires some indication from the Honourable Member from Brandon West or from you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, to begin with, in respect to the citation the Honourable First Minister quoted, it is perfectly true, this is the rules we operate by. We accept each member's expression and sincere honour when they are explaining what their intent and what their wishes are, and we have to accept each other's word on what is the intent of each particular person, I don't think that we can deviate from that because otherwise we would be getting into too many anomalies. I have no desire to impose my will on the particular proceedings, but I can indicate that occasionally this may create two differences of opinion, but if we accept each person's word, I think we can proceed. Now if the Honourable Minister wishes to press the point further, I think we're entitled to that, but under the circumstances I think that an explanation has been given and we have to accept each other's word in this Chamber.

Now, I believe that's an explanation of the matter of privilege. Does the Honourable First Minister wish to . . . ?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think on a literal interpretation of Citation 145 that the matter can rest there, although I must express some disappointment of my honourable

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) friend that he would not have taken a very simple and appropriate step, but perhaps it doesn't require it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has invited a further comment from me. I have given an interpretation of his remarks at that convention, I am pleased --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MCGILL: I am pleased to have his explanations, and I'm rather pleased that he denies that that is his real position and that he does in fact place principles ahead of the acceptance or the attempt to gain votes in the province, and I accept that and I thank him for that explanation, which I think would have been very appropriate the day after this appeared in the paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I then just thank my honourable friend and ask that both of us perhaps should reread Lord Acton once again.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BILL

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed further, the Honourable House Leader has made a suggestion to the House and I have asked whether we have unanimous agreement on that proposition. Is it agreed? No objections? Very well. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa take note. Thank you. The Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder whether the details of the required provisions under our present rules as to advertising and the time limit for advertising and the other procedures in order to extend the time of the receipt of petitions, should not also be dealt with at this particular time in order to accommodate the former Leader of the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I went on the assumption that when we agreed to waive the rules in respect to this petition, we would go through the total process of waiving the rules for each step that is necessary instead of going through the whole procedure. Is that agreeable? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I'm not assuming anything. I want it clearly delineated the procedures that will be followed, because this is the first time that I am aware of that it has been done by the House and I would just like it established for the purpose of record. I'm not opposing it, but I think that it is only fair and reasonable that it should be clearly delineated.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that all the procedures will be carried through normally, except that we're waiving the rules? Agreed? (Agreed) Thank you. The Honourable Minister of Health. We're still on the question period.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD cont'd

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight maybe in regard to POS. POS was a project which attempted to integrate and co-ordinate, not only integrate but co-ordinate the activities of all public and private social services in a given area. After the study had been completed, the evaluation, it was deemed too rich and was abandoned as the original intent was to have it as a separate agency attempting to integrate services dealing with health and related social services. But it is now a district office of the Department of Health and Social Development, I wanted to make that clear, but it is on the same basis as other offices of the department, not a . . . of service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur. --(Interjection)-- There is no supplementary to an answer. There's a supplementary question. --(Interjection)-- Order, please. The honourable gentleman will not be overlooked but I try to be fair. The Honourable Member for Arthur has been trying to ask a question all afternoon.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources--I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House if he has acted on the resolution that he received some time ago from Arthur Municipality regarding the Snider Dam?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. WATT: . . . question as notice, I'm . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe so but I'll take the question as notice.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you. To the Minister of Health relating to the answer he has just given. Will the Minister now confirm that the money that was spent was paid to an organization to find a way to integrate and make more efficient the operations of certain social agencies and wound up, instead of integrating, becoming in effect its own department within the agencies?

MR. TOUPIN: The intent, Mr. Speaker, was to find out if it was possible to integrate all private and public service centres dealing with health and related social services, but it was paid for by the Federal Government and they reported to the Federal Government. I wish we'd got a copy. And following the study of that report it was considered to be too rich a program for us to launch on a province-wide basis so the staff that has -- most of them, not all of the staff but some of the staff that were involved in that study were integrated in one of the district offices that we have in that area. We have many district offices in the Province of Manitoba. That doesn't mean that we accepted the recommendation contained within the report. The intent was good but the program itself was too rich for what we could offer on a province-wide basis. That's what I'm saying. But we didn't pay for it. It was paid 100 percent by the Federal Government.

MR. ASPER: Is the Minister indicating to the House that the former members of the Praxis organization are now working for his department?

MR. TOUPIN: No, no, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is confusing those that, you know, made the study and those that were involved, you know, in the service spectrum itself. I know for a fact that the individual that was directing the studies is no longer in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and the absence of the First Minister, I'm not sure to whom to direct the question, however, I'll direct it at the front bench and see whether I can get an answer. What powers have been given to the Special Committee on Drug Conditions headed by Mr. J. M. Parker, and has there been a program established as to their activity in this type of work and will there be local subsidiaries organized at the local level?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my position as Deputy Premier I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege just to correct a news story. On a story in today's Winnipeg Free Press in regard to the Local Community Council election at Ilford, the press states that "he", being myself, "confirmed an incident alluded to in a letter from Mayer Kip Thompson." Mr. Speaker, I confirm that I received an allegation; I confirm that the allegation was against persons not working for my department, but I have no knowledge of whether or not the alleged incident took place or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd mind calling Bill No. 11 and follow that with Bill No. 5. Bill No. 11 stands in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party and, if you recall, Sir, this morning Bill No. 5 was continued standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland but I've just had a request, to which I'm perfectly agreeable, to allow the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party to make his contribution in respect to Bill No. 11. So I suggest you call that, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 11

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the position the Liberal Party takes, and certainly that I take on Bill 11, is really one of questioning. We're wondering why it's necessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, on balance perhaps the best procedure for us is to give this immediate second reading and move it into committee into where the less formal circumstances will permit a more detailed and less formal kind of questioning of the Minister. But I've tried very hard over the past two hours since last discussing it with the Minister of Finance, to understand why we need another pot, why we need another financial pocket, and

BILL NO. 11

(MR. ASPER cont'd) because we are committed as a party to lessening the numbers of discretionary funds available to governments which are not accounted in the normal sense to this Legislature, we view the bill with some suspicion. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may very well be that this is a harmless bill taking an old fund, special fund, knocking it out and putting in a new fund, and really nothing new being added to the bureaucracy or to the accounting complexities. And, Mr. Speaker, that is not yet clear to us.

It may be that this is simply a replacement of an old fund for a new fund with different powers and different discretions, but that isn't a good enough answer. To us, Mr. Speaker, the idea of funds being discretionary to government and not being accountable in the normal sense to the Legislature is not an acceptable point. You've heard much debate in this session, Sir, in which members on this side certainly, have expressed great concern and deeply felt concern over the idea that approximately 50 percent of the amount that is taken from the taxpayer of this province and spent by their government of Manitoba does not come through this Legislature. Now, I don't suggest that this is in the same category, but I notice a quizzical look on the Minister of Finance's face and I think I'd better elaborate on that statement. The point I made was that the Crown corporations that report to the government and only indirectly to this House, and don't go through the Estimates in the same meticulous and detailed and public account sort of way, represent approximately half the spending in Manitoba by the government, and we do not have the same opportunity for scrutiny and debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, in the past few weeks you've heard more and more and you will in the future, I'm sure, hear a growing chorus of protest by members on this side of the House regardless of which party they belong to, that they are being thwarted, that they are being deprived, that they are being denied the opportunity to carry out their duties in the manner in which they would like to.

We heard the most incredible statement in this House. I call it, in my opinion, perhaps the most cynical display we have had this session, when the House Leader said a day or two ago that his view of this House is a bear pit operation in effect. Those weren't his words, that's my characterization of his words; that it was a contest; that the government tried to get control of the House and rush its position through and--oh he's returned to the Chamber and his first words are "No, Mr. Speaker." And the Opposition is scoring its little points. It's only, or its main thrust is to get the other guy. Now I don't want to get into a debate with the House Leader as to whether those are his words or those are my interpretation. I can see before the protests rise that that's how I read not only his words but the performance in this Legislature by the government as a whole. And, Mr. Speaker, my view of the Opposition, the role of our Opposition, whichever party it is, differs very fundamentally from the government including the government's view of its own role, if the House Leader expressed it correctly or my interpretation of what he is saying and doing is effective. And that's why we find it difficult to pass a bill readily that creates a special fund, until we have some assurances and we have had this bill for what? 24 hours? 36 hours? And a number of other matters to attend to - 48 hours, 52 hours. Time seems to be passing fast.

