

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 7, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 32 students, Grade 11 standing, of the Pierre Radisson School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Stenchuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

We have 30 students of Grade 1 standing - Oh, I'm sorry - Level 1 standing of the Red River Community College, an Economics Class. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Pothier. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

We also have 11 students, Grade 7, 8, and 9 standing of the Brooklands Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Morrone. This school is also located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

And we have 26 students, Grade 5 standing of the Victory School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Wilder and Miss Slipitz. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Health and Social Development.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present this as their first report.

Your Committee met on Thursday, March 7, 1974 and appointed Mr. Shafransky as Chairman.

Your Committee has examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1973.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from the officials of the Manitoba Telephone System and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the Annual Report and the business of the Manitoba Telephone System. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health, the Minister in charge of Housing. Some time ago I asked him a question about the relationship between the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation and The Pas Metis Development Corporation. I wonder if he's in a position to answer the question in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I've made inquiries from the department on that; I haven't had a reply. I'll chase it up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

CORRECTION - VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

MR. EDWARD McGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege I wonder if I might have leave of the House to make a correction in a written question submitted in Votes and Proceedings No. 24. In the first line of the questions it reads: How many persons are employed by the Department of Education, that should read: the Department of Colleges and Universities Affairs. I wonder if I would have leave to make that correction.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. I.H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): My question's to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Is he now in a position today in view of statements he made to the media yesterday to confirm to the House how much more than the \$600,000 that was shown in the MDC report has been advanced to William Clare (Manitoba). Basically the question is: Does the additional \$650,000 referred to in the Manitoba Gazette of October 27th refer to additional loans, making a total of \$1,250,000, and if that's the case, would he please explain what has been done with the money in the company which has found it necessary to close its doors and have a part-time girl answer the phone.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I indicate that I have no objection to members asking questions but I believe one of the procedures is that a question, oral or written, should not contain an expression of opinion, and that's what makes it fall into the category of becoming argumentative. If members would create questions which are terse and to the point it would help the Chair very much.

The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I regret that the question is so phrased as to indicate that certain things have happened which did not happen. The honourable member starts his question by saying, in view of statements that I made to the media yesterday. Mr. Speaker, a member of the media asked me where he could get the information relative to advances made to a corporation, where it was publicly reported. I took him to the library; with a secretary there they tried to find the information; I came back a few minutes later and helped them find the information and pointed out the portion of the Manitoba Gazette where the additional loan was referred to. The honourable member asks whether this is additional money. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he read the Gazette because the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the amounts up to March 31st are reported in the statement of the Manitoba Development Corporation; amounts after March 31st would be found in reports from the Gazette, unless the period of reporting has not yet arrived.

With regard to what was done with the money and the closing of doors, I am not aware as to the physical status of the door before the advancement of the money or after the advancement of the money. I am aware that the Manitoba Development Corporation in approximately July or August of 1973 recommended that the further advance of \$650,000 was the most logical way of attempting to recover the moneys that had been previously advanced to this publisher. And on that basis, given their judgments and the consent thereto of the government, they proceeded to make the additional advances.

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

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Will he confirm that in the period following the report of the MDC and the advancing of the additional \$625,000 or concurrent therewith, the public of Manitoba through the MDC became the owner of 80 percent of William Clare (Manitoba) Limited?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I answered yesterday that in the additional financing that the Board of Directors of the Fund recommended and proceeded to act in the best free enterprise tradition of putting themselves in as favorable position as they could with respect to that advance. I am not able to say at this moment the exact percentage but I believe that they took greater equity in the company since they were taking a much greater share of the risk than is normal.

MR. ASPER: Will the Minister confirm to the House or indicate whether he has been advised by Mr. William Clare of Vancouver, the President of the Company, that the company does not expect to show any profit before 1981, seven years from now?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have not been so advised by Mr. Clare but I am aware that the nature of the relationship between the fund and the company is such that Rand McNally, being a major publishing house in the United States, is using the material published by this publisher which will then result in a royalty to William Clare which the Manitoba Government will be a recipient, and that in the judgment of the board of directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation, whose judgement I have come to respect far more than I respect the judgment of the Leader of the Liberal Party, that was the most satisfactory way of protecting the interests of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Co-operative Development, I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether there has been any fraudulent or misuse of Government of Manitoba funds or Federal Government funds by any fishing co-operative in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I have not determined that there has or has not been. When I do I will advise the honourable member.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister - present another question to the Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether there has been meetings of his department with the head of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board or Corporation, its officials, with the Department of Indian Affairs, dealing with allegations of mismanagement and incompetence by the Department of Co-operative Development in its assistance and supervision of fishing co-operatives in northern Manitoba?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member alleges mismanagement in a number of co-operatives or one or more and, Mr. Speaker, that is quite possible. That is a situation which can arise at any time, and of course does from time to time. We have had a great deal of experience departmentally in trying to deal with these new co-operatives who, by the way, have no way of knowing how to begin to operate as a corporate body. So it wouldn't be surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, if there were problems. That's something that we have had from day one, and I'm sure members opposite had to deal with those problems when they were the government. So, you know, I'm not sure the extent of the problem. I'm sure there are problems.

MR. SPIVAK: Another question to the Minister. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether he has received a report of a meeting held on September 1st of 1973 between the offices of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board and the Department of Indian Affairs and the Department of Co-operative Development, dealing with charges and accusations of mismanagement and incompetence in connection with the operation of the Southern Indian Lake Co-operative, fishing co-operative.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that I have received any official report from anyone because no one was commissioned to bring a report to me.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister. I wonder if he can indicate, whether any officials of his department brought to his attention allegations that advances that were forwarded to one fishing co-operative were solicited fraudulently by members of his own department?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if that were the case then obviously I think it would depend on the findings of a court as to whether any fraudulent practices occurred, and I don't believe that I could at all suggest to members opposite that someone, either in the department or as a board member of any co-operative, acted in that way because that would be a most serious allegation.

MR. SPIVAK: The question put to the Minister was whether any one had brought allegations to him concerning a suggestion of fraudulently being involved in the misuse of money. Now the question to him is, did any one bring him allegations, not whether it was true or not.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall of anyone bringing such allegations to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate to me why the department allowed the expenditures at Southern

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HARRY J. ENNS cont'd) Indian Lake Co-operative to be so far out of line with the actual physical properties there being constructed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, again the Member for Lakeside should know that the local board of South Indian Lake is autonomous from government other than the government is assisting in the management advice and so on, as we do with all co-operatives, especially the new co-operatives; so it is not a departmental management function, Mr. Chairman, but rather a private affair of a private corporation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister need not lecture me on the responsibilities of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: My question is: Why his department approved of the construction of, for instance, a 25,000-dollar cedar for a log house at Southern Indian Lake surrounded with a 10,000-dollar fence in that same complex, and why his department approved of those kind of expenditures of public funds?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, again the honourable member is alluding to something that I know nothing about in that the South Indian Lake Fishery is a private corporation, it is not a departmental organization, so I think my honourable friend should know that we are not in control of private companies.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a final supplementary question to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate why the department allowed the original projected proposals for Southern Indian Lake, estimated to be in the neighborhood of 200,000, to exceed a million dollars, I believe the actual cost being a million four?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the department is not in a position to allow or not to allow the formation of a private company, and what that company may or may not do. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think the question should not be put in the way that my honourable friend puts it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources responsible for MDC. Can the Minister report to the House is the Misawa Homes plant at Gimli still closed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I indicated to the honourable member that I would want to answer his questions concerning that establishment if he would put them properly and not make implications which I have already indicated the status of.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has Misawa Homes been given approximately a half a million dollars additional loan since the time that it has been closed?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I really want to answer the honourable member, and when he puts his question in a form in which it can be accepted I will answer it.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Was the additional loan to Misawa directed by the Minister over objections of the Board of Directors of MDC?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the loans that were made from the Manitoba Development Corporation relative to Misawa Homes were recommended by the Board of Directors and accepted by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture regarding the Department of Co-operative Development. Is it true that the Department of Co-operative Development is certifying financial statements from fishing co-ops but it is impossible to reconstruct any of the accounts?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think if the honourable member wants a particular piece of information, what he should do is submit a question with a particular situation so I can do a research job, but my honourable friend is generalizing in such a way that I would have to scan the whole of the northern part of Manitoba to find out what he wants to know.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll reduce the question then to one, of asking the Minister whether or not his department is not certifying the financial statements?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the department is involved in giving management advice and

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) indeed auditing services. Now if the honourable friend has a particular co-operative in question, I'd be happy to research it for him and give him an answer.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question then. I ask specifically whether he is not supervising the accounts, the financial . . . certifying the financial statements in the case of South Indian Lake?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that now I should indicate to my honourable friend that I will get the information on South Indian Lake for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder can the Minister indicate to the House how many of the loans guaranteed by his department for fishing co-ops to the banks and the credit unions are now in arrears?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many are currently in arrears. I know that since ever I've been Minister I was aware of a whole host of them being in arrears at all times; in fact in the first year of office, wrote off at least a half a dozen that were uncollectable accounts emanating from many years before.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder can the Honourable Minister advise the House how many of the guarantees because of failure to pay interest are now hired and that's authorized by his department?

