

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, April 13, 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 54 students of Grade 9 standing of the John Pritchard School. These students are under the direction of Mr. A. M. L. Gurney and Mr. Nisch. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rossmere, the Honourable First Minister. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, 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.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, approximately two weeks or so ago the Honourable Member for Thompson and the Member for Brandon West and, I believe, perhaps one other member had asked for information relative to the Dominion - Provincial fiscal arrangements and equalization payment formulas, and I've arranged to obtain copies of perhaps what is the most definitive work on that subject prepared by the Canadian Tax Foundation and accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would table four copies for honourable members.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can inform the House when Eric Kierans was appointed to head a task force with respect to the sale of power to the United States.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's an internal task force; it is not a formally constituted entity as such but all of the persons involved. Messrs. Bateman, Stuart Anderson, Mark Eliason, Lee Briggs and Mr. Kierans have been -- they have met once now and are proceeding herefrom with their task force study and analysis.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate when it is likely that the task force will complete its work, and realistically, what are its terms of reference?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, its terms of reference in one sense hardly lend themselves to a summarization during the question period. On the other hand I suppose it would be accurate enough to say that the basic term of reference is to study and investigate relative energy pricing policies in Canada or alternative energy forms, also with respect to export sales and realistic energy pricing and to update certain past assumptions relative to energy pricing.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then as a result of the answer, there may have been some misunderstanding on my part. Is this task force going to be dealing with the question of rates for consumers in Manitoba or is it going to be dealing just with the question of export?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in a sense why I don't suppose one could separate the two completely, but certainly the primary if not exclusive, certainly the very primary purpose is to analyse alternative energy form pricing patterns and export pricing. Domestic pricing of energy is something that is left to Manitoba Hydro and to the Manitoba Public Utility Board.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the committee will have power to negotiate with any authorities outside of Manitoba, either in Canada or in the United States.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a negotiating entity, it is a fact finding and economic analyses body. Negotiations of such will be carried out by -- in the normal way by the utility itself but based hopefully on a good deal of new information and new data that has been brought forward by the task force.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate then whether the Hydro development in the north and the stages that are now being undertaken and contemplated will in any way be delayed pending the receipt of the study by this task force.

MR. SCHREYER: Well again, Mr. Speaker, that is not likely inasmuch as we do not feel that a task force with terms of reference having to do with updating of data and information relative to energy pricing in any way impinges directly on the obvious need to proceed with the development of the Nelson River. The decision was taken some years ago; it was in my opinion the right decision; we must proceed.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether Mr. Kierans is heading the task force or whether he is just a member and if not, who is heading the task force?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kierans is a member of the task force, so is Mr. Briggs, who I might add is one who did have a senior position with Winnipeg Hydro many years ago, and who in the last ten years was a member of the Board of the National Energy Board, and therefore has useful experience to bring to bear on this. The task force is chaired by Mr. Eliason.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the chairman of the task force will be made available to the Standing Committee on Public Utilities.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the task force is an internal one, but certainly through Mr. Bateman it is possible to get whatever questions my honourable friend has in mind asked and, I believe, answered through Mr. Bateman.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is the study that's being conducted by Professor Kierans and the group involve short-term pricing for export or long-term or both?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would run the entire gamut or gamut -- I don't know which is the right pronunciation . . .

MR. ASPER: In view of the fact that the government then is now studying long-term pricing for power export, is it the intention of the government to negotiate long-term exports of Manitoba power?

MR. SCHREYER: Well that depends, Sir, on how long is long.

MR. ASPER: I think in the Hydro trade, five to ten years would be considered long, anything beyond ten years certainly would be a long-term contracting. In view of that definition, is it fair to assume that the government intends to seriously negotiate for the sale of major blocks of power on a long-term basis?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we already run into a difference of interpretation. My understanding is that anything in the order of five to ten years is intermediate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate in the study that is being contemplated, or being undertaken, is there any government direction of an intention to have domestic users subsidize foreign users, or vice versa?

MR. SCHREYER: If I understood my honourable friend correctly, to have domestic users subsidize export users, perish the thought.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, there was a second part to that question. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether there was an intention of having foreign users subsidize domestic users?

MR. SCHREYER: If foreign users were to hear that they may not want to buy it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether the government has fixed any upper limit of the percentage of Manitoba generative power it is willing to commit for export, as a limit for the study?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only reply as a layman, and I do believe this question lends itself very well to being asked by my honourable friend of Mr. Bateman at the next committee. I would say, just as a sort of tentative interim answer, that something

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) in the order of one plant capacity, in other words something in the order of 800 megawatts to 1,200 megawatts, something in that order, very very roughly.

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

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the study in any way co-ordinated or co-operated in by the Department of Industry and Commerce with a view to determining whether by withholding power sales to the United States industry would be attracted to locate in Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Of course, Mr. Speaker, we've heard this argument for at least a half a century. There are arguments on both sides of that, and of course it is one of the very -- it is one of the points in mind of those on the task force, on the in-house task force.

MR. ASPER: Is any representative of the Department of Industry and Commerce involved in the task force?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do have the automatic liaison in the sense that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is aware of the task force's work. The Minister of Industry and Commerce also chairs the Manitoba Energy Council. Mr. Bateman is one who is on the Manitoba Energy Council and so naturally the liaison is there, the exchange of information, the channels for it are there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether there has been any agreement by the government or Hydro, either verbally or written, to an American user to supply in fact the capacity up to 800 megawatts.

MR. SCHREYER: There is no commitment, Mr. Speaker, I believe I heard the honourable member's question in its entirety -- there there is a commitment in existence -- the answer is no.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that discussions along these lines have in fact taken place between Manitoba Hydro and the United States users?

MR. SCHREYER: . . . Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that, and I can also confirm that these discussions have been going on with varying frequency ever since 1965.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can now confirm to the House that one of the reasons the government proceeded with the Churchill diversion now was because in fact this commitment is to be honoured.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there was no commitment, and in fact I don't believe that any commitment was given in 1965 or '66, but further elaboration on this I think, Sir, you would not allow me the time during the question period to go into elaboration of this, but as a starter I would refer honourable members to the speech made in this Assembly in February of 1966 by the then Premier who was addressing himself to the question of export sales of Hydro, and the way in which this juxtaposed, or interrelated, with the decision to develop the Nelson.

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

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is it correct then that the Churchill River diversion could in fact be deferred until after the task force, until after the Federal-Provincial Task Force on Environmental Damage were completed, if there were no commitments or no intention to sell long-term power to the United States.

MR. SCHREYER: That is not correct, Mr. Speaker, and the reason why it isn't, I think I could explain but it would take several minutes. I invite my honourable friend to take advantage of the opportunity to question Mr. Bateman directly, he would be in a position to give him the information in the greatest of detail, and technical detail at that.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the Department of Industry and Commerce or any other department, or the task force headed by Professor Kierans any intention . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I may point out Professor Kierans is not -- that was the answer placed in this House.

MR. ASPER: The task force then, Mr. Speaker, in which Professor Kierans is a participant. Are there any studies, any consideration, any data being accumulated, that

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ASPER cont'd) would indicate the bargaining strength that Manitoba has in negotiating to attract jobs and industry from the United States into Manitoba by the use of power? Are there any studies of that kind being done?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the -- again I explain -- that is one of the many reasons why in constituting this internal task force we have put men on it who are, you know, extremely competent and well able to deal with those questions. We have Mr. Bateman, who honourable members have got to know, who is the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and who is intimately aware of all of the considerations. We have Stuart Anderson who has been a Deputy Minister of Finance in this province for I think some 22 or 23 years, transcending three administrations, or four, and these two gentlemen in particular, as well as Mr. Briggs and Mr. Kierans and Mr. Eliason, all of these concerns that my honourable friend is preoccupied with are precisely the kind of concerns that will be analyzed in depth.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 20 members of the Flin Flon Midget Hockey Team under the direction of their manager, Mr. Kitch and coach Mr. Jarvis. This team comes from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. I wonder if he could indicate to the House what arrangement he has made at Camperville, I believe, where there is, certain students are refusing to go to a school, what arrangement he has made for their education in the town.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I believe that a similar question was asked of me yesterday. However, in the light of some of the news comments with respect to this matter and answering the honourable member's question, I wish to indicate that by way of assisting the Duck Mountain School Division in providing education facilities in Camperville which apart from whatever other reasons may be stated by some individuals for the need for such a facility, the fact of the matter does remain that it is a somewhat geographically isolated community, and in that sense not different from other similar communities which have to be looked upon separately in terms of their education needs, so in that light I had offered assistance to the Duck Mountain School Division to provide whatever education facilities that are necessary in Camperville, and it appears that this is in the nature of assistance for two teachers plus a related expenses that may be covered by grant. But at no time, Mr. Speaker, did I indicate or say anything that could be interpreted that this was a form of direct assistance or a grant to the Camperville community to provide to set up their own school. Thus the instruction services will proceed in Camperville under the jurisdiction of the Duck Mountain School Division for the Camperville community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister is now telling us that he is

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. BOROWSKI: That he is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. BOROWSKI: Can he tell us if this school is set up now under racial and segregated lines for Metis?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I did not and I have no intention of doing a survey of the Camperville community to trace the racial origin of the students enrolled, or entitled

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) to be, or qualifying to enroll in a school in Camperville, and I have no knowledge as to whether or not they are Indian, Metis, Ukrainian, Polish, English or German or what. I'm not too concerned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he could tell us whether it's a fact or not that it was a Metis group that applied for it and we now have a segregated class of children in Manitoba?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the school facilities provided at Camperville are no more evidence of segregation than a school that may be provided in Thompson for the benefit of the Thompson community, or in Morris for the benefit of the Morris community, or wherever -- or Teulon, Stonewall for the benefit of that community. There's a community, there's need for education facilities within it, and they are provided therein. And he also mentioned that at the present time the community is also meeting with other neighboring communities closer to it, more readily accessible than Winnipegosis, to determine the feasibility of re-aligning school division boundaries and school district boundaries to provide a type of facility as would best serve Camperville, Duck Bay, Pine Creek. But this is in its exploratory stages, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he is going to take action himself or have the Human Rights Commission take action against the Minister of Education for practicing racial segregation in the educational system . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question is out of order because it expresses an opinion. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson state his matter of privilege.