I'm still one who wasn't here during the war when the Emergency War Fund was established; I'm not even sure which war it was. It might have been--and I'm not sure whose side we were all on during the war. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, our reluctance is based only on the lack of assurance at this stage that this bill is not a means of dumping public funds into a fund which is discretionarily controlled by government and which is not accounted to this House in the normal way. Now it may very well be that the Finance Minister can make the assurances I require, and in which case of course it will be a perfunctory matter to support the bill. But our position is recorded as being deeply concerned that we do not wish to see another fund, another source of capital, another source of grants, another source of government ability to make special dispensation to some and not to others, without being fully subject to account, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, with that caveat we will vote to put this bill into Committee and we hope to hear reassuring statements on all scores from the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in order not to delay the bill any longer than necessary, I would just like to add a few words and a few comments. I find that we under the new bill have the objects, the purposes of the Act, and one of them is to provide insurance against future loss

BILL 11

(MR. FROESE cont'd) of revenue. I would like to have the Minister explain just what is intended by this particular section in the Act or provision in the Act, I should rather say, because I certainly don't want to get the House Leader to get up and make a point of it, and, as has already been pointed out by the Leader of the Liberal Party, certainly it appears to me that we're opening another fund to which allocations will be made from time to time and from which the Minister has the authority to pay out moneys and for certain expenditures. Then it also has the provision in here that moneys in fund not to lapse, so that any allocations authorized will carry on and carry forward. So I think when the Minister closes debate that I would like to have a little more information as to the actual purposes and to what extent the purposes of this Act exceed that of the previous Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too will be brief. But, you know, this is the type of legislation we've learned to expect from the government. This is the type of legislation that says we can set up a fund, we can put money in and we can take money out, we can roam around the countryside for the next couple of months obviously saying, well we'll give you this or we'll give you that. We don't have to check with the Municipal Board. We don't have to put it in budget, we don't have to put it in any form whatsoever, but here you are, here we are, big fellows with the public money, not having to really make any account to anybody but the fact that they can put money in the fund as they see fit and take money out and give it away as they see fit without any tie strings attached.

That's not government. That's damn foolishness. Quite frankly, that's not good business. You wouldn't even run your house like that and why should you expect to run this House like that when you're playing around with the people's money? You're spending the people's money and you should have to be more accountable to the people than this bill allows you to be. This is just a playing around of making good fellows out of the NDP Party as they roam through the country being nice guys, giving handouts with no explanation to anybody. And that's basically what this bill does and that's not legislation, Mr. Speaker. As I said, that's damn foolishness and they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is up answering, I was wondering if he would inform the House if these funds are available to capital projects in municipalities such as sewer and water, road construction, street construction and the likes of it, and if the funds are available cheaper than they would otherwise pay through interim financing at banks and sale of debentures, etc., different capital projects.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, some of the members who have spoken--well, I want to thank all members who spoke on second reading and who made a contribution, and I want to thank them also for the expeditious way in which they have dealt with it, and I think the fact that they may not have long enough time to look into it, to inquire about it, may excuse their attitude towards it and the fact that I think that, in their attack on the motive or the principle of the bill, they did a disservice to their own colleagues, some of them, and probably a disservice to the predecessors of their party as well as the predecessors of the Liberal Party. Because, Mr. Speaker, what happened in connection with--the reason for bringing this bill is that the government wished to make it possible to be able to assist municipalities on an emergency basis when it was found necessary by the municipalities, or desirable by municipalities, to do certain works in the municipality for which they needed funds in order for them to be able to borrow the funds and also to provide, in such cases as may be, works projects, labour intensive projects, to be able to bring in a forgiveness feature, the kind of forgiveness that has been discussed in this House which I don't think actually any one party objected to in principle. And when that desire came about, in the Budget Speech it was announced that a sum of money, and as I recall it was something like \$10 million, was to be taken out of surplus and put into this account, and I think that the surplus, as I recall it, and the, let me say the moneys that came unexpectedly from Ottawa which included various sums, that there would be a sum set aside to replenish the War and Post-War Fund in order to make it possible to use that vehicle, the mechanism already existing legislatively in the War and Post War Fund, to make that available for the purpose of assisting municipalities in some of their works. It then was deemed

BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) desirable, mainly by the Legislative Counsel, that the War and Post-War Fund Act, which did have that mechanism and did make that possible, should spell out more clearly - broaden its area to specifically include municipalities.

Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was some difference of opinion within the Civil Service or the bureaucracy as to whether or not the Act had to be changed or not; whether the Act as it was was adequate for the purpose or whether it should be broadened to include that specific purpose; and good judgment on the part of the people who are involved in the day to day operation of government programs, good judgment on their part was it would be better to broaden the Act. And then there was the question, shall we just amend the Act by saying that municipalities can be included or should we rewrite it, since it was felt that the wording in the Act was sort of dated, should we rewrite it and bring in another Act in substitution therefor. In the wisdom of whoever made the decision--and I wasn't Minister at the time, but I agree with the decision--in somebody's wisdom it was felt desirable to replace one act with another; and therefore what happened was that they took the War and Post-War Fund Act and they copied it to the extent that they wanted to update the wording and they then included those additional features that were necessary to make it possible to broaden the scope.

As I recall the history of this Act as it was related to me, it was created by Premier Stuart Garson who was the provincial treasurer in his time and who was a premier in his time. It was brought in by him I think in the late forties, or after the second world war, was created for the purposes set out in that former bill, which I do want to read for one particular reason, and that is because I have a feeling that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell didn't really have an opportunity to read it. The preamble to the former Act, the Act called an Act Respecting Reserve for War and Post-War Emergencies speaks of the accumulation of certain moneys, "And whereas the purpose and intent of this Act is to authorize the expenditure out of the Consolidated Fund to be charged to the Reserve of moneys for the welfare and employment of the people of the province during the War and Post-War periods and for War and Post-War Emergencies, and for further uncontrollable expenditures, and for insurance against future loss of revenue." That was in the preamble of the former Act which I believe was passed 1947-48, thereabouts. And I have brought to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the wording, specially "insurance against future loss of revenue", because the Member for Birtle-Russell came in and said, "Why did you bring that in there, why did you write it into the Act?" -- (Interjection)-- Yes, yes, he did say "why was it put in there", and I only have to tell him it was put there because it was the desire of whoever drafted this bill that they copy the bill to the extent that it had anything in it only making certain changes to update the wording, and it was put in the way it was before so that there really wouldn't be any appreciable change, just an extension.

So they prepared this bill and then I asked that they bring about a--oh yes, and then I should say that I am informed that the administration under premier Doug Campbell used this fund in whatever way it was felt desirable under the stated objectives. The government of Premier Duff Roblin I know used this fund, the government of Walter Weir I know used this fund, and I would guess that at least the members of the opposition who sit here today who were formerly cabinet ministers, must be very well aware of the War and Post-War Act, and I am sure that they are aware of the way it was used by that government; and I think it was reported to this House maybe even last year, that that fund was reduced from some 10 or \$12 million to some 2 or \$3 million mainly in augmenting the moneys required for the Centennial Corporation, the Centennial Centre and other Centennial purposes. It was used by the previous government for that and I don't think I have ever expressed any criticism of it. And now we find that when we wanted a mechanism to be able to assist municipalities that this seemed to be a good vehicle. So the attacks made today by some of the members really wasn't warranted, wasn't warranted.

I wonder what the Member for Sturgeon Creek would say if I talked about the War and Post-War Fund as having been the Duff Roblin slush fund. Suppose I had referred to it as the Duff Roblin general election campaign fund, or the Walter Weir. He doesn't know it possibly, but his colleague from Birtle-Russell called this that and now he is saying possibly one of the sections we have introduced has turned it into a slush fund. Well Mr. Speaker, I know we all feel we're on the verge of the election, it would be quite amusing if the First Minister decided that since he has at least a year to go, that we just wait for an election, but now we're all keyed up so we're all prepared to make extravagant statements about each other and to each other and to the public and call this election gimmicky.

BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the only extent to which this can be termed an election program is that it was in the budget of this government in this session, and that budget contained a progression of tremendous work that we have done in being able to turn back to people monies which are turned back in such a way that can be useful, and I will not go into a budget speech, but to the extent that we are creating a vehicle to help municipalities and to the extent that we are able to do it out of an accumulated surplus, that can be called, that can be called something that would favour us at election time. For the rest of it the bill is very much the same as the War and Post-War Fund; and indeed the Bill provides that that Fund disappears, the moneys in that fund are turned into this fund, the objectives and purposes are extended somewhat.

Now the Member for Charleswood asked a specific question and unfortunately I cannot give him the answer. It is my task to create the vehicle but the program itself will be one that will be developed by the Department of Municipal Affairs and that will be its program, it will be announced. I'm sorry I can't answer it, but the purpose is, and the vehicle was my task and that's what is before us now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party talked about the inability to get a proper accounting and talked about control of the House. He referred to the Honourable House Leader, a much maligned modest person who in his amicable way tries to assist us as members to carry out the work of this House in order to get it through with expedition and with consideration for each other, and then accused him of saying that this is a game, and this is what I want to take issue with.

Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to what the House Leader said and I have a feeling, and I can be corrected, and I'd sit for a minute to be corrected if necessary, I have a feeling that the Member for Morris understood very well what the House Leader said, and I understood it to be that in the dealing of the rules of the House, in dealing with the procedures of the House, that each member and each group in the House, both government and opposition, try to use the rules in such a way as to give them the greatest exposure in attempting to put across what they're trying to do. And I understood him not to be critical of that, and if I'm misinterpreting how I read the Member for Morris of course I'll sit down for a moment to give an opportunity to tell me I misinterpreted his reaction, and he's not rising so it's not really important I guess, but the important thing is that the leader of the Liberal Party who is comparatively new to this Chamber and procedures, confused what I believe the House Leader said, what I'm sure he said and meant, with a recognition I think by all of us that we do have great opportunities to go into all aspects of government. The time limitation is a self-imposed limitation. I believe that every time limitation we have had has been negotiated and not forced. I may be wrong but I'm thinking of the last ten or eleven years of my experience here. I believe it was usually negotiated and I believe that it is often the opposition, and I was in opposition more than I was in government, that the opposition itself sometimes traps itself by getting involved in spending too many hours, more than it wants to, on any particular subject and then runs out of time. When I was in the Legislature first, members will remember I think we started, we had a maximum of 60 hours and then it became eighty and now its ninety hours and it still isn't enough. The Leader of the Opposition of the Liberal Party, who complains we didn't have time to deal with Capital Supply knows full well that when Capital Supply was completed in Estimates, there was still ten hours and fifty minutes left in the 90 hour period and he and his colleagues had another ten hours within which to deal with Capital Supply if they wanted to.

I have departed a little from the Bill and I do want to deal with what was said by the Member for Birtle-Russell, who unfortunately isn't here at the moment, and by the Leader of the Liberal Party about proper control and accounting. Because, Mr. Speaker, there's not a penny that's spent out of consolidated revenue that isn't checked and reviewed and reported. There is a pre-audit system that exists where there is an Audit Branch which makes sure before cheques are issued that they are properly requisitioned. There is a post audit where there is a report made, and it all ends up in Public Accounts, and although I haven't looked to make sure that I'm right, I feel confident to say that if anybody picks up the Public Accounts for each of the years, they will find a full record of the War and Post-War Fund.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to prevent members of the Legislature to deal with expenditures, be they out of a department of government, be they out of current budget, current estimates I mean, or resolutions, or be it out of the War and Post-War Fund, there's nothing secret.

BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Duff Roblin, Walter Weir, never intended to hide any of the moneys that went out of the War and Post-War Fund. I believe that. Do honourable members opposite believe that? By the same token, I don't think there should be any suggestion that there would be a misuse of this for reasons which could be attributed to the Member for Lakeside, to the Leader of the Opposition when they were in government. They knew the War and Post-War Fund I'm sure. So that let's not exaggerate, let's not get carried away by the feeling of an election. I had hoped that we could deal with this bill in its true sense. What is it? It's practically a duplicate of the War and Post War Fund Act. It has been broadened to permit municipalities to be able to borrow and receive grants from this fund and it has been updated as to wording.

Now the Member for Birtle-Russell mentioned--well first he accused me of misleading the members of the House by giving them misinformation and when I showed him he was wrong he justified himself, because the words "of finance" following the word "minister" was taken out of the old act when the new act was brought in. He misread it, he made the mistake; I'm disappointed that he didn't openly acknowledge his mistake, but it was obvious that he had made it so I forgive him. But he did refer to the omission of one section which deals with - well which reads, "Moneys expended under this Act shall be charged to the reserve and the due application of all moneys so expended shall be duly accounted for." He made some point about "how come, why is that out, are you not going to account for it?" Well the Leader of the Liberal Party has now returned so I won't repeat anything that I said other than that this Bill, the War and Post-War Fund which this replaces was passed I believe in the late or the later forties by Stuart Garson, that was 1947-48, thereabouts, I may be out a few years. At that time there was not the Financial Administration Act we have now, and in the updating it was felt unnecessary and redundant to keep that section because - and now I can quote from comments of the Legislative Counsel who is the servant of the Legislature. With respect to the deletion of the words "so expended shall be duly accounted for" from the old act, Mr. Tallin has made the following observation: "In Public Accounts, the Minister is required to make a full accounting of all moneys expended from all divisions of the Consolidated Fund. Therefore this old requirement in the Reserve for War and Post-War Act, is redundant." And that's why it was removed. And if honourable members won't accept the interpretation of the Legislative Counsel, it's unnecessary and they want it back in again, it can go back in again although it's archaic and redundant and unnecessary.

I have forgotten to mention one of the ways we could deal with this - and remember this is for emergency use, it's not a regular program - we could issue a special warrant. Now there's no more control, no more control by this House if we issue a special warrant than if we deal with it under this vehicle, - it would still be something that would not be presented in advance, because indeed that's not the nature of it; the nature of it is to deal with it at the time the problem arises. So whether we deal by special warrant or deal with what is an existing fund, an existing act, updated only, it seems to me that it wouldn't matter one bit to accomplish the control which the Leader of the Opposition talked about, but there will be full accounting as I explained in rather lengthy form during his absence.

So let me then come back only to the question of the section that upset the Member for Sturgeon Creek so much that I see he's not in his chair now, he may have gone off to cool off - but it is the section which deals with the waiver of the requirements under the Municipal Act for full advertising and for municipal boards. The reason for that is almost inherent in the name of the Act itself, The Special Municipal Loan and General Emergency Fund Act. There may be occasions, there may be a flood, there may be a holocaust, there may be some need for a municipality--what? pardon? --(Interjection)-- There may be a drought, there may be grasshoppers. Thank you, I'm getting help from the members of the opposition. Now I'm afraid, once they know I've taken their help I think they may trap me, so I'd better not take any more help. So, Mr. Speaker, there may be an occasion when a municipality is in need for funding and in need in a hurry, and under those occasions, under those occasions there should not be necessary to have the requirement that they go through the entire procedure, which people who have been involved in municipal life knows can drag out, and therefore there is a provision that the time may be waived or shortened - and I stress the word "may" - and that there may be a waiver of the requirements to go to the municipal board. Now that is just again broadening the nature of this.

BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

So let me conclude by saying that I appreciate that we've dealt with this expeditiously; when we were in Committee of the Whole we'll have the Legislative Counsel present, we can deal with the exact wording, we can deal with each provision separately. I would like, however, again to reassure honourable members that we could have--some thought we didn't need the bill at all; everybody agreed that all that had to be done to use this vehicle was to make slight amendments and it was thought desirable since it's such a short act to update the wording to bring it up to modern phraseology and present the bill afresh. So it's still the old War and Post-War Act, the title is redundant, so is some of the wording, its been updated, changed. The funds that are now in the War and Post-War Fund, which I believe are two to three million or less --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Ah, good, the Leader of the Liberal Party has done some homework, there's 1.8 in there approximately, will be paid into this new fund because of the change of name and it will be augmented as was reported during the Budget Speech, for the purposes set out in the old act, War and Post-War Act, plus the addition of making it possible to assist municipalities and school boards in certain works which they may want to approach the government for assistance on. That is the vehicle, and members who want to attribute to it election motives, as the Member for Fort Garry just called out, I want to suggest if you think that this is for election purposes then obviously it is good, and if it is good then I expect you'll vote for it; and if it's good I expect that you will help pass it in this session, within the next few days, so that it'll be good for the people of Manitoba. Credit will be given where credit should be given. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: . . . Honourable Minister would yield to a question?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Would the government look favourably upon amendments to the bill which would require accountability and disclosure of each advance made under the bill and including a greater definition of what emergency relief entails or is available under the Act?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Firstly, the reason we had to bring the bill here was because the Legislative Counsel, or whatever counsel was consulted, felt that the terms under the War and Post-War Fund were not broad enough to include the objective of helping municipalities and school boards. I would not like to restrict this even more in case we find there are other needs, has been used for many purposes.

As to the question of accountability, I'm sorry that the honourable member wasn't present when I think I made it absolutely clear that all expenditures are reportable in a regular way in Public Accounts by the accountancy staff, every penny is accounted for, accountable for in various ways; and I wouldn't like to make any exception or any spelling out in this which would seem to in any way denigrate the existing accountability that we have in all other departments, because if the general method now used is inadequate then I think this is not the place to change this act, but rather one should change all accounting by the government, not this particular act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: I wonder if the Minister would yield to another question? Relates to the fact that the opportunity for debate on accountability through the Public Accounts Committee in a year such as this is in effect absent likely, or in estimates is absent in I think three-quarters of the spending, or two-thirds of the spending of the province. Would the Minister not feel that some current kind of disclosure, inasmuch as the Public Accounts are about a year late, wouldn't some form of current disclosure as is now being done with the Manitoba Development Corporation make more accountable sense, so the members of the opposition would know that the government does not have a pot that it has absolute discretion over, that it only has to account a year at a time, and a year . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable gentleman is taking advantage of a question to debate the issue. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I must agree with you because I understood what the honourable member was saying long before you interrupted him. Mr. Speaker, there are various ways to get reports. The honourable member has yet to learn techniques. Then that's exactly what the House Leader was talking about when he was talking about the use of rules and the knowledge of procedures. There are estimates and the honourable member can't complain if 90 hours were used up when indeed he would possibly want 270 hours, so let him negotiate that, that's

BILL 11

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) been done. The 90 hours was not imposed, it was negotiated on. And when the honourable member did have 10 hours available to debate Capital Supply, I wasn't here but I understand he made a speech. --(Interjection)-- Yes, there were 10 hours left,--there were 10 hours left, Mr. Speaker, at the time they concluded the debate on Capital Supply, so you know, he doesn't impress me when I know that he complains about Capital Supply not having had time to debate when I know he had 10 hours available to him. So that I cannot accept the fact that because he doesn't know all the methods whereby he can achieve an accounting that that means that we now have to change our procedures in order to give him information that he doesn't know how to get through any other way.