MR. USKIW: I think, Mr. Speaker, that kind of question really requires an Order for Return. If my honourable friend wishes to submit an Order for Return we'll provide him with the answers.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Cultural Affairs. Does the government have any plan to assist the Winnipeg Art Gallery in view of the serious financial difficulties now being faced by the Gallery?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Well, Mr. Speaker, the budget for all programs contained within the Department of Tourism, and Recreation and Cultural Affairs will be before this House very soon, and in view of the implication of that budget towards many different organizations that are partially financed through the Department of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs, I had at least one meeting with the Arts Council, and we are preparing the - how should we say - the ground rules in regards to financing by means of the Arts Council to many organizations that are implicated with that Board given certain responsibilities. So really I can't, I can't be more specific at this time until the Estimates of the Department of Tourism and Recreation have passed this House.

MR. MARION: Well, this is a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can the Minister confirm or deny that an offer of \$100,000 has been made to the Gallery on a pro tem basis by the province?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, knowing that at least in principle some funds will be made available in the upcoming fiscal year starting on the 1st of April, 1974, it is quite possible that we've offered to guarantee, bridge financing to a certain extent. I'm not personally aware of \$100,000 being the figure, but that is certainly a possibility, that officials of my department have had discussions by means of the Arts Council that this be done.

MR. MARION: A supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the government ready to accept the report at terms that were offered by the City of Winnipeg whereby they would rebate the \$293,000 in tax arrears and grant \$60,000 outright if the province gave this in-term financing of 100,000; is the province willing to accept those terms?

MR. TOUPIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, we're starting to talk turkey, and the province is not in a position, Mr. Speaker, to start negotiating with the City of Winnipeg in regards to what is considered by them to be tax arrears, and what we consider as being a responsibility of the city. There will be certain measures taken at this session, which my honourable member will have a chance to participate.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this to the Minister of Agriculture under his Department of Co-operative Development. Can the Minister indicate why \$20,000 was spent on communication equipment and not used, and which was approved and supervised by his department, when we understand \$700.00 would have been suffice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the Member for Riel that I would undertake to find out just what the Department's role is or was with respect to the affairs of South Indian Lake Co-operative. I want to respond to my honourable friend for Rock Lake, for Rock Lake, that the co-operative in question has its own board of directors.

MR. EINARSON: I have another question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate the amount of arrears of loans which were obtained from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Commission which were assisted and directed by his department, or supervised?

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister in charge of MDC. I wonder can the Minister confirm that William Clare Limited does not have any manufacturing facilities of its own in Winnipeg and that the film-strips which have been produced by the company have been done so under contract with a Toronto firm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's possible but I don't know - I do know that it is not a requirement of firms receiving money from the Manitoba Development Corporation that they only get work done in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the same Minister confirm that the maximum number of Winnipeg-based . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MINAKER: . . . permanent employees with William Clare Company has never exceeded two?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be certain about that. I indicated in the House, Mr. Speaker, when I was asked the other day that this is a firm which has not generated a great deal of employment in the Province of Manitoba. The main reason for the Development Fund's first activity vis-a-vis the firm was in connection with Canadian publishing companies.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the same Minister inform the House what criteria is used by the government and MDC in granting of loans to a company, and are the number of jobs that are -- or will be created in the establishment or a permanent manufacturing facility from the granting of loans, are these considered as a major criteria in the granting of loans?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, all of that information is contained in the guidelines that were arrived at as between the - following discussions between the Manitoba Development Corporation and myself, which guidelines are available to honourable members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Co-operative Development. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how much of the \$1,300,000 paid out of the Consolidated Fund under the authority of the Fisheries Act, and loaned by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to fishermen and fishing co-operatives, is in arrears at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice because it would require a great deal of research to get all of the facts for my honourable friend. There are, I would presume, hundreds of loans made and therefore it would take a day or two to get that information.

MR. MCGILL: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the government or the Agricultural Credit Corporation has written off any of these loans to the fishermen or the fishing co-operatives?

MR. USKIW: Intuitively, Mr. Speaker, I would think not because the program is relatively new and we normally don't write off a loan unless it is at least three years or more

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) in arrears where a decision has to be made as to whether there's any hope of collecting, and so on. So I would think that since the program is relatively new that that would not be the case, but I will confirm for my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Honourable Member for Riel asked a question which I took as notice. On Page 1102 of Hansard he asked, pointed out that it's indicated that the results of the Succession Duty Tax Act brought to Manitoba approximately one-quarter of the estimated return, namely one million versus four million of the year in question, and he asked for an indication of the reason for the drastic shortfall.

Firstly I should say that one estimates what one expects will be payable in the coming year based on some knowledge of the past but no foreknowledge of the future. People live and die not in accordance with the plans that may be made for them in governments.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to the honourable member that the statement on Page 28 and 29 of Public Accounts of revenue for the year ended March 31st, 1973, does show the figure of Estimated Revenue for Manitoba Succession Duty Gift Tax of four million, does show a receipt of \$1,770,323.00. A few lines or some ten lines above that under the same category of the Department of Finance is an item entitled Estate Tax showing no estimated revenue, and showing a receipt of one and a half - well \$1,536,250.00. The total revenue therefore from the State and Succession Duty Taxation was somewhere in excess of two and a half million dollars which is still one and a half million dollars less than had been estimated would come from that source.

One point I could make on that is that in the first year of succession duty taxation there was certainly a lag in the administrative process. Members will remember that this Act was -- notice was given of the intent of government, but the Act itself took a little while to get through this House's deliberation and was passed retroactively some time well into the year. The administration process then was obviously slowed up and took some time before they caught up with their work. That may be an explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then directly whether the Minister is suggesting or verifying that there will be no reduction, or no significant reduction, as a result of people rearranging their affairs with regards to the moneys that they would normally pass on in succession.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I suppose some people make efforts to rearrange and have for many many years. There is nothing to indicate any appreciable reason but I'd be glad to discuss it with the honourable member during the Budget Speech - I understand he is my counterpart in the shadow Cabinet - and we could discuss it either under Estimates or when the Budget is presented and then the Estimates of Revenue will be before him for this coming year.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Co-operative Development. I would like to ask the Minister if the Management Services and the supervision provided by his department to the South Indian Co-operative included the drawing up of the contracts and the tender specifications for the building of the South Indian Lake Co-operative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister is taking that as notice, will he also take as notice the question of whether the tenders, if any were called, came to his department and if so, how many bids were received, and if there were any could he indicate what the tender price was for the construction of the South Indian Lake Co-op?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for housing. Does the government plan any immediate steps in the field of rural or native housing to take immediate advantage of the newly announced program by the Federal Government in the rural and native housing field?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Board of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is working on a number of projects, this is one of them.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell us when the House might expect the 1973 report of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, considering the vital importance housing has in the province at the present time, so that we can examine its past performance and proposed plans.

MR. MILLER: I'll make enquiries.

MR. AXWORTHY: I would also like to ask the Minister if he expects to bring the Estimates for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation before this House within the next week or two, so that we can also get down to debate on this important issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister tell me whether or not as late as this February, just last month, Mr. Max Hofford, the Chairman of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation sent an official representative to investigate and examine the conditions of the farm of one Gordon Monkman, and is it a case that the representative or himself, Mr. Hofford, subsequently recommended the advancing to Mr. Monkman money sufficient to purchase an additional 50 cows?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that members opposite would respect the fact that the matter is before the courts and we should not be discussing a matter that is before the courts.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I had no idea that Mr. Hofford was before the courts or his representative. My question simply is: did the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation send a representative to this farm under question as late as last month and subsequently advance additional moneys for an additional 50 animals? It would be obvious to the Minister of Agriculture that as late as last month there obviously must have been considerable problems . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question. Question. Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . The animals must have been in the state of malnutrition at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: For the benefit of my honourable friend no additional moneys were advanced, but I don't think we should entertain discussing that particular case since it is before the courts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party state his matter of order?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The issue that the Minister has just raised is one which is very familiar to all of us I think, the issue of what can be discussed and what can't be discussed. Mr. Speaker, what is before the courts was a man guilty or not guilty of cruelty to animals, and nothing else. What is before the courts is not the question of did the government aid, make grants, loans, and so, and I want it very clearly understood that the rule of law is that this House can discuss anything except the issue relating to the specific charge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I don't think that the Minister indicated that he was relying on any rule of the House, and I'm not even going to comment on that one way or the other, but the matter of order is that the Minister can answer or not answer questions. If he chooses to say why he is not answering questions, it doesn't affect the rules of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize both points of order. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture under Co-operative Development. Can the Minister confirm that the loan funds obtained from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Commission by his own department were used for direct benefits for the fishermen and as a result - resulted in shortages of adequate cash flow for effective operation of the fisheries complex?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know, I couldn't tell my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Minister in charge of Co-operative Development. Can he indicate whether he is aware of any trust liabilities certified by the Department of Co-operative Development that are not now available for payment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Is the honourable member referring to the same co-operative that he alluded to a few moments ago?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I am in this case referring to the Ilford Co-operative.