MR. BOROWSKI: I was not stating an opinion, I was simply reacting to what the Minister had admitted two minutes ago. It was not an opinion, it was a fact that the Minister admitted two minutes before, and I'm asking the Attorney-General whether he is going to take action . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is really pursuant to the Member for Thompson's point of privilege. As I heard the Honourable Minister of Education's answer, he indicated the precise opposite, that there was in fact no intention of allowing this problem to be settled on the basis of segregation, on the basis of racial or ethnic lines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: On just a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. When I spoke of educational facilities I was speaking of high school facilities, not elementary. The elementary schools are already there, serving the communities that I have referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Will the report of the Welfare Advisory Board be available before the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development are debated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, that depends. The report is not now ready. I'll take the question as notice depending when the Estimates of the department actually are debated in this House. It could be that the Estimates of the department will be debated before the report is tabled. Hopefully a report will be forthcoming soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. When will it be convenient or possible to sign a special agreement for water and sewer in Cranberry Portage?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if the Minister of Agriculture is not the one to respond, but my understanding of the sequence would be that upon receipt of a firm offer or proposal from the Manitoba Water Services Board through the aegis of the Minister of Agriculture, that the local residents then have a period of 30 days in which to be advised and in which to make any objection, if there be any, and following that period of time I believe the agreement can be executed, following which construction can commence with the installation work.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Will the First Minister undertake, in view of the importance of the long-term export of power to this province or the retention of that power, to table or make available to the Public Utilities Committee the report of the Task Force prior to the concluding of any contracts for long term sale of power?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply in the affirmative to that question, but this being in the AM, I'm not sure that I really grasp all of the implications of that so I will take the question as notice.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the, I believe to the Minister responsible for Air Services Northern Affairs. Is it correct that the present government, the Provincial Government, has leased or purchased an executive jet for approximately \$600,000?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON. McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, the question as stated by the Leader of the Liberal Party is not correct.

MR. ASPER: Would the Minister indicate to the House whether the Province of Manitoba has in its possession, one way or the other, or by any means, a very expensive executive aircraft recently acquired, and so that there's no doubt as to what I'm asking, a plane, I believe an M-U2 from Mitsubishi.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the member is now learning to ask questions in a way that doesn't try to provide all the answers. Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba has on lease from a firm in Montreal, an M-U2, which is a Turbo aircraft, --(Interjection)-- and Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of this government, of course, Mr. Speaker, to provide information to the honourable members and if the honourable member would like to refer to an Information Services news release of probably two months ago now, he will find the information that he is asking for at this time. The Province of Manitoba is leasing this aircraft. It operates at the same operating cost as a Turbo Beaver, we've found it very valuable in terms of the PAT program, the Patient Air Transportation Program, and so we've extended the lease, temporary lease, we've extended that lease at this time, or we are trying to extend that lease.

MR. ASPER: Would the Minister care to indicate to the House why we require, why the Province of Manitoba requires a \$600,000 aircraft when a \$200,000 aircraft . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Order, please. Again -- Order, please. Let me again caution honourable members that when they state opinions in a question it becomes argumentative and automatically becomes out of order. So if they wish a question I would hope they would state it briefly and succinctly. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is not one which calls for an opinion or expresses an opinion. It simply asks a fact. What is the purpose . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If I may analyze for the honourable member, when he quotes a price then he's stating an opinion which may not be a fact. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Why does the Government of Manitoba find it necessary to acquire a very expensive aircraft by lease when it has available to it (a) existing inexpensive aircraft in numbers greater than ever before; and (b) is building aircraft at Saunders Aircraft?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, that's a very long and complicated question but it would certainly be a privilege for me to answer it for the honourable member. The plane that we are leasing, and I think leasing is quite a bit different than acquiring what the honourable member would imply, and I suppose it would be right for me to say that we require this plane, Mr. Speaker, because the monorail isn't built yet. And because the monorail isn't built, we would like to have a plane that can get us around the province in a hurry. But, Mr. Speaker, more important than that, Mr. Speaker, this plane is on lease; the lease is on very good terms favourable to the people of Manitoba; the plane referred to is a plane that can operate from our northern airstrips; it is a plane that can fly into the various small airstrips in Manitoba and it is also a plane that puts the Patient Air Transportation program 2-1/2 hours from any point in the Province of Manitoba. And, Mr. Speaker, for the same cost

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd). . . . as a Turbo Beaver we have a plane that can go around or just over 300 miles an hour and handle emergency situations. And, Mr. Speaker, we've found this plane very very worthwhile. Part of the member's question was in terms of the Saunders Aircraft, and certainly if there was a need, if there was a need of the Air Division of the Province of Manitoba for that type of aircraft, we would be willing to consider it but, Mr. Speaker, the aircraft that we have on lease now is quite different in that it is able to land at all these very small airstrips and therefore is much more practical. Of course it's a lot smaller than the Saunders Aircraft as well, which is really a passenger plane for short distances. I think I've covered all the points raised by the honourable member. If he has some more, I'd be pleased to answer them.

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Industry and Commerce in the absence of the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Corporation: Has Saunders Aircraft sold any aircraft other than those that were reported a year ago?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the latest information but I know there are several very interesting offers that are now being discussed with other purchasers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: It might be also germane to advise my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party that the aircraft that have been sold have been sold, not because of, but in spite of the attitude of benign neglect of Prairie Canada by the Canadian Export Credit Insurance Corporation, or Export Development Corporation as it is now called, which I believe, Sir, has not provided any financing for exports of products from any of the prairie provinces.

MEMBERS: Shame, Shame.

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

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, and my question relates to his statement of a minute ago. Is it a fact that Canadian Export Credit Insurance Corporation, along with several other independent government agencies, has expressed great doubt about the economic viability and the flyability of your aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the aircraft that have been purchased by the airlines operating in the Republic of Columbia, we have received reports back on a regular basis. They are indeed quite happy with the product and with the arrangements, and are intending to purchase more. All of this, Sir, without any help from a federal agency that seems to be completely and callously indifferent to prairie Canadian export needs.

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

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that the Government of Manitoba in effect had to provide the financing to induce the Columbian airline to buy the aircraft?

MR. SCHREYER: The kind of financing that was arranged for, Mr. Speaker, was similar in nature to the kind of financing which the Canadian Export Development Corporation provides manufacturing firms in Eastern Canada but which they have not, and the records will show this, Sir, they do not have any accounts, they have one account in the three Western Canadian prairie provinces. The great bulk, Sir, of Canadian Export Credit Insurance or Export Development Corporation financing, which is every bit as generous, more so, than that which was provided through the MDC, is provided to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to follow up the question, and ask the First Minister: Is there any valid reason why they will not finance Manitoba planes or Manitoba manufactured?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I can advise my honourable friend that they do not finance anything out of Alberta or Saskatchewan either, and certainly this has been taken up with the Minister of Defence, the Honourable James Richardson, he does have a concern which I believe to be genuine, and we are attempting in co-operation to see if something can be changed here, but it is certainly indefensible in every respect and the record shows it.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Honourable Minister indicate to the House whether there are any indications that Manitoba farmers might run into an automotive fuel shortage during the summer or during this crop year, such as is indicated for the U. S. especially in the Chicago area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no indications of that kind of problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary. Are there any surveys made in any year on this matter or is it completely left to the private companies?

MR. USKIW: I don't recall the department ever being involved in this kind of thing, Mr. Speaker. I can check for my honourable friend but I don't think that we have ever been involved in that kind of research.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of his great desire to want to sell some of the Saunders white elephants, is he prepared to sell them to any country in the world including, for example, North Vietnam?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that my honourable friend was asking that in a half-banting way and I will simply say that it's my understanding, wrong though it may be, that North Vietnam buys Migs not Saunders.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Public Works. I would like to ask him if he has had the approval from any of the service organizations such as the Legion, the Amputees, the Army, Navy and Airforce Vets, for the building of the washroom on Memorial Park?

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if there has been any further developments regarding the unsubstantiated charges of impropriety levelled against the Chairman of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether members opposite have been satisfied or not with the answers that were given . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: . . . but I think it is an opportunity for me to give a further piece of information for the benefit of friends opposite. I would like to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, if I may, a letter received from a member, former member of the board, who was in the decision-making process with respect to both applications. A member who called me yesterday . . . (Interjection)--

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

MR. SPIVAK: On a question of privilege. . .

MR. SPEAKER: State his matter of privilege?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I will, if the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs can just close his mouth just for a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, on question of privilege, there's nothing wrong with the answer being given by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I think it really is in a form of a statement, and I think it should have been given as a Ministerial Statement; I think that the answer that he is now proposing to give, and there is no objection on our side from hearing that answer, in fact we would welcome a statement from him, comes as a result of a response to a question which is not in the context of the answer that is now being given. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is more appropriately considered to be a matter of a Ministerial Statement and we accept that only because it gives the members on the opposite side the opportunity for a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we get ourselves into a procedural wrangle, I would say that there is some validity to what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is stating, but he is going on the assumption that the reply will be long. I am going on no such

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) assumption until I have heard it. If it gets too lengthy and becomes a statement, I will stop it. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: It really is a service not so much to the House but to the member who called me yesterday expressing some concern over the fact that his integrity was questioned as a board member, and he asked whether it could be facilitated that his letter be read to to this Chamber to clarify his own position. And it's from Harold L. McKay, 51 Westgate, Winnipeg 1, Manitoba, a member that was appointed some years ago by the previous administration, and subsequently reappointed by this administration. So, Mr. Chairman, if I may in that context be permitted I would read the letter into the record. It says as follows, Mr. Speaker: "I was . . ."