So these are my answers to him. We can discuss that in committee, but I would say that this money should be no more or less accountable than are all other funds of government. I believe all accounts of government are accountable, and next year if he succeeds in being elected in Wolseley where I believe he has been nominated, he's back in this House, he may file an Order --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, I think he's just--he may have just lost a vote, Mr. Speaker, because the House Leader has now announced that he's not voting for him--and I would say that next year, next year he will file an Order for Return, or he'll have means whereby he can get full accounting; just as I believe Doug Campbell was accountable, Stuart Garson was accountable, Duff Roblin was accountable, Walter Weir was accountable, and so I believe will this government be accountable at all times.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member state his point of privilege?

MR. ASPER: I will. Well, the point of privilege doesn't relate to the voting habits of the Minister of Mines. This is the last observation I'll make, but it is a point of privilege because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It's not a point of privilege.

MR. ASPER: It is a point of privilege, Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must indicate to the honourable gentleman, to in fact the whole House, questions are allowed at the end of a member's speech for clarification of points that were made; they are not permissible if they open up other avenues of debate. That was one reason why I terminated what the honourable gentleman was saying a little earlier. And if there's points of clarification they will be allowed, but not otherwise. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Yes, as a point of privilege. The Minister of Finance in his answer put on the record the supposition that at the time of the Capital Estimate debate I was not aware that there was 10 hours of debating time left, he implied that I did not know that there was 10 hours of debating time left. Because he said that, Mr. Speaker, I have to state for the record that I did know that and that only because there were I think 12 more departments left to go I did not see fit to take the time of this House to use the last 10 hours to complete one department.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That's a matter of explanation, it can be brought up in other debates but it is not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you. Would the Minister of Finance entertain another question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have to hear it first. If it's for clarification, yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . how the time has run on this, Mr. Speaker, that's what I'm after.

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

MR. GRAHAM: I would ask the Minister of Finance, is it not a fact that all other separate fund types of acts such as this have an accountability factor separate and distinct from any other accountability built into them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Since I don't know what the honourable member means when he says "all other types of acts like this", I only have to tell him I don't know any other act like this so I can't answer his question.

MR. GRAHAM: May I give him then examples such as the Centennial Fund and other funds that were set up for special purposes, have a separate and distinct accountability factor built into them rather than through a general blanket expenditure examination in the House or Public Accounts?

BILL 11

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this fund we're talking about is a fund of government and it's not turned over to any other agency, board or commission. Therefore it is part of government accounting because it's government money, just as it was during the time of Walter Weir, Duff Roblin, he can go through the rest, so that there is no other account I know of of this type.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 5

MR. SPEAKER: The question pass? Agreed? So ordered. Bill No. 5?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the bill before us. I certainly haven't finished or completed my examination of Bill No. 5. I feel that on the surface of it I think it's a good bill. Certainly it's something, there are provisions in there that I think have been needed for quite some time. But my complaint is that we should have taken this particular bill into consideration early in the session so we would have had time to deal with it, if we'd had an explanation of the Minister concerned earlier in session and then had a wider distribution of the bill.

We as members haven't really given full consideration to the bill and examined it in detail. How can other people who haven't even got a copy of it give their interpretation and their examination to it and appear before a committee. I definitely feel that many of the organizations in this province should come forward. Certainly the financial institutions and even such as credit unions, and I surely would hope that copies of this would have had a wider distribution so that we would get reaction from the various groups to make a presentation to the Committee on Law Amendments. Because, Mr. Speaker, some of the provisions in the bill are far-reaching and certainly are new in many respects. Some of them are very good in my opinion, especially when it comes to mortgages and so on, the add-on provisions and so on, I think this is something we've waited for and definitely appreciate, because it will certainly improve procedures and also accommodate people much more readily and without creating new instruments.

However, there are other areas where I am also very concerned, and especially dealing with the provisions under the Rights and Remedies section where on different occasions the word "reasonable" is used. In regard to expenses for that financial organization can add on to the costs of an individual. And what constitutes reasonableness? I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on that score because what is reasonable to one person can be exorbitant to others. And I might mention on this occasion that I had a party relate to me the other day that one of the top officials of CFI went to New York and received \$400.00 a day plus free expenses and had his secretary with him, all paid for, and this apparently is reasonable because nothing is done about it, nothing is raised; yet I feel that this is exorbitant, and I'm sure that many people would feel this is exorbitant, especially when the corporation has a deficit of around \$24 million. So that when we deal with the matter or the word of reasonableness, certainly this is left to interpretation and the interpretation can vary very much indeed. --(Interjection)-- No, it was a female.

The Central Registry for personal property and so on I think is going to be very useful, and also that the information will be readily available through a new system that will be brought in. I think this is very good indeed. That people can check on certain items that they acquire or others where they give it as security that they can check whether there are any liens on it and so on; so when this part goes into operation, certainly it would be an immense improvement and it is one that I sure appreciate. No doubt there will be costs involved and maybe the Minister could give us some ideas as to what the costs will be. We know what the fees are at the present time and is there any indication at this time that the fees for registering and so on will be substantially increased as a result? I think this would also be useful information.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few observations. Certainly I'm not prepared at this time to speak on the bill, not having gone through it as I would like to, not having had the time to do it, and while I was not here this morning I certainly didn't work on the bill, I didn't have time, I had another previous commitment and at the time that I made it I didn't realize just to what extent we would have progressed, so I had to be absent from the House this morning. I understand that the Leader of the Liberal Party did speak on it and raised certain matters, where he made the requirement that certain parties appear before Law Amendments so that we can hear

BILL 5

(MR. FROESE cont'd) from them and I think this would be useful; I think it should almost be a must that we hear from the Law Society and some of the other organizations who are knowledgeable and they will participate in the drafting and who have research to things, so that we will get their views on it and also what they feel what the contentious areas are and if they have any further recommendations at that time so that we can hear from them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General shall be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the honourable members who have spoken on the bill, and particularly in recognition of the fact that this is most desirable legislation; that it now will provide for an effective information system to all who are concerned to know the status of title in connection with personal property that may or that in all likelihood often has been utilized for the securing of other commitments. We have had, as I indicated in my opening remarks, a very inadequate system and this reform is long overdue.

Now in respect to the concerns that have been indicated as to the need for very careful scrutiny of these provisions by persons who would be affected both in the commercial field and the legal profession itself, I again, without reiteration at length, want to indicate that the legal fraternity have had this bill and various drafts of it under consideration for many many months and we have had effective representation through the Uniformity and Law Commissioners not only on the part of people who are associated with the Provincial Government, that is the senior Legislative Counsel, Mr. Tallin, has personally been responsible for much of the drafting of the essential provisions of this bill and it's been one of his, you know, projects with which he has spent a good deal of time. It is something that he has been very anxious to achieve in a very thorough and proper way. And in addition to that, as I pointed out, there have been individual members of the legal profession associated with the Law Reform Commission including the Law Reform Chairman himself and one of the members of that group who have participated in reviews of the provisions of this bill. As I indicated earlier, representation of the Bar has been studying this bill through the Canadian Bar Association and in other manners, and I fully expect that they are aware of the fact that this bill is before this House. It has been indicated both in the Throne Speech as I recall, it has certainly been indicated by me in public statements from time to time and I think there has been ample currency to our desire to see this bill enacted.

Now the essential sections of this Act as I have pointed out that come into being, that come into effect on Royal Assent are those that provide for the administrative authority to begin establishing the necessary administration to cover the implementation of the system. The actual sections dealing with the registration system itself and the rights that flow from registration, the rights of attachment and both the concepts of attachment and perfection do not come into being, do not come into being until those sections are proclaimed, and we will not proclaim them until the system has been developed with which the personal property security can be registered. And as I've indicated to honourable members we want to establish this system on a computerized basis because it will involve, frankly involve, simply hundreds of thousands of documents in the long run and to have an effective system for dealing with that we will have to have very carefully organized and efficient handling systems, and we expect to be able to utilize a computer system for the banking of this information for both the input and the retrieval. It could well be as I've indicated many many months and maybe not until after a following session of this Legislature that we will actually be able to push the buttons and turn the machines and say to the people, now you can register your documents pursuant to this system. I have, you know, considerable reservation that the system will come into being within six months or eight months or even a 12-month period, that might be too optimistic. But certainly we want to pass the bill now so that - to use a colloquial expression - we can gear up the system and start the administrative planning in accordance with the authority granted to the department pursuant to this piece of legislation.