MR. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to look at Hansard to get his precise question and I will respond when I get the information from the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask him can the Minister indicate whether any charges have been brought to his attention, or to the attention of the department, dealing with PEP grants for fishing co-operatives in the north in which materials were either allowed to be pilfered or were not used and rotted?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, first of all this is not in the jurisdiction of the Department of Industry and Commerce as such. It is in the jurisdiction of the Provincial Employment Committee, of which I am a member. My answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FERGUSON: Another question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether any PEP grants paid out by his department have been paid out by signed trust cheques in blank?

MR. EVANS: I'm not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. My question is: has the Department of Industry and Commerce completed any labour supply studies in the garment industry in Manitoba, and would he table those studies?

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

MR. EVANS: Well over the years, Mr. Speaker, we have done various studies on manpower requirements in various industries, I'm not aware of any very recent detailed studies of that nature.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Was the high rate of unemployment in Manitoba the main reason for the government's opposition to the request of imported labour into the province for the garment industry?

MR. EVANS: The figures that the honourable member refers to of course are figures compiled by Statistics Canada, the monthly labour force survey, and I would say that that is one of the major reasons, yes.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Government of Manitoba have any studies to indicate that the labour shortage in the garment industry, can be met without importation of labour?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the fact that - unfortunately the fact is that there are many thousands of people, particularly those who are rather disadvantaged people, that are unemployed in this province and we all, all of us have to make a valued effort to give them a first opportunity to work.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Minister indicate whether any of his officials have brought to his attention waste and misuse by the co-operatives of materials supplied under the federal and provincial grants?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture in charge of Co-operative Development. Is it true that the fish co-op at South Indian Lake was paying fishermen 13 cents per lb. instead of 17 cents per lb.,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) which indicated that the co-operative was short-changing fishermen in order to pay for debts caused by mismanagement?

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for Housing. Has the government or its agency purchased any homes from Misawa Home plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Yes, I believe that there are, that there were some homes contracted for with Misawa Homes. I can't recall the number or where they would be located.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House what price the government paid? Was it in the neighborhood of 35,000 per home?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have to take that question as notice and with a great deal of curiosity about, and doubt about, that amount that he just mentioned.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister also take the question as notice if the homes are inspected and the quality of the homes.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure they'd have to meet the usual inspections of CMHC AND MHRC.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister in charge of Co-operatives. I would like to ask him why a conveyor belt valued at approximately \$60,000 was recommended by the administrators from his department to be installed at the South Indian Lake Co-op, and has never been used?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any knowledge as to the way in which the plant was engineered, or who recommended the project, and whether in fact all of the designs were put in place as recommended, or whether in fact complete utilization of the equipment and machinery has or has not been used by the co-operative. The question really is one for the co-operative itself. Now we are not here prepared to answer questions over the private affairs of a co-operative. I indicated to my honourable friend before that the department does assist any co-operative in the establishment of that co-operative and in the initial stages of its operation but tries not to interfere in the management decisions as much as possible.

Now we also know that to the extent that we are involved financially we would want to have a closer look at the operation, and we do, but we are dealing with a lot of very inexperienced people in that part of the province which do require a great deal of assistance, which is provided from time to time, but which in the end must make their own decisions.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question. Would the Minister then endeavour to find out and report back to the House on his findings?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think that is presumptuous to say the least.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. Are fourth year medical students in Manitoba working as hospital clerks being paid less than the minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the fourth year medical students are concerned I don't think they're being paid.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister any plans to meet with students to consider their request that they be brought up to remuneration standards on a par with other students in Canada?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered this question twice, I'll now answer for the third time. The fourth year students are spending part of their clinical time for clinical studies at the hospital as part of the training which is required for them to become doctors, and so therefore it is part of the work study activity in which they're involved during the course of becoming doctors.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. More directly, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister planning to meet with the student association or the medical faculty on the matter?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I met with the representative of the students about a year ago.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation, following the question of the unused equipment. Is it a fact, or will he confirm for us, that part of the equipment bought by Phoenix Data, a Crown corporation in the computer business, also remains crated and unused to the value of several tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall a previous question being put to me on unused equipment but it may be that in the -- and I really can't answer the question that has been raised by my honourable friend; I can't confirm it or deny it.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, it relates to the question he took as notice, I believe yesterday. The question is: Can he indicate to the House why at the time he filed the Manitoba Development Corporation report containing the information that we owned only 24 percent of the William Clare Company, a new . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question, question.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is, did he know when the report was filed, not when it was printed but when it was filed in this House that the report was wrong, that we owned 80 percent.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am by no means certain that the report is wrong. It may be that as at March 31, 1973 -- and now the honourable member has again raised something which I'm not aware of -- but as at March 31, 1973, we could have owned a certain percent; the date that I filed the report would be another date, and I don't think that there is any obligation on my part to when I am filing the report stating everything that happened between March 31, 1973 and the date that I filed the report. I mean that is an astonishing proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I do have another answer to make to a question that was asked yesterday regarding MDC and Sheller Globe, my information is that there is nothing in the contract which would require the Manitoba Government to buy buses from Sheller Globe. We do have a ten percent interest in the company, I think that it probably would reflect a desire, but there is nothing in the contract, and I can tell my honourable friend that there was nothing so far as this particular transaction that he raised yesterday is concerned, or the day before, that I am aware of.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister relating to his just given answer, can he indicate what other material differences exist between the information -- are there other material differences that exist between the information contained in the MDC report that he filed and the facts as they are today before we go to committee to debate a report which is useless.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has just asked me to do what I said that I would not do, and I did indicate, and this was in response to a request from the Leader of the Opposition where the procedure was changed that up until last year the members of the committee asked questions only up to the date of the filing of the report. Last year we indicated to the committee that they could ask questions not only up to the date of the ending of the report but up to the date of the report coming to committee.

I've also indicated to the honourable member that at the first meeting of committee I expect the chairman to give the financial statements, that's P and L's and balance sheets, to all of the members of those companies in which we hold equity, that we would then have additional meetings so that they would have those financial statements in advance of the following meetings. I believe I indicated, Mr. Speaker, yesterday that I got my Royal Bank statement, it did not have P and L statements of the companies in which the Royal Bank has shares, or even fully owned subsidiaries; it had some balance sheets, assets and liabilities, but not P and L statements. The Inco statement does not have statements, P and L statements, of all the companies in which it held securities or shares, and that the people of Manitoba are entitled, and are getting, far more publication of the financial affairs in which they have an interest than is done in any private company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Co-operative Development. I wonder if he can confirm to this House that in stating that his department assists in

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) services to the fishing co-operatives, he is essentially mis-representing the position of the involvement of his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: No I don't believe that to be the case, Mr. Speaker. As far as I'm aware we have involved ourselves only in the assistance of developing co-operatives, the establishment of new ones, and in the initial stage of management by way of advice, and so on, but we are not operating co-operatives per se.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, a supplementary. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House why powers of attorney of the board of directors were taken by his development officers to be able to run the co-operatives.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice because I'm not aware of the event or to which co-operative it may apply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question then to the Minister of Agriculture in his capacity as Minister of Co-operative Development, and ask him if his department as he claims has had no responsibility, or has no direct involvement with the co-ops, why in a press release of November 3, 1973, or a press report, it says, "The reason" - and this is dealing with the failure of the Ilford Co-op - "The reason in the view of the fishermen was poor management mainly on the part of a manager sent in by the Provincial Department of Co-operative Services."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that's a pretty fair comment because on occasion, on occasion co-operatives who find themselves completely helpless ask the department to send someone in to assist them, and we respond as we can. But we do not have within the department management expertise, we have co-operative development officers, and to the extent that they are able to assist (a) in finding a manager, or temporarily assisting the co-operative in management decisions, they do, but really they are not designed or competent to do so. We do not have co-operative managers available within the staff of the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Minister of Co-operative Development. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether the co-operatives of Southern Indian Lake, at Ilford and Moose Lake are now closed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing without checking with the department. I suspect that there may be any number either closed, or considering closing, or opening. So until I get the information I cannot advise my honourable friend.