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BOROWSKI: I rise on a point of order. I was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his point of order?

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . I'd like you to clarify whether it's going to be allowed for other members to read a letter during the question period. I have no objection with the Minister doing it. I wonder if that same courtesy will be extended to other members of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is some difficulty there. I do believe that it is not really a simple matter to allow all and sundry letters to be read, and therefore this perhaps poses some difficulty for you, Sir. What is involved in this case is a letter which comes to bear directly on a matter that had been under previous debate in this Chamber which bears directly on that. It is a case of either reading the letter in its entirety or tabling it for honourable members information, and one assumes that they do want information, and accordingly which every way I think would be quite acceptable as long as it doesn't cause any problems of precedent for the future and that, Sir, is your decision. --(Interjection)-- Well I'm not, I am not arguing, Mr. Speaker, that it necessarily should be allowed. It is whether -- if it causes a problem of precedent then it should not be allowed, and I'm sorry, Sir, that my recollection of Beauchesne in this respect is faulty.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there may be a problem with a precedent here but there are two courses of action open to the Minister. One of them is to table the letter, as the Minister has suggested; the other one is on a Ministerial Statement, which is possible for the Minister if he wants to clarify a position, and that's one of the purposes of Ministerial Statements, which of course gives the opportunity of members of the Opposition to reply to that statement. Now the Minister has two courses that I think are quite within the rules of the House, he can choose either one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think in the circumstances and in light of the point made by the Honourable the Member for Morris, that the sort of most appropriate course of action in the circumstance would be to reply to the question by way of a verbal answer, not by way of reading the letter, and to have the letter merely tabled as such.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. USKIW: I then would wish to say that the letter in fact suggests that there was no impropriety on the part of anyone on the board, that both decisions were sound judgment decisions, and that this particular board member would want that to be put on the record as having been a participant in that decision-making process, and that he wishes this information to be conveyed to members of the Legislature. I have copies of the letter for my friends opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I may then wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if there was any reason why the officials of the Agricultural Credit Corporation could not have appeared before this committee, which is a perfect right for him to have in front of him when the particular Estimates were before the House?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, as I recall it since the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was established some twelve years ago by the previous administration, it was not provided in the Statutes for that kind of opportunity of scrutiny of their activities. So that the way we would have had to proceed, or at least one of the ways we may have proceeded was by resolution of the House waiving the general rule, or the common law provisions, allowing that to take place; or we would have to amend the act waiving the common law, the general common law as we understand it to allow this to take place.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, then I wonder if the Minister could reply to a further question and I ask now, is it not permissible then under the present rules of this House that when the Estimates of a particular department are being considered that the officials, and they're named in the Estimate . . . , the Farm Credit Corporation is one of the departments of, branches of government that is under consideration, one of the officials of that department could not have appeared before the Minister, along with the Deputy Minister, so that questions relating to the Agricultural Credit Corporation could not have been referred to him for accurate reply at that time. --(Interjection)-- No, here.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to deny that particular privilege to anyone, but they are not in a position to address the Chamber or to respond to a question put, and their response has to be through the Minister in any case.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, then Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what I want to raise can be done in the question period. I wonder if I may rise on a point of order then. The point that I'm attempting to make is that the official of the department could have appeared before the Minister and any questions that were directed, or any statements that had to be made could, he could have then got his advice and his information from that official in forming his replies. I noted that there was not an official from the Agricultural Credit Corporation before the Minister at the time that that particular estimate was being considered.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order. Further to the point of order raised by the Member for Morris, it may well be that his proposal is meritorious and ought to be adopted. On the other hand, Sir, the question period does not lend itself to the advancing of worthwhile changes in the rules procedure. The Honourable Member for Morris is, I believe, a member of the Rules Committee and is in a position to advance his idea, which I believe is a good one, but not here, Sir, not at this point in time in the -- on Orders of the Day.

MR. JORGENSEN: The point that I was attempting to make is that that rule already exists.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that Mr. Hofford has called for an inquiry into this matter that has been raised in the last few days, would the Minister have an inquiry called for the purpose of either substantiating the charge or clearing the man's name?

MR. USKIW: I don't have any knowledge of that, Mr. Speaker. It could be possible that he has made that kind of a statement, and he probably is prepared to advance his position under such an inquiry. On the other hand I think if members wish, if we can get the co-operation of the two applicants, the two people in question, I would not deny the members the files on both, but we would have to get the permission of the two people involved. -- (Interjection)-- And then that does establish another principle for all other people applying under the MACC.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

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

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of the Attorney-General. Resolution 1, Minister's salary. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could indicate how many minutes I have left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I believe the Member for Thompson was speaking last day. I don't know how much time he still has.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's good. Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that offer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't understand why some of the members of the government were so upset last night when I was speaking, and I realized that I had not prefaced my remarks properly. And my wife was up in the gallery last night also and she said that she missed my speech, Mr. Chairman. She couldn't understand why one of the Minister's wives gave her a cold shoulder. She said, "What did you say that made him so mad?" She said, "This is a friend of mine; she just gave me a cold hello." And of course I told her that I did tell the government what I thought of him, and I think that, Mr. Speaker, that I should tell the government that the other night when we voted on that Bill 10 that was a crossing of the Rubicon for me and that I am going to declare, or have declared open war on the government as of that day. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Colleges and Universities is delighted, and I want to tell him that there may be some others in the party that share his view, and I want it on record, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to do everything in my power to help the Opposition to sink that Swedish schooner that sits on that side.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): Would the honourable member entertain an invitation? Would he accept an invitation to run in Seven Oaks?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't believe that that is a . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a better suggestion; in fact I've had several offers. One is for the Minister of Health, and the other one's for Point Douglas, and I want to tell the Minister that I'm seriously considering those two constituencies.

MR. MILLER: I'm offering Seven Oaks, and I wish he'd give it very serious consideration.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I might consider it, or Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of pornography will go up and run up in Thompson. I might consider that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, That is not in order. The honourable member -- there is no such person.

MR. BOROWSKI: No, I'm sorry. We'll have to change the title at the next . . . to the next government takes office. --(Interjection)-- No.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to put that on record, and I want the government to know why I felt that way because there are certain ethics in this House, and I want the public to know of the two-faced double-crossing that was pulled on the government. The Minister of Health come to me and told me he'd vote for my bill -- Bill 10 -- and when the bill came of course we all know what happened; and there are many things, Mr. Speaker, we tolerate in this House but a two-faced double-cross is something that no one tolerates, and I want to tell the government that we're going to tell the public of the type of phonies and hypocrits and sodomites those guys are at the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on the human rights, I was speaking -- I wonder if you'd tell that Bolshevik to keep quiet from (what's his constituency) St. Matthews. I'm having great difficulty . . .

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities.

MR. MILLER: I would like to hear the honourable Fascist speak but I can't hear him.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad you're going to be very very liberal here because I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not intending to be very liberal in the terms of everybody interjecting, I wish to have some order here so that we can hear what the Honourable Member for Thompson has to say. Proceed.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the language, and I'm glad that there is a little more latitude so you can call a liar a liar and a sodomite a sodomite, and I think this is proper that this Chamber should be one place in this province where you can tell the truth without pulling any punches. And I'm glad that you are giving that type of leeway; I think it's long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I was speaking on the equal rights legislation which has been turned into equal bondage, and I want to continue in that direction. The drive and the zeal for social change has entered into a state where it's almost hysterical reform and it's causing a great deal of damage and harm to many people who have spent a lifetime trying to bring about some equality of legislation in this country. And we have a group here that are not elected by the people, Mr. Chairman, and do not answer to this House, that have been given the power by that government to do things that up to this time only elected legislators have been able to do. And that is an usurpation of legislative right, Mr. Speaker; I object to it; I'm sure many Manitobans object to it. I think I gave an example of it the other day where a woman wanted a babysitter and the newspapers would not accept an ad that she wanted a woman because it's against the law. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a criminal assault on the freedom of an individual to want to hire a lady babysitter not a male babysitter. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a situation where you can't do this, then I suppose the next thing they will do is they'll have to take off the name "Men" on washrooms and "Women" because it discriminates. I mean if you can't use the work men and women in a newspaper ad, how can you use it on a bathroom? And I know from talking to some of the people in the Human Rights that that is precisely where they're headed for.

They already have that in the United States, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to read from the November 1972 issue of the Phyllis Schlafly report again. "The equal rights amendment has already been passed by the U.S. Congress and ratified in 21 States. If it is ratified by 38 States it will become part of the United States Constitution." Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the direction that the government is going, and I know what the Human Rights, some of the Human Rights people want. I have already read some of the recommendations that have been given to the government the other day and, Mr. Speaker, that is a frightening prospect that a group of people, and a type of appointed body that all of us have been wanting like the Ombudsman, many of us have dreamt about it and prayed that one day we will have some type of a body or a person who we can go to to resolve our problems. We have the ombudsman, we have the Human Rights Commission, which should be turning around and giving people more rights, but in fact, Mr. Chairman, what it's doing is trampling and strangling the rights of individuals because they happen to have different beliefs, or they happen to want to operate in such a way that may not be in compliance with those rules. I am not so much condemning the Human Rights Commission as the government, who set out the legislation which they must be governed by.