Now it could well be that prior to the actual implementation of the provisions of the Act there will be a further opportunity and we may see where we want to make some changes. But the provisions of the Act have been studied at great length by experts in the field. It's not some system that we have plucked out of the air and is dangerous in concept or probably will have great problems associated with its workability. It's a system that is being adopted over a period of time in the Province of Ontario, with some significant changes, but the changes are not in principle with the Ontario system, except as I pointed out that it will provide for something

BILL 5

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) further in Manitoba than what they have now in Ontario. It will provide for a registry system for corporate securities as well as personal securities, and that's a very desirable thing.

Now so far as the concerns about adequate notice I really feel, and I think Legislative Counsel if he were speaking to you, and he will have an opportunity to speak to you at the committee stage, can assure you as to the eager response of the legal profession to see this system brought into being so that it can be utilized as soon as possible.

The Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell asked a specific question as to whether or not you know this system will be binding on the Crown and I don't want to refer to the specific section but it certainly will be, and the bill speaks for itself on that. He asked me some questions about the application of welfare liens which is a peculiar type of lien; it's not a lien note in the terms of personal property security, it's a lien that arises by a statute, a statutory lien, and that is exempted under the provisions of this Act. Liens like garagekeepers' liens and so on that arise by statute are dealt with in a particular fashion and not necessarily under this Act at all.

I want to assure honourable members that there will be ample time at committee for representations to be made and I fully expect that there will be, or there could well be representation by the legal profession in support of this bill, and if there is a desire on Friday afternoon for any further extension of time by the legal profession or by commercial interests that say that they need further time, I think we'll be in a position to weigh that concern at that time and decide whether sufficient time is necessary. But as I've indicated, Mr. Speaker, there has been such, in my opinion, such exhaustive preparation taken in respect to this bill that I really don't think that will be necessary.

I would like to remind honourable members that I began talking about the need for this bill I believe in 1970 and I have been anxious to see this bill come forward. It is only because the senior Legislative Counsel has felt that we wanted to await the further considerations of reports by committees that had been studying the Catzman bill and the Ontario bill and the Uniformity Commissioners final review of those reports, that we should not proceed with, as I had hoped earlier than this, with the introduction of this piece of legislation. I think it is now more than past the time when we can proceed, and if there are any provisions that would amount to any problem to the commercial life of Manitoba certainly there will be ample opportunity to make any changes if that is necessary. But I doubt that very much and I trust that this bill even though it may look technically formidable can receive not only ready passage but enthusiastic endorsement by all members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition relative to Concurrence of the Supply.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with the concurrence of the Attorney-General's Estimates. He was not present when I spoke earlier. I would like to make certain reference again to the statements that were made and I would be interested in the government's response.

But before I do that I would like to complete the last item of business that I was discussing before the adjournment at noon. Mr. Speaker, I indicated the fact that we lack in Manitoba an Administrative Practices Act. That is an Act which in effect would set up procedures that would be consistent for all administrative boards that have some semi-judicial capacity, so that individuals who appear before the boards and commissions would at least have a practice and procedure available to them which would protect their rights and their interests.

Mr. Speaker, this is required because of the fact that boards and commissions through their chairmen and through their members have discretions that can be exercised in such a way to essentially defeat a person who is not familiar with legal practice and not familiar with his rights to defeat a person's ability to be able to present his position in a way or in a manner which would essentially convey the intent of a request. That's not to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this has occurred in many cases but it I believe could be documented in some, and the fact of the matter is that the procedure that should be followed if we are concerned as I think

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) we all are in the protection of the civil liberties of our people would be to basically develop a code of practice which would allow the individual coming before a commission to know that his rights would be protected and the procedure would be followed in a certain manner, and in turn, Mr. Speaker, that the basic essential elements of legal procedure would be followed so that in effect he would be able to present his case and have it decided on its merits and not be blocked by some procedural matters or proceedings which may be foreign to him and which may very well overwhelm him. In many cases this may require some additional legal help but, Mr. Speaker, it would be in the interest of the people applying to a board and commission for such a decision to have that help so that his interests in fact could be protected.

I don't think there's any real disagreement on the part of the Attorney-General and the members on the opposite side to this. The problem of course is when this will be done. I indicated in 1969, I expressed a hope that this would be done. I know that the government made mention of it in one of the Speeches from the Throne and so far nothing has happened. I believe that the matter has probably been referred to consultants for some preparation, but the fact is that at this point nothing has happened and the fact is that this area is a very distinct need and I think the Attorney-General has to assume the onus and responsibility in this regard.

Now if I may to the Attorney-General I would like to refer to my earlier remarks about the Human Rights Commission. I indicated very simply that it was my opinion that we've reached a point where the Human Rights Commission should not be appointed by government. If the Human Rights Commission is to be appointed by government they are political appointments. That does not necessarily mean that people who are appointed are not people of merit, but they are political appointees who really sit at the discretion and will of the government. I think we've reached a point where some independent body, independent of the politicians, should in fact select those who are to sit on the Human Rights Commission, whose responsibility will be to protect the individual civil liberties of our people, not only from those who would interfere with them within a community but also from government as well. I think we have a basic contradiction when we have a Human Rights Commission appointed by the government, in effect answering to the Attorney-General and to the government in the position of protecting the public's interest against all including government. And I suggest that that contradiction does in fact exist and has been exemplified in one incident which reflects on the resignation of Trevor Berry, the circumstances of which have been in dispute and are really unknown at this time by the members in this House. The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that the person involved who was the director of the Human Rights Commission was considered to be an employee of the government and his resignation is supposed to have occurred in connection with an investigation of some particular government matter. So I would think, Mr. Speaker, just as the Ombudsman reports to the House, so the Human Rights Commission should be subject to control by this House, with the one exception that the commission to be appointed should be approved by an independent board. I indicated as well that that independent board should include the heads of certain organizations, the organizations can be named, the people who will be forming the heads of those corporations will not be known now, but it would include those who are in the civil liberty field, would include labour, it would include our ethnic groups, it would include those in community service and those who would represent a wide spectrum of appeal and support in this province. I think we could arrive at a conclusion as to who those people should be; we could alter and change the act; we could in turn provide for that independent group to then select The Human Rights Commission; we could have the commission subject, Mr. Speaker, to, not the government or the Attorney-General, but answerable to this House; we could have the members appear before a committee of the Legislature annually and be in a position to deal with the matters that have come forward. And the main thing, Mr. Speaker, is that we will have protected the individual beyond the initial purpose of the Human Rights Commission, against government itself; and I think there is a concern and it must be expressed in connection with that. Because if in fact there are disputes, and there have been, as to resignations in connection with investigations in which government is involved, then I do not believe that government should be put in that position, I do not think any cloud should exist over the procedures and I think there should be a complete recognition that the rights of the individual should be protected in its fullest form.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, the actions of The Human Rights Commission should be taken fearlessly, there should be confidence in its integrity, the investigatory activity should be such that we know with a great deal of confidence that the rights will be protected. Under the present scheme of things, even though there was an advance made when the Human Rights Commission was in fact appointed, I think we can now question the degree of confidence that can in fact be expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the proposals are ones that are constructive, are ones that should be undertaken, and, Mr. Speaker, when we form government we will undertake those proposals. Mr. Speaker, we will in fact bring the amendments to the act to provide this. And, Mr. Speaker, just as we suggest that the Ombudsman should be in a position to annually come before a committee of the Legislature, so that the Legislature is in a better position to assess his function and to be in a better position to recommend any changes in legislation so that it would enhance his activities, so should the Human Rights Commission be in the same position, annually to come before the Legislature and to be in a position to be examined by the members of the Legislature and to be in a position to offer any suggestions for any change in legislation or new direction that should be undertaken, and for the legislature based on that information to make the decisions. And, Mr. Speaker, I think with a great deal of goodwill and understanding, the kind of changes that we are proposing would in fact enhance the work, would in fact take it out of the political arena that it now partially is involved in, and would in fact bring the degree of competence to a very vital and sensitive area in which the civil liberties of our people can and should be protected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things also on this Concurrence Resolution. The Attorney-General's Department in my opinion like the Health Department is an important one because he is responsible for a lot of serious legislation, one of which is the misnamed Human Rights Commission which I want to deal with. But before I do that, I'd like to deal with the government's attitude towards a particular revolutionary which could only lead to further encouragement to those who want to resort to violence when it suits their own purpose. And Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the hiring of, or I think he's been hired, of Father Berrigan and because he is the Chief Law Officer I think he should look into the question. As a Catholic I find it very difficult to speak about the issue because we are told and taught that criticism or an attack on the priesthood is a very grave sin, and therefore rather than speaking personally and giving my own attitude I'd like to quote from a magazine, I think it's a monthly magazine called The Revue of the Times, and the story is by a Father Francis E. H. Benton, and I'd like to quote from this magazine article, or just part of it: "Daniel Berrigan was sentenced to three years for burning draft cards in Cantonville, Maryland on May 17, 1968. His brother Philip is serving six years for a Cantonville incident and three more for destroying Selective Service files in Baltimore on October 27, 1967."

Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that the Member for Ste. Rose approves of that course of action, but even in prison the Berrigans make the headlines: "Philip and two other priests, former priests, a Roman Catholic nun, a Pakistani graduate, a student at the University of Chicago were indicted on January 12, 1971 by a federal Grand Jury in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania on charges of plotting to blow up heating facilities in five government buildings in Washington, D. C., and to kidnap Henry A. Kissinger, the President's top adviser. Six were named as co-conspirators. As of this writing no trial date has been set." This article incidentally is dated July 14, 1971. Therefore they are dealing with a trial that has since taken place and they were found guilty and sentenced and I understand that one of them is out on bail. "The Berrigans give every promise of becoming serious contenders for the role of top criminals among the clergy. According to the Berrigans they did what they did because their conscience demanded it, burning and Napalming and pouring of blood on the draft records to bring home in a symbolic way the horrible suffering inflicted upon the Vietnamese civilians by the capitalists beasts of the American military" - these are quotes of the Berrigan brothers'. "Philip describes" -- this is Philip Berrigan describes, "the United States as history's most violent nation to do away with this American bestiality which he would have us believe is far in excess of that exhibited by. . . . Stalin or even Atilla the Hun. Philip Berrigan told the United Press International on April 21st, 1970 that he wanted to radicalize the Peace Movement. It seems the Berrigans started out some years back as mere pacifists, then they took up non-violent

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) civil disobedience; today they have become radicals. The government now charges them with plotting violence. Meanwhile they claim to commit their crimes in obedience to Jesus Christ and they're bearing Christian witness. Daniel Berrigan has made it plain that he thinks American society is totally corrupt, something to be despised. He has been very active over the past several years in programs and demonstrations conducted by some of the nation's most radical organizations and activists. He is likewise associated with Black Panthers, and in October, 1967 visited Hanoi as a guest of the rulers of Communist North Vietnam.

"The fact that Daniel Berrigan has spent several months in Communist Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russia is also deserving of mention, as is his meeting some months ago with Marxist leader, Bernadette Devlin, the Castro in a mini-skirt. The fact that Miss Devlin is a Communist is well established; she openly announced it in an interview with the weekly Irish Echo." And I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that is the first time I heard that Devlin is a self-confessed Communist because she had been a Catholic and this comes rather as a shock to find out that she's also a Communist. Perhaps she has left the church since then.

And finally in the article he concludes, Father Benton concludes: "In my book the Berrigans are not good guys, they're not saints or martyrs or prophets; they are revolutionaries, dedicated subversives, hell bent on doing their bit to disrupt orderly function of government and to create a maximum of confusion and turmoil in this country. If they and their ilk are encouraged by responsible authorities to continue their disruption and destruction the result will be ever widening confusion and chaos on the American scene." And he ends up by saying: "Philip and Daniel Berrigan are allowed to remain priests in good standing in the church. To my mind it is incredible." I certainly agree with the remarks of that priest.

I'd like to quote further from the National Catholic Register, January 21, 1973: "After having said the church must be faithful to a life of non-violence Christ exemplified the gospel, Father Berrigan said:- 'We have to be committed to this type of life if we are to be true to the gospel,' and he ends up by calling the church a whore." Father Berrigan is on parole granted because he claimed poor health from a sentence he received because of destruction of those government files, and when he was refused entry into Canada at the Toronto airport he made the claim that he would never return to Canada unless he receives an apology from the Canadian officials. It'll be interesting if he receives it since he has accepted a teaching post at the university.

And finally we have the story here in the Winnipeg paper and also the Calgary Herald dealing with the comments of Dr. William Clawson, head of the university religion department, where he highly praised Father Berrigan. Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister and the government makes the claim that while we pay \$75 million to teach kids at the university and to pay for the professors and the staff and the overall operation of the university, they have continually and consistently insisted that they have absolutely no right, and the public who puts up the money has absolutely no right to know what they do, how they spend it, who they hire, and they could violate the Human Rights Act, which I suggest to you they are violating, the government is violating it; they can break practically any laws and there isn't anybody in the front bench that will lift a finger to stop it. Mr. Speaker, I am objecting as an individual taxpayer and as a legislator that the government and the university by hiring him, and the government by remaining silent, are really giving the kind of unexpressed approval of a person who has been described in many articles, some of which I've just read here. I think that that is bad, that's wrong and it's dangerous. How can we expect our kids to behave properly and decently if we're going to reward a revolutionary with a job at the university.

Mr. Speaker, if my group went and occupied the hospital as he did in the War Records Office, and took the files of the abortion doctors and the patients and smashed the computer and the files and poured blood and Napalm and burned the thing down, this government I'm sure Mr. Speaker, would not only bring us to court but if there was enough of us involved they'd probably call out the military like Trudeau did in 1970. Yet this same government is prepared to sit silently by and say nothing while the university hires a person of this type of a background. And if Mr. Speaker, if he had reformed, people make mistakes; if he had reformed and said, "Well I was wrong" or "I grew up" or whatever, and "I'm asking for a second chance", but that has not happened, Mr. Speaker, He continues to insist that America is a beast and an animal and worse than Hitler and has got to be destroyed; not through peaceful demonstration like

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) Dr. Luther King was involved but through violence of the worst type, and the Attorney-General who is the Chief Law Officer has not said a single word in our Legislature or outside the Legislature about the hiring of this person, of a person who preaches violence against a properly elected government. That government in the United States may be rotten and corrupt, but the fact is it is legally elected just as this government is legally elected; it has the right to pass laws, even bad laws, and for any government, a sister government or a government in another country to refuse to recognize that, Mr. Speaker, is nothing but pure encouragement for others to do likewise if they should happen to disagree with a particular policy. --(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Matthews talks about Christ, I don't know how an atheist Bolshevik could ask that kind of question. He doesn't believe in Christ, he knows that, and I am not going to waste my time answering him that question. If he wants to talk about something he deeply believes in, I'm prepared to discuss it but he does not believe in it and to him those who believe in religion are fools, and the majority of the NDP caucus and the Ministers think likewise --(Interjections)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. A point of privilege has been raised by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): The honourable member is speaking untruths; he's making statements that are false and I insist that he withdraw them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson. The honourable member knows he's not supposed to use abusive and defamatory language within the Chamber. May I suggest to the honourable member that he withdraw that remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to withdraw it. He says I've said something that's untrue. Would he specify which statement is untrue. --(Interjection)-- . . . Well, would you mind telling me which statement is untrue?

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes. You stated that I believe that those who believe in religion are fools. Now this is a false statement; it is a malicious, mischievous statement, and I wish the honourable member would show a bit of responsibility in this Chamber. He's one of the first to chastise others who show a bit of irresponsibility.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will rephrase that and say in my opinion that he does not believe, and I will go on further to say that from my experience being on that side and any time religion was brought up you were looked upon like a complete idiot, and there is no question that the majority of them are atheists, and that is one of the reasons why I'm here; and that is as a matter of fact, one of the reasons why the Member for Rupertsland, who I disagree with practically on everything, is here because he could not stand the intolerance towards those who happen to hold religious beliefs. And, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that I am going to talk about during the election campaign.

Now I'm not going to deal with that any more, Mr. Speaker, I think enough has been said. I'm now going to deal with the misnamed Human Rights Act which to small businessmen has become a ball and chain, but an act, Mr. Speaker, that is not applicable and is not obeyed by this government. I have indicated on a couple of items where it has not abated during the question period, Mr. Speaker.

Let me first of all, before I get into the specifics, read from Page 15 of the Human Rights Act--or, I'm sorry, the Progress Report which was just tabled, December 31, 1972: "The role of the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General is the representative of the government who is charged with the responsibility for the administration of the Human Rights Act. Through it he has power to investigate and inquire into complaints. The Human Rights Commission can only make recommendations concerning methods of enforcement of the Attorney-General." Mr. Speaker, I want to have it on record that the Attorney-General has on several occasions rose in this House and indicated that he was powerless to act because it was the Human Rights Commission that was guilty of the things that I had brought up in this House. This thing here, unless it's improper print or misprint clearly shows that he is responsible, and he is not going to get away, Mr. Speaker, by telling the people in this province that it's really not him, that it's the Human Rights Commission, because in here it clearly states that the Human Rights Commission can only make recommendations. So any actions or lack of action is not to be laid at the door of the Human Rights Commission but at the door of the Attorney-General, and I wish he would have the courage to accept that responsibility and

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) get up in this House and defend it instead of sloughing it off on someone else.

One of the items, Mr. Speaker, on that same page: "The particular problem highlighted and identified here involved a specialized treatment afforded to female employees working late shifts, whose employers are to provide them with transportation to and from their residence. Changes were requested to provide equality of all employees--I'm sorry, equality for all employees by either eliminating the specialized treatment for female employees or by expanding it to include male employees." Mr. Speaker, when I brought up the question, the Attorney-General at that time chose to insinuate, and in my opinion suggest openly, that I was trying to put women down, and at that time I rose in my place to object to that kind of a statement. Mr. Speaker, clearly this legislation that has been on the books for many years, I don't know if the Conservative government put it in or the Liberal government but it's been there before we come in, favours women; and Mr. Speaker, I am the one who is defending it; that government is the one that's trying to change it, and for him to get up in the House and to say that somehow I'm trying to put women down is just not true, that it's ridiculous for him to suggest that. My statement was, and my question was and continues to be, "are you going to change that Act to allow the women to have that favoured treatment or are you going to have the employers give free transportation to men?" You can't have it both ways. Either you amend that Act or you obey the Act, but don't force employers to obey an act that this government is not employing.