MR. SPIVAK: By way of supplementary. I wonder whether the Minister is in a position to advise whether the fishermen are now selling their fish to a Saskatchewan Co-operative?

MR. USKIW: I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that they are selling their fish where it is advantageous for them to do so.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Welfare. In his reply with regards to purchase of homes by his department from Misawa Homes, I wonder if the Minister could advise us if the homes were purchased under a public tendering set-up, or were they purchased directly by his department, with no other people invited to give a price on the supply of these homes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I think I know the answer and it would be that it was tendered, but I'd have to take the question as notice to determine whether in fact I am correct in this assumption.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has there been a mill rate struck, and will the people of Leaf Rapids be paying taxes to pay back their local improvements this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): I think there will be, Mr. Speaker, for this year. If the honourable member requires further particulars I would take it as notice.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Does the government intend to lower the age of consent for surgical operations whereby allowing operations to be performed without parental consent on children younger than the present limit, much along the lines as the legislation now being brought forward in Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: I'm behind in my reading, obviously I didn't read today's paper. Mr. Speaker, if it just came out today then I have no immediate response.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and my question is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs, and I would like to ask him what efforts his department is making to capture their elusive little beavers that were supposed to have caused the flooding on the Ilford-York winter road?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, there was a suggestion that the Member for Birtle-Russell might like to go up and try and catch them. Mr. Chairman, I understand that they're -- the effort, the slush that has been caused is now freezing over and the road should be opened very soon.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Minister of Corporate Affairs. Does the government intend to intervene in the proposed 9 cents per quart rise in the price of milk as recommended by the Chairman of the Milk Board, Mr. Kristjanson?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the affairs of the Milk Control Board are not going to be intervened in by my department. I think that the increase that the Member for Wolseley has referred to has not been approved by the Milk Control Board as yet, but it is a figure that came out of the hearings that occurred at the hearing sponsored by the Milk Control Board.

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

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Does he accept the proposed price increase in the light of the dairy companies' request for only a three-cent rise?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, as the price first referred to by the -- the price increase first referred to by the Member for Wolseley is not in fact a natural price increase, I think the question tends to be hypothetical. However, I would say, Sir, that I regard the milk industry in Manitoba as one that is now regulated and that any prices that do occur, any price increases that do occur, presumably have been justified before the Milk Control Board, consequently I would not think that my department would intervene if price increases were justified. It would not intervene (1) because prices were presumably justified; and secondly, Sir, because my department has an interest in maintaining a viable milk producing industry in the Province of Manitoba, and I'm assuming that the work of the Milk Control Board does protect the consumer and also protects the viability of the milk industry in this province.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if he will consider favourably recommending, or taking appropriate legislative steps, to see in the light of his answer that consumer representatives are now appointed to government marketing boards so that they are not only producer-oriented but consumer-oriented as well.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the Milk Control Board does now have a representative of consumers in its membership. In addition, Sir, it is also my understanding that at the present hearing of the Milk Control Board, the Canadian Consumers Association did in fact appear and did apparently not object to justifiable increases in the price of milk.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of the Report of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet on women in the civil service completed in 1972 which was the subject of recommendations of the task force report released on 22nd of January, 1974.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there would be any objection to tabling a couple of copies of that report. It was a confidential report. I haven't made my recommendations to my colleagues in Cabinet as to the dealings within the whole context of the task report, but I can indicate to my honourable friend that I would have no objections to that, but I'd appreciate the courtesy of a slight delay in order that I may confer with my colleagues first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would accept the undertaking by the Minister that the report will be tabled, and withdraw the Address for Papers, because the Address for Papers refers to an internal document and it's normally not something that the House would vote to give, but if the Minister of Labour indicates that it's going to be forwarded, would that be satisfactory to the honourable member?

MR. BILTON: I have a choice between the two Ministers, Mr. Speaker. I'm very happy to accede to the suggestion made by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, So ordered. The Address for Papers withdrawn. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you now go to the second reading of bills?

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING - BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Bill No. 7. The Honourable Minister of Labour was speaking.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took a considerable period of time to point out to the House the reasons why I thought that the Assembly should not accept the six months' hoist as proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. I did so for a number of reasons.

First of all, after having perused all of the comments made by honourable members opposite that I found a sort of a two-forked approach, a tongue approach by the Conservative Party in particular, that half of their spokesmen did indicate support for the general premise insofar as political participation by the civil servants, and others did not. There was in some of their contributions to the debate a question as to whether or not the Employees Association wanted to be able to participate in political affairs. I think I proved without question that the majority, about 55 or 56 percent by a referendum vote of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, did want to be considered the same as everybody else in the Province of Manitoba. I further pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that there was legislation in some of our sister provinces giving the Civil Service the right to participation contrary to what some thoughts were in the minds of honourable friends opposite.

I also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in reply to the question of urgency that I felt that there was a likelihood of a relatively early federal election due to the situation prevailing at Ottawa with a minority government, and I thought that it was only fair and reasonable that this particular bill should not be killed but should be allowed to go into the committee for consideration.

I gave it another undertaking that I gave when I undertook to introduce the bill, Mr. Speaker, that if reasonable amendments were suggested, we'd certainly take a look at them.

I also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that under the present Act the Civil Service in its entirety, from Deputy Ministers down, had the right of full participation, including the collection of moneys for any political party up until the issuance of a writ of an election, either federally or provincially.

So I want to appeal to my honourable friends. I realize, I realize after a few years in this House that sometimes the six months' hoist is given as a device to have another round of oratory of establishing principles. But I think in this particular case, Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly have had ample opportunity and ample time to bring forth their respective views.

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... This isn't really the type of a bill in my opinion that would warrant undue delay if we really and sincerely believe in the rights and the freedoms of individuals in society today.

Yesterday, I referred to the former - a former President of the United States, one who was well respected by all of the community, not only here in the North American continent, but elsewhere as well. I pointed out that in Franklin Roosevelt's message to Congress in January of 1941 he stated four freedoms! the first is freedom of speech and expression anywhere in the world; the second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world; the third is freedom from want everywhere in the world; the fourth is freedom from fear everywhere in the world. I think Mr. Speaker, that some of the comments made by my honourable friends opposite indicate that the application of the absence of fear within the Civil Service if this bill were to pass would become manifest. I think the opposite is true, Mr. Speaker, that the fear can be there at the present time, because they fear that if they express their opinions then they will be subject to discipline within their respective departments and jurisdictions.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not so. I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that we should be no different here, that this Assembly and this government, and in this instance when I'm talking about government, Mr. Speaker, I'm not just talking of this side of the House, I'm talking about government generally, that should not continue to have different rule games, or rules of the game for our employees than prevail elsewhere.

These were the basic principles, Mr. Speaker, under which I introduced this bill. It is not unusual for me to take this position because it's a position that I have taken generally speaking throughout my whole political career. It is true, as the Honourable Member for Riel pointed out, that in 1960 I did not object to the bill; and it is true as I indicated that the bill was introduced by me about five years ago, still containing the clause of prohibition. But I did indicate, Mr. Speaker, that on due reflection, I was wrong in '60, I was wrong in '64 or '69, and my honourable friend says I'm wrong in '74 - I don't believe that I am. I believe that he, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who on occasion is a very knowledgeable and charming individual, still wants to keep us back in the 19th century, and of course I think he can be changed. I would suggest that if his present Leader - and I understand his competitor for leadership in the next ensuing Conservative Party - may be able to use some of his influence on my friend from Lakeside to indicate to him the error of the ways of the Member for Lakeside, although as I pointed out, too, yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Conservative Party spoke with both sides of the cheek, because at one time he was giving verbiage, or suggesting, that he was in favour of the employees of this government having the right to free expression and then finished up his address by saying, well everybody else can have it except the Civil Service of Manitoba.

I'm very interested, Mr. Speaker, or was very interested the other day to note that in a news item, Mr. Speaker, that a gentleman by the name of James L. McPherson of Vancouver, spoke to a group here in the province. He told the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Manitoba, "that what is needed to inject more business expertise into government is a sweeping change in the attitude of business toward government and the political process in the country." And the article goes on further to say, Mr. Speaker, and here again I quote from the paper as alleged to . . .

A MEMBER: What paper?

MR. PAULLEY: ...I really don't know.

A MEMBER: Well, you're making it difficult.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I'll table it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, if it was the Free Press, it was - I'm sure that the Free Press would not want to publish anything that I might use in order to support my case, because no other paper is more vindictive against the Minister of Labour than the Free Press.

However, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend, if my honourable friend from Lakeside would give me an opportunity, I would like to read what Mr. McPherson said, and whether the article was in the Tribune or the Free Press it was not an editorial, it was a news item. And Mr. McPherson said; "He said, it wouldn't be difficult to formulate policies for leave of absence for employees seeking time to help in campaigns. All that is needed is the acceptance

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . of the attitude that any person in a democracy has the right to take part in political campaigns without compromising his career. Mr. McPherson said that in his opinion the major effort must be made to accommodate the businessman who chooses to enter politics as a candidate for office."