Mr. Speaker, under the present legislation, I suppose all the diamond drilling crews up in the north -- you can't turn around and say that we want a diamond driller to live in some isolated tent all winter long on the basis of the present legislation. You're going to have to be able, you're going to be forced to hire a woman and send her up with the men up in the north. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that first of all it's not being done, which means that the law is being violated by the government itself with their own exploration crews; and Mr. Speaker, when they start enforcing that law it's going to mean chaos, particularly throughout the north where there are absolutely no facilities for women. And I am saying to the Attorney-General and I hope that he has enough ruddy brains to convince his colleagues to stop this idiotic madness, to stop trying to drag everybody down to a certain level and make everybody nobodies because a handful of liberationists or other kooks in society want everybody to be equal on their terms.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read of what is happening in other countries that have this so-called equal rights legislation. In an article in the March 1960 issue of Political Affairs, official Communist monthly, one of the speakers stated with pride of the new Soviet woman: "45 percent of industrial workers are women". Now that is really something to be proud of, and I know that -- they think that it's a great thing to give the women equality so they work in the steel mills in bush camps, in mining camps, digging ditches and construction camps, street sweeping and steel mills, garbage collecting, all the rest of it. Now that is really a wonderful, progressive mood to turn around and take the women out of the house and put them into the factories and street sweeping, and all the rest of it. They think they are really doing something great. Well, I suggest that those members who think it's so great should go and visit the Communist country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you. I visited Poland in '68 for the first time, Mr. Speaker, I've seen equality, and we have relatives there who have told me what equality means under that system. I have seen women on their knees with rubber pads on their knees and they were pouring asphalt, they don't have the sophisticated equipment for laying down asphalt, like we have in this country, so they simply dump the asphalt into wheelbarrows and with their hands, on their knees, they spread the thing. I've seen equality wherever I travelled in Poland, Mr. Speaker, and I've -- (Interjection) -- I wonder if rubber lips would keep quiet for a few minutes so I can turn around and continue my remarks here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read -- I would like to read from a clipping. I think it's the Tribune, and this is by a former model, Betty Jarboe who has four children and she is supposed to be against women's lib and I think that the members on the opposite side should ponder some of her remarks. She says: "We're all in favour of equal pay for women provided it also means equal work. If a woman wants to be a garbage collector, then let her, but if she gets the same wage as a man then let her make sure she loads just as many garbage cans into a truck as a man". And she ends up by saying: "We've had enough of those women stomping about in heavy shoes and men's shirts trying to humiliate and put down our men. It's all a lot of rubbish. Women's lib is ridiculous and takes away the dignity of womanhood." Mr. Speaker, I think that the members of the government should start paying attention to the wives and mothers in this province who also have a point of view, instead of listening to the -- well I guess I'd better be careful, Mr. Speaker, there's kids in the gallery and I don't want to corrupt them like the government is trying to corrupt them through their system.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, in telling those hysterical, half-baked, caricatures of reformers, that we don't want the legislation the anti-life and the anti-gods who are class values of theirs imposed on the majority of Manitobans. I want to tell those immoral dropouts that the result in our values will only inspire rebellion; and I want them to know that I will assist the opposition in sinking their garbage schooner, Utopia schooner in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I want to make a small contribution to this debate. I listened with some interest to the Honourable the Attorney-General when he was submitting his Estimates, and one of the things that surprised me very much was that he made no reference to the all-time high crime rate in the City of Winnipeg, and throughout the province for that matter. In fact he never mentioned the subject whatsoever, and he certainly didn't give us any information as to what the intentions of his department were towards curbing this problem to some degree. He didn't mention the intensified crime in this city that is a problem, that has been related to by the Chief of Police, nor did he give us any comment as to what is happening in the proposed school college that was talked of last year.

I was quite interested in the grants that he was giving to communities for police protection, over 500, and certainly I acknowledge with appreciation the \$8,000 that is being contributed to the Community of Minitonas; and I wondered how he came to that conclusion, because Benito is 25 miles from Swan River and is served by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Swan River. Minitonas is only some 10 miles away, and while as I said a moment ago I appreciate what is being done for Minitonas, I am at a loss to know why the Minister

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY - GENERAL

(MR. BILTON cont'd) did not consider some financial help to Benito.

And the same can be said for Bowsman, and the same again can be said for Mafeking which is considerable distance from Swan River.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could interrupt the honourable member for a moment to introduce 50 students from Crescentview School, Grade 9. The class is under the direction of Mr. King and Mr. Harrison. Oh, sorry.

I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 9 standing under the direction of Mr. King and Mr. Harrison. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

And we also have 15 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing of Waskada School under the direction of Mr. Slater, and this school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I bid you welcome to the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL Cont'd

MR. BILTON: For some time now, Mr. Speaker, I have brought before the Minister the problem of police work on our Indian reserves, and I have three in my constituency, and one of them, Pelican Rapids, has been a problem, and I know the Minister has taken some interest in that direction, and I'm just wondering what he has in mind for elsewhere throughout the province, because crime is on the increase in these areas, much as it is in all other areas. But many of these reserves are isolated and whilst they come under the jurisdiction of the RCMP that are around the province, many of them are quite a distance from the scene of -- at least the Mounted Police are quite a distance from these communities, and a good deal of time is taken up in carrying out their duty. It has always occurred to me that an Indian or Metis person given the proper authority could do a tremendous job and a well worthwhile job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with those few remarks, I do want to again thank the Minister for the contribution to Minitonas, and I hope in his reply he'll give me some reason why that something was not done for Benito, Bowsman and Mafeking in the same respect, because they too are in need of better police protection than they have been getting in the past. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I just have a few short remarks to make and I find myself somewhat at a disadvantage getting up and taking part in the debate with the Honourable Attorney-General since his academic standing is somewhat higher than mine. You know, Mr. Chairman, when the Attorney-General and I were boys, he of course had access to the University of Manitoba and I believe his boyhood and his education years were lived in Winnipeg, and he had the opportunity to go to the University of Manitoba, and to receive training and learning -- I shouldn't have used the term "training" but learning in the University of Manitoba which has brought forth to him a very high standing in the field of academic standing, whereas in rural Manitoba at that time, 200 miles from a university, from the City of Winnipeg, it was almost impossible for very many of us, particularly coming from large families as I do, to receive this type of education and to be able to get up and express ourselves in the House as the Attorney-General can. However, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that I was plugging it out on the farm, my father's farm, in order to keep up the economy of the province in order that people like the Attorney-General could receive their education, and I say that it is to the advantage to the province that we have people in such professions.

Along with the Member for Swan River, I want to congratulate him on the move to assist towns and municipalities in the field of the cost of policing, but I may say that I have some reservation insofar as cost of the policing in many of our areas, and I particularly refer to southwestern Manitoba where there is not that much need for policing because by and large

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. WATT cont'd) the people in the constituency that I represent are very law abiding people and do not take that much in the field of policing.

Mr. Chairman, in the question period a few days ago I directed a question to the Attorney-General in regard to regulations, I think new regulations, directed to the Legions and I understand to other areas where they have licensed premises, particularly in the area of parking space in these areas, and I believe the Minister's answer to me at that time was to the effect that it was general over the province, that there were -- that all licensing areas were being treated on a general basis. But I want to point out to the Minister that I have in mind some cases -- I don't think that it's necessary to name any particular town or village or area where there are these outlets -- that the orders that have gone out through the Chairman of the Liquor Commission Board have made it almost impossible for some of these clubs or Legions to comply with the rules and regulations that have been laid down by the Commission, and I naturally assume through the direction of the Attorney-General, and I would like a little clearer answer to my question in this respect than what I got in the House the other day. I think that's all I have to say on this at the moment, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like the opportunity from time to time for extending in answer and perhaps elaborating further in some of the areas where I touched very briefly in my opening remarks. First of all, perhaps I could deal with some of these contributions in reverse and if I run out of time perhaps we'll be able to deal with the other matters on other occasions.

I would like to respond to the Member from Arthur by indicating to him that I thought I made it quite clear that the information I had from the Liquor Control Commission was that pursuant to long-standing policy they do make requirements in respect to the provision of adequate parking area at licensed premises throughout the province. This is not something new, it's been something ongoing.

I know in the previous session your colleague on your right asked me questions about some requirements for parking at, I think a licensed premise at Minitonas, and I made inquiry into it and it wasn't anything unusual or anything too elaborate or too expensive, or out of the ordinary, that was being requested. These licensed premises, generally speaking, provide for a very good economic operation, and I'm in a position to say that because the Liquor Control Commission looks at the various licensed premises and considers their ability to be able to afford the kind of facilities that is demanded of them, because if they are not in a position, not in a viable economic position, they wouldn't make these requirements that otherwise would be made to bring them up to a standard which is considered desirable. So that is not a new policy, it's an ongoing one; it's not a blanket order going out, each licensed premise is dealt with on an individual basis.

Now the Honourable Member from Swan River has left the Chamber unfortunately, but I would like merely to indicate to him that his criticism that I didn't mention crime rates in Winnipeg or in Manitoba, in my opening remarks I think is rather unfair criticism. I indicated that I would deal with certain matters in my 30 minutes and would respectfully recognize that that would not give me sufficient time to deal with all matters in detail. And I would like to point out that the Honourable Member from Swan River had his fun with me and did want to interject and throw me off course from time to time, and that's fair game, but I don't think that he should be critical of the fact that I didn't cover every aspect of the operation of the Attorney-General's Department in the 30 minutes that I had, and I am concerned. I think every citizen in Manitoba and in Canada, in North America, is concerned with the changing way of life we see and the escalating of violation in society which has its final result in criminal activity, and we see this before our courts. No one is proud of this; we're all concerned about it, and that's one of the reasons that I did spend a little time in mentioning the work of the Manitoba Police Commission, because I am concerned that there be more effort in the area of public relations, in getting and enlisting the wholehearted co-operation of every citizen in society with the concerns for adequate law enforcement and the prevention of criminal activity.