Mr. Speaker, there are employees working in this very building who do not have this section of the Act applied to them, the very government, the Public Works Department is breaking this Act itself. The Attorney-General knows it; he's not prepared to prosecute the Public Works Department, but he is very well prepared to prosecute employers, particularly hotels and restaurants who employ girls as waitresses who have to work late hours and they're compelled by legislation, or the employer is compelled by legislation to give free transportation. I suggest to the Attorney-General, the Chief Law Officer, to show a little example for those poor employers who are having a difficult time in this province making ends meet, to either amend the legislation or enforce it for everyone, and that includes the Provincial Government, and that includes, Mr. Speaker, that includes that sacred cow, the universities in this province who are openly and deliberately violating the law, and when a friend of mine mentioned it to them, he says you guys can make the laws for yourself, but don't bother us. That is the type of attitude that is prevalent in our universities. And can you blame them, Mr. Speaker? They openly smoke pot at the university, and I understand they grow pot, I think the police found some of it there. But did you ever hear this government get up and say, "We're going to make those rascals obey the law too." No, Sir. If a businessman violates it, heaven help him, but if a university does it or one of the departments, that's fine, the law simply doesn't apply, and that is hypocritical of this government to do that. --(Interjection)-- That seems to be the slogan of the hallmark of this government.

Page 16, The Liquor Control Act, November 10th, 1971. Recommendations: Several female hotel employees complained that Section 110 subsection 6 of The Liquor Control Act prevented them from acting as beverage room waitresses in male only beer parlors. And this applies also to where they hire bouncers, and I'm sure the Attorney-General will agree that when you get a couple of miners half tanked up that you're not going to get some weak little girl that's going to throw them out. No, I think it would be criminal for our government to allow a girl to be put in a position, a waitress or a lady bouncer to be put in a position where she has to chuck a couple of big drunks out, whether they're in Thompson or in Flin Flon or in Winnipeg. --(Interjection)-- Particularly--I'd better not say it, Mr. Speaker. But under the human rights legislation the hotel in Thompson cannot advertise that he wants a bouncer. He has to put - what is that phoney euphemism? - a person, and a girl comes up to apply and he has to tell her in such a way so he can't be charged, look lady really the job I have is for a bouncer. And of course anybody who lives in Thompson knows how tough the miners can get, so if she's insistent enough she has to insist that he hires her and then the hotel is paying salary for nothing because the girl simply cannot toss out drunks. Certainly not, not the majority of them. This is unfair to the hotels and I think the Attorney-General has a responsibility to amend that legislation.

The other one, Mr. Speaker, it's not in here but I brought it up before and it continues to be a problem, is with babysitters. The law still is that a woman who wants a baby-sitter

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) or a couple who wants a baby-sitter are prohibited by law from advertising for a woman baby-sitter. That is terribly unfair. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, when the law was passed in this Legislature that anyone on either side of the House ever intended that the law should compel people who want baby-sitters, girl baby-sitters, lady baby-sitters, grandma baby-sitters was ever intended - should compel these people wanting a baby-sitter that they would be forced to consider males to baby-sit. I don't think it was ever intended. If that is the case the Attorney-General - the session is almost over - the Attorney-General has not taken any steps to rectify that.

And this applies to Autopac, this applies to group insurance and superannuation plans, all of which in my opinion make a great deal of sense, and the insurance companies who have been in that business for many years certainly know what the rating is and to force them to turn around and treat everyone the same is wrong. For example, as a miner when I wanted to buy life insurance I found out that the miners' life insurance was the highest in Canada and for a very good reason, because we happen to work in an occupation that is considered the most dangerous. Under this stupid legislation they're going to tell the company to give the miner the same type of premium as somebody who sits in an office. The net result will be, Mr. Speaker, is that those who are in non-dangerous occupations are going to have to subsidize those who are in the mining occupation or some other occupation which is very dangerous. --(Interjection)-- What's wrong with that? Well the Member for Flin Flon who is not in his seat again is saying, what's wrong with that. I suggest that he tell that to the people at election time, that he wants everyone treated alike. And if he does then he should get up in this House and say that everybody should pay the same licence plates--I'm sorry--the same driver's licence fee and the same licence plates. You want to treat everybody the same, why shouldn't everybody pay the same rate? Why do the people in the north pay a higher rate than the rural areas? And why does Winnipeg pay a different rate than the rural areas? Because there's a damn good reason for it, and I haven't heard anybody from that side say, let's give the north the same rates. If we're going to be consistent with this Swedish equalization then let's apply it across-the-board. Let's not apply it on things that we think are important to ourselves.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, dealing still with this report, Page 20, I notice that the Attorney-General - and I'm quoting: "The Attorney-General advises that the report on the Status of Women in Canada and various recommendations contained therein have been under consideration by the government departments and agencies and as a result a number of the recommendations have been implemented either by way of legislative change or administrative action and that continued reviews are being made of those recommendations not already implemented."

Mr. Speaker, I know one of the recommendations is to have abortion on demand and I would like the Minister to state his view whether the government is giving serious consideration to that, particularly in view of the statements he's made in the House, and the statements that the Minister has made in this House. Are they seriously telling the women they're considering that request among the other ones? And the last item is legal assistance of para-legal personnel who would be employed in areas where such assistance is needed. This deals with legal assistance or legal aid in rural areas and although I'm not a farmer nevertheless I feel that I can speak for them since I live out in the country. These people are entitled to the same consideration. It's impossible for them to get it because of distance the same as the problem that's faced by the people of the north.

And the last item I would like the Minister to comment on is Professional Associations. The Commission reviewed various statutes dealing with professional licensing and recommended (1) that citizenship requirements not be included in membership qualifications, and (2) that objective standards be set for the evaluation of all applicants. Mr. Speaker, on the surface that sounds rather strange in view of the history of this country but perhaps something else is meant and when the Attorney-General gets up to answer I hope he can answer the purpose and the intent of that recommendation. Mr. Speaker, I'll be speaking again on drug abuse. I understand that on concurrence one can get up and speak several times --(Interjection)-- Just once? Well in that case I'm going to really read again. --(Interjection)-- Yeah, well I've got a 40-minute speech lined up for the Minister of Health.

I'm really just going to read a couple of clippings I have in my book here that I think are self-explanatory. I know the Attorney-General is very concerned about the drug abuse and the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) drug problem in our society and if there's one thing that he is going to continue to take serious action on I think it's on drug abuse, so I'm not going to lecture him or give him a sermon, but I'd like to read an interesting comment by Gene Telpner, a column which I seldom read but someone brought it to my attention and it deals with drugs and I'd like to read it into the record, Mr. Speaker.

"It's hardly news these days when young people get busted for drugs and to the judges who sentence the offenders the cases are getting to be routine. The drug scene is happening in almost every city in the world and Mrs. Charles Layden of 323 Wellington Crescent happened to be in Miami, Florida recently when a 17-year-old boy was sentenced to a year in a county stockade for drug offence. What made this particular case of interest according to Mrs. Layden, and I agree with her, was the lecture given by Judge Alphonso S. . . during the sentencing of the boy and his parents who were present. Fortunately, Mrs. Layden had saved most of the judge's direct quotations and I think they are well worth repeating in this column. This is what he said to the boy: "Do you know who's going to serve that year? Not you. Your mother and your father will serve that year. That is what's wrong. They get sentenced. They get sentenced for a lifetime, you serve a year. Your body is in the stockade for a year but their souls are tormented for the rest of their lives. Why? Because you are a selfish spoiled brat, that's why. You think you're smarter than everybody else." The judge continued: "There is no punishment in the world that I can inflict on you that could in any way compensate for what you are doing to your mother and your father. I have not spent five cents raising you; I don't know you from Adam but your mother and father have put their lives, their hearts, their sweat, their money and everything else they have in bringing you up. Now they have to sit in this court room and listen to a total stranger who had nothing to do with your upbringing scold you and put you in jail. This is at a time when phoney kids your age are yelling, you people have your alcohol, we want our drugs. And you have polluted our air and water and you have polluted this and that and all the rest of that garbage that comes out of your mouth. Meanwhile you put yourselves above everyone else. I feel sorry for you. I want you to think about this for one year and the reasons why I say it. If you are sick" --the judge added-- "if you are sick a doctor will treat you and he won't be on drugs. The lawyer who represents you won't be high on drugs. The people in whose custody you will be won't be on drugs." Perhaps this judge hasn't heard of Manitoba. "Your astronauts are not on drugs and your President is not, and your legislators are not, and the engineers who build the bridges that you drive across and the tunnels that you drive through, they're not on drugs. And those who build the planes that you fly in and the car that you drive in are not. Neither are those who build the bathrooms that you stink up with your rotten, lousy drugs. None of them have been on drugs. And this is because of people like your father and mother," said the judge. Then he sadly concluded by stating that in the world of the future the same may not be true. Teachers, doctors, lawyers, legislators, products of the new drug-oriented generation may well be high as kites. You won't know whom to send your child to or to whom to trust your life.' Just as Judge S. . . closed the book on this case he told the boy before him, "Let's see what world you'll leave to your children before you talk about the world we left you."