Now basically, Mr. Speaker, that is what I am saying. I'm not saying it insofar as business is concerned. We know that one of the large business institutions here in Winnipeg some short time ago - I'm referring to the Great West Life - did indicate to their employees that they had freedom of participation, and freedom of security, if they took part in political affairs. All I'm asking, and all the government is asking, Mr. Speaker, in the principle contained in Bill No. 7, is to give what Mr. McPherson suggests for business, and the Great West Life did, and this should be extended to all business and all parts of the community. I say, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to all members of this House to allow this bill to go into committee, to give consideration to the principle contained therein. There may be objections to some sections of the bill, but I plead with my honourable friends opposite, and all members of this House, do not kill this bill, and it won't be killed, I know that; I do know that under this motion that there can be speech after speech after speech, delay after delay after delay - this is a parliamentary device that is as old as the hills. But I appeal to my honourable friends opposite not to use it because while this particular section of the bill, present 44, is contained on our statute books, we are depriving the civil servants of the Province of Manitoba the right of freedom of involvement in the affairs of Manitoba and in Canada as free citizens in a free community. This is the important thing.

If there are objections to the mechanics and other tidying up articles within the bill that is before the members, I appeal to them to not delay further this bill, to allow it to go to the committee, and if all that comes out of the hearings at Committee is the right of free participation of our employees, I think that history will prove, Mr. Speaker, that this First Session of the 30th Legislature of the Province of Manitoba did advance the well being of all citizens in this free society we call Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour wound up his speech today on a very timid note contrasting greatly with the wind and the bluster that we heard yesterday. Yesterday, Sir, in the opening of his remarks - and one could see from the last week or so that the Minister was very eager to get into the debate, and we had every reason to believe that that eagerness was prompted by a desire to communicate something to this side of the House. Well, Sir, all we heard yesterday was the wind and bluster.

Sir, it was explained to the Minister the purpose of the amendment by the Member for Gladstone. We have devices within our rules that afford us the opportunity from time to time to do certain things, and during the course of the debate it became obvious that even some members on the other side of the House were not certain as to the interpretation of certain sections of that Act. I refer to the Minister of Public Works who urged the Minister to have a second look at certain sections of the Act because he was now beginning to have some doubts as to whether or not those sections of the Act should be proceeded with. And on the --(Interjection)-- Well the Minister of Public Works corrects me. He points his finger up, and that indicates there was one section and I'm going to concur with that. I want to make sure, I don't want to misinterpret his words, that there was a section in the Act or a portion of that section that he would like to have a second look at. Having received that information and that indication from honourable gentlemen opposite, we thought here that we would provide the Minister with an opportunity to end the debate very shortly.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: And rather than moving the amendment for the purpose of killing the bill, which is what the Minister seems to indicate. . .

A MEMBER: Well, isn't it true?

A MEMBER: No.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . we moved the amendment as indicated by my honourable friend from Gladstone, to provide the Minister with an opportunity of communicating to this House his willingness to listen to some of the suggestions that had been made and to propose some amendments to the Legislation which would meet some of the objections that had been raised from this side of the House. That was the purpose of that amendment, and the Minister knows that.

BILL 7

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . But the Minister has been - he indicated a while ago that he's been 20 years in this House, and during those 20 years in this House he has never been able, as is characteristic of some of his colleagues, never been able to make the transformation from opposition to government. He has a position of responsibility, and in that position of responsibility has an opportunity to make decisions. We provided him with that opportunity; we provided him with a chance to indicate that he would be prepared to have a second look at some of the sections of that bill. Sir, I say with deep regret that he failed to take advantage of that opportunity. Instead used his time to rant and to bluster, as is his character, rather than using the conciliatory tone that he could have used; rather than indicating to members of this side of the House that he was prepared to listen to some of the suggestions, as indeed the Minister of Public Works is. Sir, no such indication came from the Minister of Labour.

MR. ENNS: None at all.

MR. JORGENSEN: He suggested that the members were using this opportunity only for the purpose of venting their lumps. Well if this is the only opportunity that the government is going to provide for us to do that, then it doesn't say a great deal for the kind of legislation that they're bringing in to this Session. Sir, they argue from the position that all this bill intends to do is allow the civil servants to run and then having been defeated or otherwise can return back into the Civil Service. Sir, we've never questioned that. From time to time members on this side of the House said, we are prepared to accept that. They tried to convince us, and indeed as they've convinced themselves, that that's the only section in the bill. That, Sir, is not the principle of the bill. That's only a portion of it. The Minister, and some of his colleagues, have never been able to separate that one provision in the bill from others that are objectionable to us. The one that will set up a core of bagmen to act on behalf of the government. Sir, we object to that one, and we've said so; and there was no indication from the Minister at all that he would intend to have a look at that section of the bill and to remove it, or at the very least modify it.

Sir, the Minister's impaired capacity for anticipation has created a situation now where we don't know whether the bill is going to be rammed through, as the Minister has a habit of doing, without listening to reason, or whether we could end the debate, go into Committee and have the amendments made. The Minister lost an opportunity that had been provided for him by the Member for Gladstone. And I am really sorry that he didn't take advantage of that opportunity to close the debate in a reasonably short period of time. We now, unless something can be communicated to him from more reasonable members of that side of the House, we are now in the position of not knowing whether or not we should continue to oppose the principle of this bill, or certain portions of the principle of this bill, or do what I in trepidation would be inclined to do, and that is take the Minister's word that he will look at certain sections. He's given no indication of what section he may look at . . .

A MEMBER: And how hard.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . and how hard he'd look at it. Well, we have had some experience with taking the word of honourable gentlemen opposite and I am sorry to say, Sir, that that experience leads us to reject any of those blandishments on the part of the Minister.

And I come now to the remarks made by the Minister of Finance who indicated during the course of his remarks, as shown on Page 707 of Hansard, that he said, "I haven't read the Minister's speech" - indicating in that comment the Minister of Labour who read out the principle of the bill when he introduced it. I might add as an afterthought that he wouldn't have learned very much if he did. But he goes on to say, "My own belief is that a person who wishes to participate in political affairs during an election should have a right to do so and should be guaranteed tenure in the event that he comes back. That to me, "he said, "is the purpose of the bill." And then he goes on a little further to say, "That really to me is the essence of the bill, and that is the principle on which I intend to vote." Sir, what they've done is blindly closed their eyes to the reality of the bill. They refuse to recognize what is in the bill, and I think Sir, that that stems from a characteristic that we have noted, and particularly in the Minister of Agriculture, the characteristic that I stated a few days ago, a tendency to assume, and that's a happy position to be in, a tendency to assume that the fact of a given situation just happily coincides with their conception of it, without really attempting to understand what is contained in the legislation before us - and we've had an example of that on the part of the Minister of Finance during the course of recent debate on another measure. The Minister of

BILL 7

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd). . . Finance seems to be oblivious to the real principle behind this bill. Just as oblivious to principle as he was under the Mineral Acreage Tax Act when he so blithely suggested that the principle of that piece of legislation had not been changed, or that the principle of that bill was something that it wasn't. A manifestation of that attitude, Sir, further comes from one who was a former member of this House who now sits in the gallery from time to time and writes learned columns . . .

A MEMBER: For what paper?

MR. JORGENSEN: The former Minister of -- the former Attorney-General, who in each case that he sits in this Legislature he listens to honourable gentlemen opposite and then writes in his column, "we sure heard facts today." Facts are those as expressed by honourable gentlemen opposite because they have the happy facility of believing that facts emanate from their utterances, not from anything else. Well, Sir, I suspect that the former Attorney-General is attempting, attempting to win all the debates that he lost when he was a Member of this House, and there were many.

Well, Sir, of all of the utterances that we've heard from honourable gentlemen opposite nothing, nothing was more beguiling that that of the Minister of Mines and Resources in his contribution. "The fireman." Sir, every time that the government get into trouble, and I recall there was a pitcher with the New York Yankees who every time one of their first line pitchers got into trouble they'd always throw him in, and he was nicknamed "the fireman," and I can't recall his name at this moment. The Minister of Mines and Resources is "the fireman" of honourable gentlemen opposite and every time they get into serious difficulty they throw him in and he endeavours to get them out of difficulty.