Now, the Honourable Member from Swan River is not here and I will wait until a further occasion when I have the specifics at hand to refer to his concerns about why certain communities in his region and not others. But I can generally indicate to the House that this new program was based upon the existence of the patterns of enforcement and the patterns of

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) contractual obligation that had existed in the past, where communities did have an obligation in their area pursuant to their either being an incorporated community or having a population of 500 or more and falling into that category where they were obliged to engage police services. And it was on that basis this formula was devised, and I think the phasing in, the phasing in of municipal responsibility, community responsibility for policing, is a very fair one.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could just interrupt the Honourable Minister for just a moment, to draw the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 34 students of Grades 12 and 13 of the Fort Frances High School -- Fort Frances, Ontario, that is -- under the direction of Mr. Allison. This school is the guest of Mr. Speaker. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly, I bid you welcome.

. Continued on next page.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL Cont'd

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, since I indicated those words, I've received advice from my staff that the community of Benito already receives policing services at no cost to that community, through the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and we, the province as a whole, looks after the policing of that community. Now I'll deal with the other communities later when I have the specifics in respect to those.

I would now like to, but briefly, turn to the contribution of my former colleague and the Honourable Member from Thompson. I happen to be one of those who shares with the honourable member the concern for what appears to be a quickening of the erosion of moral standards in society. I view with dismay the apparent tolerance of greater and greater liberties in certain fields. I suppose that I could be considered a little more conservative than some in those respects, and I say conservative with a small "c". I'm one of those who -- (Interjection) -- Well I think I'm talking about something that is of fairly grave importance, and I appreciate levity in this Chamber but at the moment I would like to be serious with honourable members for just a few minutes.

I believe that laws are made for men and men aren't made for laws, and we in this Chamber and we in this country fashion laws to deal with the problems of men in society. Man comes together in society and develops laws to liberate him from fear in certain areas. There are certain in our society today, however, who want to attack all laws, who want to put a test to every restraint that exists in society and, you know, we as legislators have to recognize the right of individuals to continue to challenge and test laws which we have adopted, which we say are right. And that's a healthy thing, Mr. Chairman, that that testing should be ongoing, because we know, we know that the laws that we have made from year to year and from decade to decade do become stale, outmoded and irrelevant in our time. Through the system of the common law we have -- and legislative law -- we have the assurance that the law will be a living thing and will adjust to a changing society, but still, even with those mechanisms, even with those mechanisms we have seen fit to establish a Law Reform Commission, which again in turn is charged with the responsibility of looking at areas of the law that have become antiquated and are ripe for change. And thus we have seen even in this session, as I alluded to earlier, recommendations which I hope will be accepted, which will mean fundamental changes in individual rights in this province.

Now I shouldn't really repeat what I said earlier about that legislation, but I would like honourable members to recognize that for many many years women in society were considered chattels; they were considered to be completely bonded to their husband; all property that the wife had immediately became that of the husband. She had no individual rights, and it was only through very very vigorous protestation on the part of females in society that they became emancipated; that they established the right to vote. That didn't come easy, Mr. Chairman, and I think it's no tribute to men in society that that is a historical fact. It is also a historical fact that women were denied the right to own individual property in their own names, that they were considered, they were considered to be mere appendages to a man once they had accepted the bonds of matrimony.

And then we saw, through the course of history and the history of laws in this province, a gradual enrichment, a gradual strengthening of the individual rights of women with the passage of acts such as the Dower Act and the Family Testators Maintenance Act and so on. We have gradually broken down, broken down the former tradition of law that had made a virtual slave of a wife in matrimony. On the other hand, there have been historically cases where women had been used, had been used in the most menial, the most despicable forms of labour. Yes, you know, the barefoot woman in the field, the barefoot woman in the fields picking stones, gathering grain, working in the coal mines, pregnant women working in coal mines.

You know, we have seen vast improvements in our society. Women now also are demanding, demanding the right to be recognized as equal individuals, equal in their right to have a job opportunity, whether it be driving a truck, running a piece of farm equipment, doing any physical task which they consider is acceptable to them. There is a demand for an equal opportunity to work. There are women in society who prefer to work with their hands -- (Interjection) -- Well, the honourable member wants to keep alluding to things that to me are distasteful. He likes to parade those things and I don't. I just merely want to point out in this

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) House that there has to be, there has to be in our day a frank recognition of the fact that there are women who can do work, physical work, equally as well as men.

We have women who work in meat packing plants; we have women who drive trucks; we have women who drive farm tractors; we have women who do all manner of physical labour and do it well. We also have women who are now entering some of the, what otherwise had been the professions that had been dominated by men almost exclusively. We have more female lawyers, and I think that's a healthy thing and that's a tribute to women who are pressing ahead in getting equal educational opportunity and getting also an opportunity to participate as equals in any job opportunity which they can usefully and profitably contribute to. And I don't think the stereotype, the stereotype doctrinaire position that some members seem to have in respect to women in society is a healthy one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Thompson did allude to a concern that you can go too far in respect to the erosion of standards by wanting to forego all legal restraints in trying to establish greater rights. You know, there is a measure of truth in what the honourable member says because there is, as I've indicated, a concern -- and I think a healthy concern -- that if you take, if you take some of the agitation for the development of equal rights, in the way some people do, to their logical conclusion, you get a society that has no laws, that is chaotic. But that is not, that is not the intent of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission. That is not the intent of this government. The intent of this government is to provide a vehicle for redress, for redress of human rights restriction, of discrimination, discriminatory practice, whether it be in respect to a person because of race, creed or colour, or sex, and there have already been cases that have been established by the Human Rights Commission, and I could document a number, where there was no question but there was discrimination practised by individuals, by a corporation, even by -- in my opinion -- by a trade union, against a female because she was a female and -- (Interjection) -- Now I'm getting a contribution from the Honourable Member from Portage and I expect he'll have his opportunity, and I'll welcome that, but I would like to continue without some of those kind of interruptions.

The Human Rights Commission has been attacked for requesting that the newspapers run advertisements, not on the basis of male and female classification, but job opportunities. And believe me, that has had a significant effect, Mr. Chairman, because now it is possible for women to find employment in some places that were not open to them before and there hasn't been, as the honourable member suggests, a wave of criticism that has engulfed this Human Rights Commission in respect to that policy.

He refers to one instance, you know, about the woman who wants to hire, the woman who wants to hire a female babysitter. That's not prevented under our legislation. If the honourable member would read the act -- and he was concerned about the priesthood being taken over. I don't know what he was alluding to there, but the sections of the act are quite clear. If the honourable member would read the Human Rights Act rather than the documentation he was reading from the United States, he would come to appreciate the fact that our act is somewhat different than -- the things he's talking about is apparently his fear of the situation in the United States.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I think the Attorney-General is misquoting me. I did read the Equal Rights Acts from the United States but the cases that I cited are Manitoba, not American cases, and I don't care what he is saying to this House, I am telling him that these things are taking place and that government, through their legislation, is responsible for it, and he can't get out from under it by fluffing off the responsibility on the Human Rights Commission. It's his law.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order; it's a difference of opinion. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member really did not have a point of order but he made another contribution, I would disagree with him that the case that he refers to is such that there was an imposition involved. He says that a lady who wanted to hire a female babysitter was prevented from doing so. I suggest to him the mechanics of the Human Rights Commission and the operations of the Act makes every opportunity for any person who has a particular situation and they want to hire either a female or a male exclusively, for good reason, can do so. It's a very simple technique.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . the Attorney-General is misleading the House. The fact is the legislation prohibits the putting of an ad in the paper saying male or female, and he knows that. He continues to mislead the House by saying it's not true.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is rising on points of order which are not points of order. I pointed out, I pointed out -- (Interjection) -- Well now listen, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to accept further interjections on the part of the Member for Thompson. I am going to answer his argument and not his points of order.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. You are the Chairman and you will decide whether my point of order is proper or not, not the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I don't think that there's a point of order before the House. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, if anyone in society wants to hire a specific sex for good reason, for a particular job, then they can make application to the Human Rights Commission. It's a very simple technique and many many instances have already been handled where people in society, because of the particular vocation, the particular business that they have, want to engage females rather than males or vice versa, then there is no problem. Now, the honourable member continues to say that I mislead the House, but that is not misleading the House and if the honourable member would read the act -- and unfortunately it's not available for me to read the section -- Section 4(4), Section 4, subsection (4) -- outlines the areas of exception and certainly include all of the religious orders that my honourable friend is so concerned about.

I merely suggest to the honourable member that his criticisms are unfair and highly prejudiced because of a concern that he has for erosion of standards that is not attributable to the Human Rights Commission or to Human Rights legislation. He's concerned about areas of the law, areas of society such as violence in society, sex in society, and all of these things should not or ought not to be laid at the door of the workings of Human Rights Commissions whose concerns are to provide -- (Interjection) -- Well, here we are again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of order.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking the Attorney-General was getting up on a point of order and disturbing me. He is continuing to misrepresent me. I said 90 percent of the fault lies with the government not with the Human Rights Commission. I resent him trying to put on the record that I was blaming the Human Rights. I am blaming him and his bloody government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. That is not a point of order. That's an opinion that the honourable member has. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am becoming more tolerant of the honourable member's points of order and really, if he wants to argue all day, why we'll engage in an argument. I really don't care. It's up to the House as to how long we dialogue and I'm at the behest of the House, and I'm sure we can engage the Honourable Member for Thompson in lengthy dissertation about our differences of view. I want to indicate that this legislation was introduced in the House, it was debated, and it was agreed upon by the House. The operations of the Human Rights Commission have been done openly. They have been involved in a number of cases where there has been considerable publicity. I hope that some time before the House rises or prorogues to be able to present to the House a complete report on the progress of the Human Rights Commission, which has been drafted. It is not in final form, and I'm therefore not in the position to give it to honourable members, which will outline the scope of the activity of the Human Rights Commission. And I'm sure that when I get down to the item in the Budget, in the Estimates dealing with the Commission I will be able to elaborate even further.

I would like to now refer to the contributions of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek. I refer the honourable member to Section 4 of the Human Rights Act, subsection 4, for protection to, the exception for religious groups and others in society from the applications of the basic provisions of the Act.