Mr. Speaker, I've got a whole catalogue of letters from parents, from children and letters left by kids who committed suicide. The rate of drug abuse is tremendous in our society. It's particularly bad in the United States; it's getting worse in Canada. I am concerned about it and I'm sure every legislator here is, about the present campaign, the subtle campaign that is going on to legalize the so-called harmless soft drugs which is marijuana. There is enough evidence around to indicate that those drugs are neither soft nor harmless and they are very dangerous and lead to many problems even though a person may eventually kick the habit.

I would hope that the government, particularly the Attorney-General, would make representation to the Justice Minister in Ottawa and the Health Minister in Ottawa and indicate this government's position clearly, as they have done in other things, clearly indicate the position that they do not want the Federal Government to loosen the laws on drugs as they have on abortion. This thing here destroys human life just as surely as an abortion. But perhaps worse, Mr. Speaker, because the kids we are talking about are kids that we have brought up. They may be 10, they may be 15, they may be 20. They have been brought up by parents who have great hopes for them; they have been educated by our society and we expect that they'll make some contribution. Those drugs are destroying them, killing many of them, causing many of them to

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) jump out of windows, to get killed in car accidents, and those that are not killed become mindless zombies who stare into the ceiling, and our institutions are getting full of them. I would hope that the Minister would seriously consider some type of resolution or an approach to the Federal Government to make absolutely certain that there is no further liberalization of the Drug Act in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The main subject in the departmental considerations in front of us at the moment with which I'm concerned in this concurrence stage of the debate is that having to do with the Human Rights Commission.

I intend to be brief, Mr. Speaker, but I did want to raise the question on the record as to just what extent of support and help the Human Rights Commission is getting in a tangible way from the Attorney-General's Department this year. We had a fairly wide-ranging debate last year on Estimates of the Attorney-General's Department with respect to the Human Rights Commission and it was suggested by many of us, myself included, that some of the things that the Human Rights Commission was purported to be doing really came into the classification of luxury items and frills at a time when government spending should be pared. Well the Attorney-General at that time defended everything that the Human Rights Commission was doing and went to some length and to some pains to explain to the House that there were a number of successful undertakings in which the Commission had been involved in the preceding year and that he felt that the money appropriated for that particular commission could be justified. In that case, Sir, it was a total of \$248, 700. 00. He said that the Commission was worth its salt, that the money appropriated for it was going to a good purpose and that in fact the Commission acting in the capacity of the ombudsman's role that it really fulfills had resolved a lot of problems for a lot of people in Manitoba and had certainly justified the appropriation. He disagreed strenuously with us that any appropriation for that commission could fall into the category of luxury or frill and he made a pretty passionate argument in short, Sir, in defence of everything the commission stood for, everything that it's intending to do and every cent that was being spent on it. Well that's fine, that's all well and good. We accepted that at the time; we said we agreed with the concept of the Human Rights Commission; we agreed in principle with what it represented in terms of an interlocutor for people in our society who felt that their individual rights were being trampled or at least affronted, and if the Attorney-General could justify the expenditure on the grounds of performance and on the grounds of fulfillment of promise and performance then we would stand with him on it and we would accept the appropriations being asked.

But, Sir, the Attorney-General and his department can't have it both ways. They've either got to believe in the Human Rights Commission and believe in everything that it's doing and believe in every buck that's been spent on it or else it's got to be regarded as a frill and a luxury which can be dispensed with or many of the operations of which could be cut back in the interests of a reduction in public spending at a time when budgets in terms of government spending are already far too high. He's either got to be with them or against them and the situation this year is that there's a far higher sum of money being appropriated for the Human Rights Commission while the commission itself and many agencies in our society interested in its work are convinced that its efforts are being thwarted and it itself is being muzzled perhaps through no direct role that the Attorney-General himself is playing but at least inadvertently by the fact that they're not getting the back-up necessary to do the job they're supposed to be doing. So it has to be one way or the other.

This year we're talking about nearly \$300, 000 for the Human Rights Commission - 297, 000 to be exact. That is an increase in appropriation of approximately 20 percent over last year. We have on the record the Attorney-General's impassioned defence of the commission; we have on the record our acquiescence in that defence and our agreement that in principle, yes the commission has a role to play, and what do we have facing us in society and in this Legislature where the commission is concerned today, Sir? We have discontent, dismay, frustration on the part of many people who believe in the commission because they feel it's not been given the opportunity to do the job that the Attorney-General himself says it's here to do. There have been difficulties placed in its way with respect to some decisions reached with respect to some court decisions pending, and since some of those decisions still are pending I appreciate that we can't go into specific examination of them at this time, but I would like to say on behalf of at least one agency with which I am closely involved, and that is the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, that there is some fear that the Human Rights Commission at

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) the present time is not getting the support from the Attorney-General and from the government that it needs to have to do the job it's supposed to do. Now if it's not going to get that support then that \$297,000 appropriation is frill, is luxury that we can't afford. And last year's \$248,000 appropriation was frill and was luxury that we can't afford. It can only be justified if the commission is going to be allowed to work, helped to work, encouraged to work and supported in its work. So I think the Attorney-General should have a hard look at that aspect of his responsibilities, Sir.

One other point, I would commend the honourable gentleman and his department for the manner in which they have I think throughout this Attorney-General's stewardship supported the police departments and forces of this province and the work that the police do in our society. I think that there has been a substantial improvement in police community relations in the last three to four years. Five years ago I think we were in trouble as a society with respect to the attitude the people on a fairly widespread basis had for the police as an institution and for the things the police were charged with doing. Well I must say that through many of the programs undertaken by different agencies and organizations in society, through the police efforts, the efforts of the police force itself and through the attitude about police and police work that is reflected in the administration of his office by the present Attorney-General, I think there has been substantial improvement in police community relations in our province, Sir, and I would commend the Attorney-General for his role in that sphere. I think there is more that can be done.

I think that youth-police relations are extremely still extremely tenuous and any programs either of an advertising or public relations or community relations nature in the best sense of those fields should be undertaken and supported as far as possible by the Attorney-General's department so as to continue the improvement in relations that has already begun. I don't think we can say that a provincial government or an officer of a provincial government like the Attorney-General can regard themselves as being not responsible for that kind of work and for that kind of goal.

It's not entirely the job of the schools and the job of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews and the job of the Red Cross and the job of the YMCA and YMHA to build a bridge between society and its protectors, its police departments. It is to a substantial degree a responsibility of government and government officers to participate in that function and so if there is anything of a supportive nature in the field of consultative programs, advertising programs or public relations programs that the Attorney-General and his government colleagues can do in that respect I urge them to do it, to keep the climate in our society where the role of the police is concerned healthy and continue to have it improved in the manner that it has done in the last few years.

Those are specifically the things that I wanted to say in this Concurrence debate, Mr. Speaker. (1) Keep up the good work where police relations with the community is concerned. (2) Do some good work where the Human Rights Commission is concerned or else kill it and put the money back in the public treasury and give the people back some more of the taxes that they've already paid.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to be brief. I don't know whether five minutes will do it or not. We had the Manitoba Police Commission Report delivered to our desks earlier. There are a few items in this Commission Report that caused me some concern, Mr. Speaker, and I will turn very briefly to the first one on Page 11, where the report from the individual inquiries and the commission received an inquiry from the Winnipeg Inner City Policy Department about what is commonly referred to as the Main Street problem. "It is the feeling of some that because of the conditions on Main Street, there is a higher volume of violent crimes than is usual. After having given this matter considerable thought, it became apparent to the commission that there was an urgent need for more rigid control of liquor outlets, for detoxification centres, for tighter management of controls of hotels, better trained waiters, more native staff as probation aids, " and two or three others.

I raised this matter earlier, Mr. Speaker, when we were dealing with the affairs of the Liquor Control Commission, and last year we did find activity by the Liquor Control Commission where there was a tighter management control on the hotels in that Main Street area. But since that time we've seen, in the last three or four weeks, we've seen a relaxation of the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) control on liquor outlets which seems to be in direct controversy with the recommendations of the Police Commission. We've seen store hours on the Main Street liquor store extended; where they were at one time from 11 in the morning till 8 at night, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, they're now extended from 10 in the morning till 10 at night, and where it was previously open till 9 at night on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, it's now open till midnight. So we find that while there's a tightening of the control on the hotels, there's a relaxation of control on the government liquor stores, which I voiced earlier, and this does not seem to be within the recommendations at all; in fact it goes directly against the recommendations of the Manitoba Police Commission in the report that they have tabled in this House. And I would ask the Minister, if he is going to reply, to consider seriously following the recommendations of the Police Commission Report, because they suggest several other things in the field of alcohol control, and later on they refer to "a desirable feature of a research program on the effect that alcohol in our society today has on our law enforcement program. The role of the police and the detoxification and rehabilitation program . . . "

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 8:00 p. m. tonight.