Well they did that during the course of the debate on the Mineral Acreage Tax Act, and I tell you, Sir, that the temptation to succumb to the blandishments of the Minister of Mines and Resources was irresistible because he argued, and he based his argument, his initial thesis was that the opposition was intelligent, and how could you possibly resist that kind of a thesis? And then he built his case from there and it was a -- I must say if you accept the initial thesis the logic of his argument flowed, the logic of his argument flowed straight through, but I do maintain that we were hornswoggled on that particular bill, but I won't go into that. But he used the same technique during his contribution to this debate. And, Sir, it's -- having once accepted the initial thesis then it's difficult to accept anything else, and I suspect from time to time that the Minister of Mines and Resources must get his inspiration from the Department of National Revenue in Ottawa. Just yesterday, Sir, I got a communication from them and that was beguiling in its concept. The letter that I received said that: "Your return has been adjusted in accordance without letter dated January 2nd, 1973" -- and they go on to say -- "The tax on your blended payment" -- whatever that is -- "has been recalculated and you have been taxed at a rate that is beneficial to you." Well, Sir, I fully expected that having read that communication I was going to be in receipt of some largesse from the Federal Government. But when I picked up the return, when I picked up the notice, I discovered that I was

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance state his point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could we ask the honourable member to table the the paper he was reading from.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well the Minister of Finance is a real interesting person. I'll send it across to him and he can read it and then return it, because it is the only copy I have. But it really contained nothing of significance other than what I have read.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member state his point of order?

MR. CHERNIACK: Is it not in order for a paper that is read from to be tabled? Is it something that the member has the right to retain if it's his only copy?

MR. JORGENSEN: If it was a document, Sir, that was of some import or significance I would expect it tabled, and I don't mind tabling it, I don't mind tabling it. It's a communication that I received from the Department of Taxation. If he wants to read my personal taxation problems then he's welcome to them.

BILL 7

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe that in accordance with the rules I rose and asked that the paper of communication from which the honourable member read should be tabled. I thought it was a rule that on a request of that type that it shall be tabled, and if that is the case then I don't think there ought to be any question as to whether somebody is interested in personal affairs or not. If I am wrong in my impression, and the Honourable Member for Morris is the one who always poses as the expert, if I am wrong, and you find me wrong, I will sit down without making speeches, but if I am right, then it should be tabled.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, why doesn't the Minister sit down, because I have tabled the document. What's he talking about?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, until this moment the honourable member has not agreed to table it but has been waving it. He may have said it but he has not agreed to do it, and I haven't seen it yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The letter has been tabled. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The nonsense that is now being spouted unctuously by the Minister of Finance can be characterized as sheer stupidity. I have tabled the document and I told the Minister that I have no objection to tabling it. Now, if he wants--I'll tell you what I'll do with the Minister. I will give him all my personal correspondence if that makes him any happier.

A MEMBER: Including your love letters.

MR. JORGENSEN: The Minister is one of those who on occasion wants to live by the letter of the law and wants to live by the rules of this House, but when it suits him he will break them, he will violate them and indeed, Sir, he will destroy them, as he did the other night in his debate on the Mineral Acreage Tax Act--(Interjection)--. Well, Sir, the Minister can think what he likes, but we have evidence of some of the Minister's tactics in this House. And, Sir, you could say that, although he attempts to portray himself as a man of high integrity, I have my own opinions of how the Minister conducts himself in this Chamber and outside of it. I don't want the Minister to forget that.

Sir, the government expects us, in their dealings with legislation that is brought before this Chamber, to take their word that all is well, that the principle as enunciated by a Minister is indeed the principle in legislation, and I say, Sir, because of the Minister of Finance we're not able to do that, and I don't intend to do that. We can read the legislation for ourselves. --(Interjection)--Well, Sir, we have another example of the reasons why the government would want to bring in such legislation, and I only need to refer to Order-in-Council No. 431, dealing with the appointment of one Chief, Hedley Robson, as Director of the Animal Industry Branch in the Department of Agriculture. That, Sir, is an indication of the kind of blatant practice that this government carries on in political appointments. The intention of that appointment, Sir, was to do none other than to implement the government's monopoly position on certain sections of the Animal Husbandry Act. We know that that was the intention of the government, and that really is the intention of the government in this bill, to get their own people appointed to positions where they can then conduct election campaigns on behalf of the government.

A MEMBER: At public expense.

MR. JORGENSEN: At public expense. We have seen samples of that. We saw it when the Minister of Agriculture carried an ad in the Manitoba Co-operator paid for by the taxpayers of this province in order to promote the Minister's own . . . --(Interjection)--. When I am through and if I have time, I will answer the Minister's questions. But the purpose of that particular venture into coercing people is an indication of the attitude on the part of this government, and we know precisely what will happen if they're given the opportunity of putting those people in a position of conducting election campaigns at public expense for themselves. We intend to have no part of that.

But, Sir, I wanted to deal particularly with the remarks of the Minister of Mines and Resources because the Minister of Mines and Resources, as I indicated earlier, is one of those who, when he speaks in a debate, commands the attention of the House. And I'll say this much for him, which is more than I can say for the Minister of Finance, he is prepared to accept the responsibility for his actions and prepared to accept the responsibility on behalf of the government. They don't try to blame their mistakes on the opposition. And I don't say any comment about the Minister of Mines and Resources with any irony because he knows that I

BILL 7

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) respect his integrity and his powers of analysis. But there were a couple of comments that the Minister made during the course of his remarks in this debate that caught my attention, and I think it deals with the heart of this problem. The Member for Lakeside had made a comment, and I will paraphrase that slightly. He said that the government is not just another employer; that there is a difference between an industrial employer, an employer as such, and the government. And the Minister's reply dealt with that particular aspect of the Member for Lakeside's comments. He went on to say this, and I quote:

"As far as the relations between employees and the government are concerned, it is my suggestion to you that the very same interests vis-a-vis bargaining, vis-a-vis security, vis-a-vis terms and conditions of employment," and at that point in his remarks the Minister was distracted by an interjection. But I take it that his central point, that in all of its essential aspects the relationship between the government and its employees ought to be, and is, the same between all employers and employees. That interpretation, Sir, is of course reinforced by the rationale that has been advanced in support of this bill right from the very start - and that goes back to my original comments, that when you start from a certain position, a basic thesis, and then build your argument around that thesis, if the thesis is correct in the first instance then there's no problem. But if that thesis happens to be wrong, then your entire argument and all your logic falls.

Now, the proposition that the government/employee relationship is or ought to be the same as all employer/employee relationships, is an interesting problem. Indeed, this is rather appealing, because I think no one in the Chamber would want to suggest to any group, any group in this society, be singled out and treated differently from other groups who appear to be in similar positions. And at one level, therefore, one can agree that in terms of security and working conditions and so on, the Minister may have a point. But lying at the heart of the assumption, in the government's case, is an assumption that should not be allowed to slip by, and that is the assumption that the government is just like any other employer. I suggest, Sir, that that assumption is far from self-evidently true, because I suggest that the government occupies a position in society and in the state that is unlike any other institution or body. Government is, in fact, the tangible evidence, the symbolic expression, the day to day embodiment of the political sovereignty of the state. It is, in virtually all democratic societies, the effective instrument of popular sentiment and aspirations. It is the one body in society, Sir, to which all others may be rendered subordinate. Because in its legal aspects it represents the people as a whole.

The Minister, I expect, would not quarrel with that, but in the course of the same remarks that I referred to, he said on Page 563; "I will not in any way try to influence the way an employee chooses to bargain, chooses a bargaining agent, and I'm not doing that to help the employee. I'm doing that to help the employer, the government, which is the people that I represent as a Minister of the Crown." Now, Sir, the Minister says, and quite correctly, that as a Minister, as a member of the government, he is an employer. But he is, by being a Minister of the Crown, an employer representing people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what other employer in the society can make that claim? To pose the question is surely to answer it. No other employer stands in the position of representing people. In that respect and in certain others, the government is unique, because it is the government. And it can do many things which will affect or alter relationships between other employees and employers, and has done so - and on the whole, creditably. But my point is that that power is not reciprocal. The government in the fullness of its powers has no peer in any institution, group or association. Within its constitutional jurisdiction, it is sovereign.

Now it may appear, Mr. Speaker, that I'm belabouring this point, but, I make this suggestion because several conclusions are drawn from it. First, if the government is like no other employer, then those who are employed by the government are not quite like any other employees. They are not necessarily better or worse off--although I think in general they are better in the sense that they have the opportunity to serve the whole community--but whether better or worse, they are different. For if the Ministers of the Crown are those whom the public have, through their franchise and the Legislature, entrusted responsibility for general policy and senior administration at one level, then the employees of the government are those serving the public through general administration and execution of policy at another level. The critical point, therefore, is this: Whereas the employee in all other situations is there to serve

BILL 7

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) an interest that is private and limited, the government employee is there to serve an interest that is public and unlimited. Unlimited, that is, except by the legal and geographical limits of the government's jurisdiction.