And since I've been on my feet I again have had further information that Bowsman and Mafeking are both already policed entirely at the cost of the people of Manitoba. So the Honourable Member for Swan River's concerns have been completely covered in the past.

-- (Interjection) --

Ask a question? Surely.

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I thought that I had outlined to the Attorney-General that Mafeking, certainly it's paid for by the province; I fully understand that. Minitonas was getting the same protection from Swan River but they in turn are receiving an \$8,000 grant called "Local Police Protection on the Spot". Mafeking does not have that, nor does Bowsman. They are served by the Mounted Police that are stationed in Swan River, this is the only thing. I hope I've made that clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, I'm sure, excuse me, that I will be able to confirm the criteria on the basis of which Minitonas has been engaging their own police services prior to this year and Mafeking and Bowsman were not. Now it was on the basis of who was providing for their own police services that this system was introduced.

In respect to the concerns of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek he was concerned to have further elaboration of the rationale, or the concerns that some have in respect to the timing of certain charges that were taken before the courts with respect to certain personnel, and he named them, Messrs. Kasser and Reiser, and there were others in respect to The Pas Forestry Complex. Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that during the course of The Pas Forestry Commission's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. MACKLING: . . . during the course of their inquiries and their investigations it came to the attention of the Crown that there was clear evidence that there was circumstance that indicated that there was public wrongdoing on the part, or I should maybe not use the word public wrongdoing, but use the word criminal wrongdoing on the part of some, in addition to the fact that there was probably other concerns as well in respect to the matters under investigation. So it was that the Crown engaged outside counsel, that is outside of the Attorney-General's department itself, for the particular task of following certain lines of evidence that had come forward and specializing in a review of that kind of evidence to consider what charges, if any, might be later imposed. And during the course of those investigations there was a clear evidence that further information would be available, that on the basis of what information was available it would be in order to lay certain charges, and they were laid, and then as a result of further investigative measures taken, with the assistance of the courts through search warrants, further information, rather, massive information was obtained, which was then studied at great length and thus it became possible to formulate a series of recommendations for charges to the Attorney-General's department.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that it is with some hesitation that I want to talk at any length at all about this matter because there's no question but that the charges involved, people who are not resident in this country, we are concerned not to give overpublicity to the aspect of the case, because of course the persons involved will want to raise the argument that there has been so much publicity to this matter, and so on, that they would question the fairness of any trial that they would receive. So I have been more than somewhat hesitant to go into detail about these matters and have purposely generalized in my remarks in respect to them.

But let me assure honourable members that when considering charges for persons non-resident, and considering the basis of extradition applications, that we want to be extremely careful to have covered every conceivable charge that we want to make and to make sure that the case and the basis for the applications is the best because, you know, if we were to proceed in haste and in error, then we would be more heavily criticized for it.

So I trust that that gives without going into unnecessary detail the kind of assurance that the honourable members want. There has never been any hesitation on the part of the government in making all arrangements that legal counsel have requested, outside legal counsel have requested, in respect to further investigations and further steps that were necessary to be taken to perfect the work that is necessary to proceed with those prosecutions. All steps were taken on the advice of counsel, both in timing and otherwise, and the matter that was referred to in Court were recommendations that had been received by my office merely ten days before and they were, they involved very complex and numerous matters for recommendation for prosecution.

Now, in respect to the concern of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek in respect

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) to the resignation of one of the staff members of the Human Rights Commission, I think that the all of the circumstances have been articulated, not in this House I admit, but I've indicated outside of this House that I didn't really want to go into all of the rationale, the argument for why the Human Rights Commission as a body had made the, had come to the conclusion that it would be in the interests of the Human Rights Commission and all concerned including Mr. Berry, the person involved, that he left the services of the Commission. A decision was reached by the Commission. There may have been some misunderstanding on some part of the commissioners as to the timing of that withdrawal of services and exactly how that withdrawal was to take place, and that may have led to some misunderstandings on the part of some, particularly in the media. But there was no question but the Human Rights Commission had satisfied itself and it communicated that decision to me that Mr. Berry's services were no longer desired and I met with him; I had a frank discussion with him about that, and without any great protestation, without any great equivocation of any kind, and it was a very fair and reasonable and frank meeting, he tendered his resignation, and that's the long and short of that. I say there was some misunderstandings about it, but not on the part of the Commission, on the part of some who misunderstood because they had asked individual members of the Commission, well how did this come about, or what was their recollection, and so on? I have met with members of the Commission; the Chairman made a statement to the public indicating and confirming what I have said, and there is no misunderstanding about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Minister's time allotted has expired.

MR. MACKLING: All right I'll . . .

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I propose to ignore many of the specifics in the department at this stage of my contribution and intend to be as broad as possible in my comments on the Estimates of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Chairman, I say that with the training of one who has the highest regard, perhaps the highest of all regards, for the office of Attorney-General because of my own background in training in the law, and while some of the observations I may make may transcend the Attorney-General's legal department, nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I direct, and I regret that other members of the front bench of the government aren't here, and I hope they will take into consideration the comments I'm about to make. But I look to the Attorney-General as the Chief Law Officer of this province to be the guardian, the safeguard for all people in this province, to make sure the law works for them, to make sure that government is the servant, not the master, that the courts, that the police, that the entire framework within which our society is bounded is one which serves the individual in society.

Mr. Chairman, we debate these Estimates at a time when the very institutions, the very fabric of the free society, the democratic system, is under attack, is challenged, and at a time when large segments of our population have become remote, become alienated from the mainstream and have in many ways lost respect for the institutions by which we govern ourselves and by which we live. And, Mr. Chairman, I regard that, as I am sure my honourable friend the Attorney-General does, as a very serious kind of happening within a community.

Our youth alienation stems in no small part from a loss of respect, a growing loss of respect for the institution, and when those institutions, whether they be political, the law making process, the law implementation process, the courts, the law interpretation process, lose the confidence, or that confidence is threatened or jeopardized, then it's time that society must renew the questioning of those institutions and not be afraid to re-examine the current validity of them. And so, Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks, but certainly not new to me as an individual, I've spoken of an open society, a more individually oriented society -- we call it the incentive society; we call it the individual initiative society. The cornerstone of that society must be the reform, the major reform of the institutions of law. The law by which we live, the law-making process by which we decide the rights and the obligations of individuals. And I regard the function of the Attorney-General to not only protect but to expand the individual's freedom, the individual's access to the process, the individual's right to participate meaningfully. Now I would be most remiss if in these observations I didn't sincerely compliment the Minister for some very major progress that's been made whether it be Ombudsman or the Rentalsman or the Consumer Bureau, we have made considerable yards in these past few years

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. ASPER cont'd) but not fast enough. And, Mr. Chairman, I can't comment on the Ombudsman without also saying that it's a matter of some regret to me that the Ombudsman's role, his authority, his power to really achieve redress, has not been broadened in a much more enlightened fashion, and I would urge the Attorney-General to consider in coming legislation the enhancing, the improvement and the increasing of the power of the man who speaks to and for the people, the Ombudsman, to have total access with no restraint of investigatory powers.

Mr. Chairman, the cornerstone of the open society, or the incentive of the individual oriented society, that I spoke of is a Bill of Rights. Now this has been introduced twice by the Liberal caucus in this Chamber, and on both occasions no support from the government bench. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of deep regret that the Attorney-General has after four years not produced a Bill of Rights, and I recognize that there was a vague reference in the Speech from the Throne to a study on a Bill of Rights. And, Mr. Chairman, one can only conclude that the reformers have become reactionaries. The zeal for change, the thrust for improvement in the human condition, which is a phrase the First Minister so dearly loves, has been blunted. We presented to this Chamber a proposed Bill of Rights. We conceded when we presented it that it was a draft, that it was a talking bill, a point to begin the dialogue, and we have had no support. And I again urge the Attorney-General not to study the concept of a Bill of Rights but to recognize that individuals in this society are being, to use the vernacular, hassled. We are living more and more in a computerized society, a dehumanized society. We have created -- when I say we I don't mean the New Democratic Party, I mean governments at all levels -- massive bureaucracies which struck, which intimidate, which choke the individual from approaching government from feeling that the dice are not loaded against them, because they are loaded, Mr. Chairman. No one can fight city hall, and city hall is there to serve us, and I use that only in the colloquial sense.

Mr. Chairman, when I say we have created a new title elite, something that even feudalism didn't know, I speak of the licensed few. We are moving in this society to a point where freedom of choice; freedom of action, freedom of option, freedom of career is licensed by governments. Now, Mr. Chairman, once you adopt licensing and it becomes cancerous, it becomes rampant, you get to the stage in society where one needs a permit, a license, an approval, from some government regulatory board for the most common, the most ordinary, the most natural act. The extension of licensing not only inhibits freedom but creates a new power that was never conceived of when licensing originally came in. I'm speaking of the power to grant or not grant licenses, because we now have boards, hundreds of boards which have discretionary power.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the statistics really are but one research piece I've seen suggests that in the past 25 years since the end of the war the population of this province has grown by 23 percent but in the same period it's been suggested by this one research piece, done by a lawyer, that the bureaucracy, the boards, the tribunals, the commissions, the regulatory agencies, that dominate our lives have mushroomed not by 23 percent but by 1147 percent -- I don't know if this statistic is reliable but we know when we look around how much more interference, how much more licensing. We now have people who get licenses and people who don't get licenses when they apply. As a result a market has been established, the sale of licenses. Now, Mr. Chairman, I spoke of feudalism, that's precisely what happened in feudalism. People sold their earldoms, their titles, their lordships, and this is what's happened. Now some progress, very modest progress, has been made in stopping the sale of licenses, for example in the taxi board I believe the government has made considerable progress in preventing the marketing of licenses. But it still exists in so many other areas of the province, and there's only one solution and that is to eliminate or to curtail the discretionary power of boards, commissions and governments, to grant or not grant licenses. The right to produce milk, the right to drive a truck, should be a right, not a privilege, not something that a government licenses. And I don't wish to spend my entire contribution on that one point, Mr. Chairman, but it is a matter of deep concern, where you have an absence of a Bill of Rights, a bill that says you have the right to work, you have the right to ply your trade, the right to choose your career -- that's what a Bill of Rights would do, and a Bill of Rights would end discretionary licensing, because there is no cause any longer in this society to say, "You, Mr. X, will get a license to run a restaurant; you, Mr. Y, will not get a license to run a

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. ASPER cont'd) restaurant." The only control and regulation by government in that minor area, I suggest, is that if the Health laws are observed, if the government regulations as to safety and standards are observed, the license is automatic, not discretionary.