Well, Sir, I'm not prepared to argue that the public servant's position should be less secure and its conditions of work less fair, and so on, I've already made that point. Nor am I prepared to argue that a public servant should not be free to resign, seek public office, and return to the public service if unsuccessful at the polls. That, indeed, is possible now, and Sir, to just pick up that argument from where the Minister of Public Works left off, he argued that the public needed men of the calibre of those who have had experience in the Civil Service. Because of their knowledge of the department they would perforce be people who would lend their expertise and their knowledge to the position that they would occupy if became elected. I disagreed with that concept. I disagreed and that's a personal disagreement on my part, because I believe that the Civil Service, by the nature of their employment, occupy a unique position in government, and I believe that the politician is the man who, essentially, is the buffer between those who administer the laws on the one hand, and the people who are affected by those laws. A politician must always be in the position of being able to see both sides, and I suspect that a civil servant who goes into politics - and I've seen some examples of that in Ottawa - tend to lean towards the direction of the Civil Service rather than the people, and therefore the people become less ably served as a result; not to quarrel with the expertise and the knowledge that those people bring to the Civil Service or to government, but, Sir, that expertise and that knowledge can be hired rather than elected. Now, the Minister of Mines and Resources has a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry I came in in the middle of the honourable member's argument, but I take it that he said that what other employer is also sort of seeking the public support of the employees, or words to that effect. That we are different than other employers because we also are seeking the votes of our employees. I think that's the way he put it. Is that not similar - and I'm not doing more than to ask the point that he made - with the City of Winnipeg aldermen who employ the civil service in the city who are members of a union?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: The Minister was not in his seat when I dealt with that particular aspect, and perhaps I'd better invite him to read my comments when he has the opportunity, and I'm sure he will do that since he knows now that I have been dealing with the comments that he made in this debate. But, Sir, what concerns me about the provisions of the bill is the overt, partisan activity by the public servant while in public service, for such activity must inevitably lead to a confusion of roles. I don't know how it can be otherwise. On the one hand, the public servant seeks to do what the public bid them to do, and on the other he seeks to influence the public in its decisions as to what it will have him do. Given the supremacy of the government as a legal institution, Sir, it has immense coercive powers, whether it is actively employed or not; and when its employees are engaged in partisan political activities we move closer to the position where those coercive powers can be employed, whether they are campaigning or not. I am of course aware that what the government is arguing is that such activity will be open to all its employees, and I realize that that's been the burden of their position, and some of these may not be supporters of the government of the day. But that argument is an attempt, Sir, to side-step the issue, because there are two points that can be made about this particular argument.

Let's consider the analogy that the Minister has drawn, with a normal employer/employee relationship. I suggest to him that if the employees of a corporation were engaged in activities directed at the shareholders of the corporation with the object thereby to shape or change the policy of the management of the corporation, the shareholders might legitimately wonder what was going on. And their confusion, their uncertainty and their doubt, it seems to me, would be perfectly legitimate, whether the employees were agitating on behalf of the management or against it. Of course, some employees will support the opposition; we're aware of that. No matter what party's in power. Government employees working overtly for an opposition are not likely to intimidate voters, because they know that no real coercive power exists with the opposition. The power of intimidation, however subtle, however innocent, and however

BILL 7

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) unintentional, can never be absent when civil servants are actively engaged in partisan activities for the government, of whatever party. The magnitude of government grants and benefits are far too great; the dependence on government business, direct or indirect, too great; and the protection of the public servant within the Civil Service is too great for there not to be a real and present danger that government employees who engage in partisan activity for a government party will exert influence of a kind that may have little to do with the merits of their case, and much to do with the fact that they are perceived to be agents of the government. Well, Sir, this is the case of the opposition parties.

What I've attempted to do is to make the difference between the civil servant running as a candidate in an election on the one hand, and a civil servant engaging in activities during the course of an election campaign, activities which we feel, Sir, will do great harm to the Civil Service, will be able to exert an undue amount of pressure on behalf of the government in power, whatever government that may be. For that reason, Sir, we oppose this bill. As my friend the Member for Riel stated, there is much in this bill to commend its passage. There are sections of this bill that I think will do a great deal of harm to the Civil Service of this country. We must reject it on that basis, because surely to accept it as a principle would be interpreted by the Minister of Finance, if no one else, as being in favour of something of that which we are not in favour of. For that reason I regret very much the Minister of Labour did not use the opportunity, and he had unlimited time to use that, did not use the opportunity of saying something about this bill that would lead us to believe there's a reasonable degree of hope that the government were prepared to accept a modification or change of direction in that particular aspect of the legislation. The debate, I presume now, because of the failure on the part of the Minister will continue for some time to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the Honourable Member from Morris would be prepared to answer my question now. The honourable member in referring to the Civil Service Commission and use of patronage referred to the case of one Keith Robson, and suggested that he in fact had been appointed because of political patronage; is the honourable member aware of the fact that this same Keith Robson that he refers to was a Progressive Conservative candidate who ran in the constituency I now represent against my immediate predecessor, Mr. T. P. Hillhouse.

MR. JORGENSEN: The Minister, the Attorney-General has a capacity of asking irrelevant questions. I really don't give a damn whether he was a Conservative at that time or now, the man is an opportunist whether he calls himself a Conservative, a Liberal or a Socialist. It has really nothing to do with the particular case. He believed in establishing a monopoly for the government. The Minister of Agriculture saw in him a tool with which he could achieve what he believes in, and appointed him for that purpose rather than an appointment coming through the Civil Service. He was appointed for one purpose, and that is to achieve the aims and the ambitions and the desires of the Minister of Agriculture. That's the reason he's there - by-passing the Civil Service.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to prolong the debate unnecessarily but I think that a great case--(Interjection)--I have a booster in the House, thank you, the Honourable Minister of Finance. I think that this side of the House has made a very considerable case with respect to the inherent problems that can arise from accepting this bill. I think that the underlying principle - and I will be generous in all of my remarks to the honourable gentlemen on the other side - the underlying principle of this bill is personal freedom, or is it? How many injustices have been perpetrated in the name of freedom, and I think that this is a question that is really relevant. We don't have to go very far, it was last year where a bill was introduced giving the right to strike to every worker in this province, even those engaged in strategic services. We are now faced with a situation where this will prove to have been a very illogical kind of legislation. What was wrong with the system as it was before where there was mandatory conciliation that was binding on both parties, and where injustices could not be perpetrated upon those who are bargaining. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that question is relevant and there have been in the name of freedom a number of injustices perpetrated.

I think that my honourable friend from Morris made quite a case of the very specific position occupied by members of the Civil Service. It is not difficult to agree that a civil

BILL 7

(MR. MARION cont'd) servant is not an employee like any other kind of employee. I think that he has a very sacred trust. He works for an ever-changing employer, one who constantly is on the move to obtain favors of all of the citizens of the province. By that very nature the employee of the Civil Service has to be very careful of not being, or not showing too much favoritism to the government of the day for fear of being discriminated against by ensuing governments. And I think, Sir, that the legislation that is being brought before us today is one that has all of those dangerous connotations. I think that if you liken the government to an ordinary employer you will find that there are very very vast differences, yet in the bill we find that in some sections the Executive Council is taking over in essence, if I liken the Executive Committee to the president of a company, it is taking over active management of every department, and I feel that this is completely wrong. I think that the government of the day is there to set policies and direction to what should be done for the welfare of the residents, the citizens of the province. It's not there to administer those policies but rather to set them. I think that in private enterprise the president sets the guidelines and does not communicate directly with employees. This is another point that is weak in the amendments that are being brought where directly you find the Executive Committee coming into contact with the employee--(Interjection)--by of course weakening the Civil Service Commission.

I think it's difficult, Mr. Speaker, to voice all of the dangers that are inherent, all of the dangers that are inherent in providing this ultimate freedom. I think that one's position in society has a tampering effect on his freedom, what is good for one is not necessarily good for another; and I think that I don't have to come up with concrete examples of what I mean, we can look at the various vocations in this world and we can see for ourselves that there are those who can permit themselves some liberties in areas because of their very selection, or their very walk of life, where others can not permit themselves those same liberties. I think that this analogy stands with respect to the Civil Service.

I believe in freedom of the individual be he where he might find himself, but I think that having said what I have just said it is impossible to apply that freedom holus bolus and to permit everyone to offer himself the same liberties. I use as an example: in this bill we find that a deputy minister does not have the same options as are afforded to everyone else. That is a stringent yet realistic approach. The deputy minister being involved in applying the policies that are set by government, the government of the day, is so directly intertwined with the political process that it was wise that he be refrained from taking on this active and positive freedom that is advocated by the bill. I wonder if we go far enough, Sir? I wonder if there are not other department heads that don't have the same status as a deputy minister who should also, because of the very nature of their position, be withheld that complete freedom of being a bagman or of running for office.