We will perhaps in later debates in this Chamber, perhaps in future years, Mr. Chairman, debate the question of why the government sells liquor. Why is the government the sole marketing agency? The whole question of what the government should be doing ought to be reviewed at this time when so many people, students, young people, are alienated from the process because they've lost respect -- respect for our goals, respect for our institutions. And one example is the Human Rights Commission.

The Human Rights Commission, set up with all the promise in the world, Mr. Chairman, a promise which I must say has been unfulfilled, has been emasculated by the government. The Human Rights Commission, the chance to really broaden the process, to have a forum where any man, woman or citizen of this community could come and seek redress when harassed, or when that person feels his rights have been abrogated or limited by government, primarily by government. That forum has been denied. The Human Rights Commission has not fitted that particular need. And there's only one solution, Mr. Chairman, and we propose it, we urge it upon the Attorney-General, that the Human Rights Commission become the ombudsman in session, in effect. By that I mean, Mr. Chairman, the Human Rights Commission must be removed from direct control of government. Because, Mr. Chairman, who is it who is most often accused successfully of violating, of pressing human rights? It is government. And to have a Human Rights Commission which is not independent of government is a facade, it's a charade, and that's why, Mr. Chairman, we urge, we appeal to the Attorney-General to give consideration to bringing in legislation at this session to free the Human Rights Commission from direct control by government, and to make the Human Rights Commission directly responsible to the Legislative Assembly, because it is a precious, a fundamental, a vital commodity, a vital sector of what the fabric of our democracy's about.

Mr. Chairman, while we speak of broadening human rights, I again commend this government for some of the steps taken to equalize the rights of women in this society and to make certain that the equal pay standard is applied. But, Mr. Chairman, this government has failed -- and we appeal to the Attorney-General as the chief law officer -- to clearly and closely investigate the whole subject as to whether or not it's working, because it does not appear to be working well. We have laws on our books designed to improve upward mobility of women, encourage women into the labour force, and to make certain that their rights as people in the work force are not discriminated against by virtue of sex. How well is it working? Not nearly as well as it ought to. Who is one of the offenders? Government. And we suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Attorney-General could make a lasting contribution to the advancement of women by setting goals, by setting targets within the government service, 10,000 - some jobs within the government service - major portion, a significant portion of the work force of Manitoba of some 400,000 - by saying - and we will stand, Mr. Chairman, and salute the Attorney-General if in his response he will make a commitment that the Department of Labour, that the Government of Manitoba, will set standards, targets, yardsticks and dates - that the Women's Bureau will be called on to supervise in the labour force the upward mobility of women and that government will set the example by saying that in government service this will occur, and it will occur by these dates and in these numbers.

We urge the Attorney-General, if he cares about an individual, initiative, incentive society, to extend the concept of legal aid to a much broader section of civil suits not now covered. The right of the individual we say, is to approach his government, but can he afford the legal costs? And so the civil aid, the legal aid must be extended to cover appearances before regulatory bodies, tribunals, commissions, license-granting organizations, so that the individual is not denied his access by lack of legal counsel or legal advice or legal representation, or the skill of advocacy that comes with it, and that would include appearances before legislative committees. And, Mr. Chairman, if the Attorney-General will say these things, we will salute him as an enlightened, as a progressive, as a man committed, as I understand his party is committed, to the advancement of the rights of individuals.

The Attorney-General of this province, Mr. Chairman, has the most magnificent opportunity ever handed to one man, to reform our institutions, to change those things in our society which harness us to an obsolete past, and it's a matter of some sadness, because I've known

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. ASPER cont'd) the Attorney-General personally for many years, that either he has been unwilling or unable to persuade his colleagues to take these steps forward.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, in outlining what kind of open society we Liberals seek, we spoke of a mandatory full disclosure of the investments, real estate, the holdings, the financial transactions of all members of government who have access to inside information. Mr. Chairman, that doesn't necessarily apply to the secretaries in offices or to members of the Opposition who don't have access to government information, but today, Mr. Chairman, the government, primarily the Cabinet, the Executive Assistants to the Cabinet, the Secretaries to the Cabinet, and various other members, have access to information which is profoundly important in terms of profit-making. For example, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. We heard a very ugly incident a few days ago, today too, the allegations relative to the Manitoba Farm Loan situation. All of these things have cast the political process, and those of us who perform in it, in a shadow. The public really believes - and this is the staggering thing and dangerous thing - the public really believes that politicians are crooks. They really do.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of grief to those of us, those honourable - and I mean honourable - members who have given up their families, given up their friends, given up their privacy to serve the public, that we are thought of as people on the take, people who will profiteer from our public office, and only through full disclosure, Mr. Chairman, only through a bill that will make it mandatory for all of us, if necessary -- if that's what's necessary let's all undress. But let us all be prepared for full disclosure. And should the Attorney-General be prepared at this session to bring in the kind of legislation that will both protect the privacy of those individuals where they're entitled to that kind of protection, but also make absolutely certain that wrongdoing will be detected and that not only will justice appear to be done, it will in fact be done, he will be remembered by this House, by this society, for a monumentally important step forward.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Would you submit to a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: As the Leader of the Liberal Party is referring to the disclosure of members of the Legislature, I was wondering if he would encourage the Member for Assiniboia, who is in his party, to complete his review of my bill for the disclosure of interest so that I could introduce it for first reading.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I have just this morning been given the honourable member's bill to read and I will read it and comment on it later. The honourable member's bill - proposed bill - arises or is complementary to the statement that the Liberal Party made, that we will in this session bring in a resolution calling for full disclosure of the investments and financial dealings. But, Mr. Chairman, the key to that kind of legislation is not the wanton invasion of privacy. For example, we saw yesterday in the House a very very insidious kind of thing. We saw a member of the back bench stand and ask a question which was designed to disclose the personal affairs of a member of this Chamber as though there was some impropriety. Now there was no impropriety alleged, but the veiled allusion was enough to warrant the kind of disclosure legislation that I think is urgent.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this Chamber tried to broaden the political process. The Liberal Party has twice now introduced legislation which we call the "free vote legislation." We urge the Attorney-General to reconsider his position because, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult enough to attract people into public life - quality people - but one of the things that is the most disincentive-oriented in our law is the rubber stamp voting system, the tradition, the great tradition that is so outdated, that calls for party solidarity. Mr. Chairman, when I became the Leader of the Liberal Party, the first step I took was to free the vote in my party. The kind of amendment that we seek to the Legislative Assembly Act is not to destroy responsible government, but simply to permit members to vote as directed by their conscience, their intellect, or by the members of their constituency, regardless of whether that requires them to cross party lines. The tradition has grown that prevents that. The government whips the House, the Premier is capable of threatening the House with dissolution, simply by the defeat of his own legislation, and as a result we have a system which is anachronistic and archaic.

We call, Mr. Chairman, for legislation from the Attorney-General that will bring modern democracy into line with reality, and by that I refer to the call for public hearings on

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. ASPER cont'd) all significant and major steps by government. Now, Mr. Chairman, years ago that legislation wasn't needed because everything went through this Chamber. The vast majority of the law-making process occurred in this Chamber and if it didn't occur in this Chamber it occurred through committee, to which the public had access, but the change in direction, the very dangerous change that we now have law by regulation, government by regulation, government by Order-in-Council, the vast majority of the day-to-day laws by which we're governed do not pass through this Chamber. And so, Mr. Chairman, the answer to this is to, as several Royal Commissions have recommended - I recall most forcibly the Carter Commission on Tax Reform, with which the New Democratic Party was in full sentiment, breaking new historical ground by saying even a change in the regulation of the tax law, the tax law itself, which is historically denied access to the public, be opened up and public hearings be available on every change in law, every change in regulation.

We have a situation, and I don't intend to dwell on it because I have in the past, where a government has passed a law which enables the Government of Manitoba in effect to, in Cabinet, grant a license to a government body - Hydro - to flood 100 percent of Manitoba without ever holding public hearings, and that's a ludicrous extension but that is the law today, Mr. Chairman. And for that reason I am sure there will be great sentiment, great support in this House for the concept of public hearings of all major, significant and long term and costly government programs, and I believe that legislation is easily drafted.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a step toward opening the process if we passed a law, and the Attorney-General should be the proposer of that law, requiring the details of every bill that goes through this House, to be published not less than two weeks in advance of the first date of debate. Mr. Chairman, we've seen examples in this Chamber when in the dying moments as we go into speed-up, massive pieces of legislation, vitally important pieces of legislation are thrust on the already full desks of the members of this Chamber and they're called upon to debate within moments

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, anyone reading a statute, even over a period of a week, a legalistic document, has great difficulty understanding it even if he's trained in the law. But in spite of that, the government proceeds annually to dump legislation through this House that is ill-considered, not well read, not well understood because of the rush, and so we call for legislation which would give the Opposition, particularly, the time required to seek advice on legislation, the time required to seek the opinions of constituents, and the time required through such legislation to advertise the existence of that legislation. And the proposal we make, Mr. Chairman, is that no bill be permitted for debate unless it has been published and explained in the newspapers that communicate with this province and the other media for at least two weeks, so that those members of the public who may be interested would have real access to the hearings that normally take place on most legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no more important piece of legislation that the Attorney-General should bring forward at this session than what we called last year and the year before, anti-patronage legislation. I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that the public regards the political process with some scorn and regards those who participate in it with some suspicion. One of the ways, one of the most important contributions we can make to rectifying that in the main unwarranted disrespect for the law and the process, is to pass what other jurisdictions have passed and called anti-patronage legislation. You'll never cure patronage nor is patronage necessarily all bad. But, Mr. Chairman, if it is suspected, if it is believed widely, as I believe it is in this province, that there is pork-barrelling, and I don't accuse the New Democratic Party any more than I accuse the Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, but, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I hear one of the back-benchers from the government side say that the Liberal Party invented it. Mr. Chairman, that's the kind of partisanship that will never lead us to any kind of meaningful debate because it follows the rule that if it comes from this side of the House, that side must show its disagreement. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, anti-patronage -- (Interjection) -- I've been asked to identify the member to whom I refer; I'm speaking of the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose.

Mr. Chairman, we called for legislation, and it doesn't matter if we have the hoots and howls from the opposite side of this House, from the government, because I promise you that should we form a government at some point in the future we will introduce anti-patronage

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . legislation. We commit ourselves publicly to introducing anti-patronage legislation, which simply calls for all significant, all government contracts, all government appointments of significance of a major type, to go before a committee of the Legislature, so that no government will have the gall, the temerity to try to slide through unqualified appointments, whether they're to boards, tribunal commissions, whether they're in engagements, whether they're in the contract planning, and that is incentive to use the government power of secrecy to reward people who are otherwise not qualified but are politically acceptable, would banish or at least would be diminished in considerable amount.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard the New Democratic Party promise in its policy platform an independent Speaker for this House. This is, Mr. Chairman, a concept that the open society, that the legislative process requires, and we even believe we heard in the first Speech from the Throne from this government some reference to the concept of an independent Speaker. In the last few days, the Speaker in this Legislature has been under considerable barrage, some accusation of lack of impartiality. Mr. Chairman, that is a very serious allegation. It can only be stopped by making the man in that Chair totally free of political interference, totally free of inhibitions because of past Party loyalty or continuing requirement of Party support, and I say to the Attorney-General that should he introduce such legislation he will have our unqualified support.

Mr. Chairman, we come to a very serious law reform that the Attorney-General should have brought in in these past four years. I refer to the public financing of election expense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The time allotted to the honourable member has expired. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, before we get into a debate between attorneys, I'd like as a backbencher in this government and therefore partly responsible for the decisions it takes because of the nature of things, I'd like to respond in my thinking on a couple of points that have been referred to by members of the opposition, and especially with reference to the human rights' aspect of this debate.

Without knowing personally the chap that was involved in bringing forth the Human Rights Commission to the present point in time, one of the difficulties in developing new concepts is the fact that when you get very good people sometimes they get a little over-anxious. It's comparable in my mind to a good race horse. You can take a good race horse and give him to a trainer, but if the horse develops the habit of getting the bit in his teeth, it's pretty hard to break it. You can break it; you can put a Spanish bit in which will hurt the horse so much that it'll turn the bit loose, but as far as top performance is concerned the horse never really gets over it, it never really develops to its full potential. And this is one of the difficulties in establishing new commissions or new systems of delivering services for people, that if you get topnotch people that get over-anxious, sometimes they contribute to the destruction of the thing rather than the growth of it.

In recalling to mind a particular time that this took place, I remember that there was a case before the courts that perhaps there were some weaknesses in the law that we had passed in this House, all of us, that if I had been in this comparable position I think I would have tried to do the best job I could under the circumstances, but nevertheless I would have backed off a little until such time as that court case had been resolved. This wasn't the procedure followed so in my view I don't think that the Attorney-General had any other alternative but to accept the resignation.

I would just like to comment briefly on the points made by my friend the Member for Thompson, and of course when he casts his aspersion at us in general I am included in that generality, and he calls me a sodomist. The quality of the debate in the House over the last four years I will have to admit has deteriorated, and I had hoped when the newest member in the House came in and he got up and told us how bad the debate was and he was going to make a contribution to the raising of the level of the debate, he has done nothing himself but help to deteriorate it.

But my friend from Thompson was rightly chagrined. If I was in a comparable position I would have been also, in what had transpired with his tactic in trying to agree with what he thinks is a wrong direction in society. Personally, I am inclined to agree with the Member for Thompson. Fundamentally, emotionally, morally, I am opposed to abortion, but nevertheless as a member of this government bench, when the government takes a decision I become party to that so I have to bear the chagrin of my friend.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General in our province, as the Member from Wolsley points out, at least he knows something about our legal process, he says he is the officer

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) in our province responsible for the enforcement of the criminal law under our system of justice. I can think of no more complicated case facing the legal profession, the total legal system, in the whole country of Canada than the problems related to the Churchill Forest Industry. One could call it a bawl-up or something, you could come up with a nice word I suppose, but I would hazard the opinion as a lay person it'll probably keep one whole generation of attorneys busy trying to resolve it.

As far as criminal law is concerned, I think that it is irresponsible on the part of an officer of the court, and I don't think that any member of the Bar Association can remove his hat when he steps in this Chamber, but I think that it is irresponsible for a member of the Bar Association, who is an officer of the court, to chastise the Attorney-General, be he who he may be at that time, for exercising the judgment that we place on his shoulders. In this particular case, as a lay person I will admit, but as a lay person who has been involved with this complex for the last four years, the evidence, rules of evidence, rules of law, rules of equity, foreign law, jurisdiction, jurisprudence, all the things that enter into it that are in the mind of my colleague, the Attorney-General, I trust his judgment, and I think that he moves in the enforcement of criminal law in the interests of all Manitobans in this case and in all cases.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reporters that is assigned to our Assembly wrote rather facetiously the roles that we should play in this Chamber. In fact I think at one time he appointed me as Minister in charge of persecution of religious minorities or something, but he said that, you know, a person at this level should respond to somebody, so he put me in a category that I should never debate issues with the illustrious Leader of the Liberal Party. But seriously, since the Member for Wolseley has joined us I have been at a loss. I have been at a loss to follow his approach to problems. Before he joined us in the House, I thought that what was reported in the paper may have been in error; that his apparent attitude towards the law of contract was perhaps badly reported at best but misinterpreted at worst; that he would, if he became by some very very strange turn of events, the leader of the government in this particular province, he would totally ignore the laws of contract.

But as the member spoke, I find out, at least in my opinion, that his knowledge of law is all questionable. He may have graduated from the best law school with the highest marks, magna cum laude, but as a citizen of this province he knows nothing about law. He knows nothing about tortes, he knows nothing about common law. he knows nothing about equity in law, he knows nothing about cases of mixed fact in law; and he goes on and on, demonstrating his lack of knowledge of law. Laws are passed by people like my friend from Roblin and myself, not by lawyers and law schools.

To prove my point, I would like you to look at what the member just contributed to this debate. He makes reference to a Bill of Rights. Some of you may have seen this document. It is prefaced, and if you will look, it says: "I, I, I, I, I, I, I". It does not say "we", it does not say "the Liberal Party", it says "I". Now, some lawyers suffer from what I call the legal mind syndrome. They think that they in fact become the law. Mr. Chairman, I got news for them. This establishment, as far as the people of the Province of Manitoba, is the law.

But in this Bill of Rights, he chastises the government, he chastises the government for extending license. Pause and think for just one moment on the concept of extension of license. A license is permission to act. If you have not got permission to act, you do not act. With reference to a Bill of Rights, if something is not defined in a Bill of Rights, you have no right, and of course this is the dilemma, that people who are responsible for writing law, not the people who irresponsibly run around through the Province of Manitoba distorting facts and distorting the fundamental concept of British justice that we're surrounded in this Chamber with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Is the honourable member aware, having used the term "British justice" that the British justice and the British system is founded on a Bill of Rights and that the Government of Canada has enacted a Bill of Rights as well?

MR. BOYCE: Of course I am, Mr. Chairman. Of course I am. Of course I am. I will also read -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I would chide the Member for Wolseley for speaking from his seat but I think I have been guilty of that on occasion myself. I will deal with his point in a moment. But a Bill of Rights is an absolute extension of license, an absolute extension of license. In three minutes I can't go back to how we got into this mess in the first place, and of course I've been trying for four years to kind of bring this thing forth, and it's

SUPPLY - ATTORNEY-GENERAL

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . a principle that I tried to bring before my colleagues with my Communal Colony Property Act, that in some instances the courts have got away from the very concept of discharging equity under our present system. But this is what we're talking about.

The member is quite right when he says that our institutions are being pressured. They're being pressured to discharge their responsibilities, and I'm sorry to say that many of the citizenry, including this layman, have looked to the courts as part of our system of justice for doing equity. Now if people will recall, the point I tried to make at that time, we have a Supreme Court, we have a Supreme Court which in this particular case four of the seven justices said, in various ways in my opinion, that this was an inequitable, inequitable decision. According to the laws of contract, all the rest of the points in law that the case prevail, and if you want to go back and read these judgments you'll find that my opinion is well founded, that in their opinion equity was not done. They said that equity should be done by the Legislature, the Province of Manitoba, in two opinions that were in that particular case. And I don't want to open up that can of worms again, but in my opinion the courts erred. That's their responsibility to discharge equity, not mine.

McCreer -- I hope my friend, he asked me if I would read it. I try to read enough. I don't come into this House and speak as a teacher. If I wanted to get advice as a member of this Legislature on teaching I'd go out and ask a teacher, and I wish he would act the same way when he comes in here and speaks in solemn tones as a Member of this Bar Association. He's trying to speak to us, has tried to speak to us ever since he got in here as a lawyer, and I personally resent it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 12:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.