I think that the tremendous importance of the Civil Service to the inhabitants of our province is one that I don't have to lend credence to, it's totally evident. And I think that for that very reason it's important that we protect that sacred trust of a civil servant. It is in my opinion probably very wise to offer all of the freedom and the latitude that is possible to give to employees of the Civil Service. But I think it is important too that if we have withdrawn this privilege from deputy ministers let's look into all of the other classifications of employees that we have, and let's adjudicate where it should be permissible and where it shouldn't be permissible.

I think that it was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who said that if he showed a preference for a union or a group - yes a union - be it MGEA over CUPE or vice versa, he felt that that very preference that he would show could have countervailing effects on the decisions that would be made by the syndicates, and I thought that that was a very reasonable comment to make, and I completely endorse that comment. I think that the comment is applicable in essence to what I am trying to say now. I think that there is no doubt that there are those who can enjoy complete freedom within the Civil Service and not really have an effect on the proper functioning of that service. Yet there are those that if they do run for office, or if they do become partisan, and for any party - I am trying to walk the middle of the road; I am trying to say that these dangers would exist for any and all parties in office at the day. I think that there is an analogy there, and I think that it would be dangerous if we didn't evaluate very carefully where the freedom of options, the total freedom of options are made available.

BILL 7

(MR. MARION cont'd)

I'm afraid that if - and I would use this as an example - I'm afraid that if you had a department head, not a deputy minister I'll grant but a department head, who was actively supporting a party, and taking all of the measures necessary to show that he's actively supporting that party, if he had employees under him I would humbly suggest, Sir, that these employees would be without doubt intimidated and they would not certainly openly profess their political belief. I think that this becomes a dangerous thing to have in the Civil Service. I think that merit rating is one that was considered and brought out by some of our members, some of the members on this side of the House, and I think that it should be certainly one of the base criteria used when giving increases in responsibility to an employee. And I would be very much afraid that if in the Civil Service you had holus bolus people professing political faiths, you would then be minimizing to a very great degree the importance of merit rating, and you would in essence be saying if you are of the political faith of the government of the day you have all of the possibilities to attain whatever goal you want irrespective of the real potential that you have in the Service, and I think that this is certainly not going to stand the citizens of our province in good stead.

I thought from the outset, or from the outset when I looked at the bill, that there were two basic principles that were being announced. On the one hand there was the principle that employees should have complete freedom to do as they will. Now I won't lend any more arguments to this side or to that principle, I think it has been well stated that it is utopic and not really in keeping with all of the other facts of life in the world of today.

I think the second principle that has been, or is being enunciated in the bill, is the one with respect to the powers of the Executive Committee. Basically, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are effectively emasculating the Civil Service Commission, which in essence should have the complete authority on adjudicating responsibilities, setting up job descriptions, providing for increments, providing for promotions within the Civil Service. I think that all of these powers should be vested in the Civil Service Commission, and what we see in this bill is none other than removing from that Civil Service Commission all powers that are at all meaningful and vesting them in the Executive Committee. Now as I mentioned earlier on this is tantamount of saying, if you make the analogy of private enterprise and government, and I realize that there are very basic differences and I used them as part of my argument in talking about freedom within the Civil Service, but if we nonetheless make the comparison it would seem to me that a president then would in a large corporation be talking to each and every one of his employees about his responsibilities and his potential. Now this is just absolutely impossible and improbable. The only thing that makes it possible for government is the fact that there are a vast number of members in the government - in the government of today there are 31 - each of which has his own executive and they might number anywhere up to 35 or 40, so when you multiply--the executive of his constituency I'm talking about--and if you multiply this you have a tremendous number of potential bosses willing to interfere with the process of the Civil Service Commission. I think that this is not a desirable factor. I think that surely this section of the Act, and there are specifically two sections in my opinion that merit a great deal of study and a great deal of revamping and are not acceptable to anyone on this side, and they will have to certainly be amended in large part before we are able to accept that this is the kind of Civil Service Act that we want for the Province of Manitoba. If the executive committee has the total and final word at every government change, could you imagine the wholesale slaughter of employees that would happen every time the government changed hands? Well I think that-- I don't--it's been stressed, this case has been made, and I can see that except those people --(Interjection)--I see that I have a friend that's supporting me in my argument. I can see that there would be wholesale changes and we would be slaughtering, in essence, all of those who would honestly like to make a career of the Civil Service and who have the qualifications to make the Civil Service or to keep the Civil Service at the level of potential that it has today, at the level of performance that it has today.

I can't help but thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for one comment that he made today. It was a comment that was much appreciated when he said, "I would undertake to accept reasonable amendments when this bill is brought . . ."--the Minister shakes his hand and I am trying to keep my cool, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: If the honourable member would just qualify that by saying I would consider them.

BILL 7

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

MR. MARION: Well I will even accept that. Thank you, Honourable Minister of Labour. I think that this is a new turn of events because in yesterday's debate there was no question that the Minister was adamant about the bill should stand as he was presenting it. I'm pleased, I'm indeed pleased, and this is the only reason whereby I could in conscience support that it now be sent to Committee for further study and amending. I think that there were some comments made a while ago by the Honourable Member from Morris where he realized and he underscored the fact that there are some good points brought out in the bill, and I think that I would like to add my feelings along the same line, that there are certainly some good points in the bill and it would be a shame for us to lose all of the potential, worthy amendments that are being brought to the Civil Service Act, and that is the reason that I am compelled, because of those good points, I am compelled to let it go to Law Amendments. This means that--(Interjection)-- Pardon? With a great deal of reservation. But this only means that when it is being studied at that level we are indeed going to bring forth amendments and we will certainly not let the bill be railroaded through without making our point and stressing the validity of the amendments that we make. I think it will be our job not to obstruct but to offer some very constructive criticism. This we intend to do, and again I voice the comments that were made by my colleagues of the Liberal Party that we support the bill with grave reservations, and we will make those reservations or we will expand on those reservations when it comes to the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 15, an Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 16

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 16, an Act to amend The County Courts Act. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the Honourable Attorney-General introduced Bills Nos. 15 and 16, he told us in some respect that they were bills of very similar nature and I fully concur with what he said in that respect. The Bill No. 15 dealt with The Queen's Bench Act and this one deals with The County Courts Act, and if the Honourable Attorney-General would read the comments that I made on Bill 15, there is no need for me again to reiterate at this time the comments that I made at that time, which in essence were a layman's suggestion put forward for debate, that maybe we should be looking in the future towards having a common court rather than a distinction between the Queen's Bench and the County Courts.

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister gave this bill second--or introduced it for second reading, some of the comments he made were to the effect that much of this was in effect house-cleaning amendments and those that are in that category I fully concur. Since the government last year established the office of a Chief County Court Judge, naturally there has to be some amendments spelling out that position in the Act where it so applies. One of the other suggested changes is the one dealing with the acceptance of certified mail as well as registered mail, and if the Minister can indicate to me that certified mail moves faster than registered mail, well I'll accept that as well. It is my own personal observation, Mr. Speaker, that mail of any kind, whether it be male or female, does not move too fast once it gets into the government channels.

A MEMBER: You got that eh, Wally? You got that, eh?

MR. GRAHAM: We have something else though, Mr. Speaker, in here that did cause me a great deal of concern. This was a section which the Minister is introducing which deals with the residency of judges. Now it's quite proper, I guess, that there are certain people in this Province of Manitoba that members of the Legislature want to specify the exact location of their residence, and I would suggest that one of those people is probably the Lieutenant-Governor. We do have a Lieutenant-Governor's residence in the province and I think we can expect that he should live in that residence. Likewise at the other end of the spectrum,

BILL 16

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) Mr. Speaker, there are some people who have been incarcerated for various violations of the law where we can expect to designate the residence for those people for a certain length of time. But I notice that here the Attorney-General is attempting to spell out the residential area of the Chief Judge and he suggests that the Chief County Court Judge shall reside within the Eastern Judicial District.

Mr. Speaker, we for quite a number of years on this side have expressed our concern about centralization in the Province of Manitoba; we have suspected that government, in any manner that they want to choose, will endeavour to bring all the powers into one central area, and that in doing so they may very well endanger the other areas of the Province of Manitoba. Here again, we find an action of that nature where we are attempting by legislation to enforce the residency of the Chief County Court Judge in the central area or the urban area of Manitoba. And I don't think that we should have that right. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't bother me at all if the Chief County Court Judge lived in Portage la Prairie; it wouldn't bother me at all. It wouldn't bother me if he lived in Brandon; it wouldn't bother me if he lived in Thompson. But I don't think that we have the right to dictate that he should live in the Eastern Judicial District. I don't think the Attorney-General really wants that right. Maybe when he's closing debate he will tell us why he wants that right for him.

If we profess to live in a free society, Mr. Speaker, then I think we must have the freedom of movement of individuals; as much as is humanly possible that we should attempt to refrain from impinging on the rights of the individual to live in an area of his choice, in a community of his own choosing, and if he particularly likes to live in Churchill, then why should we try and stop that?--(Interjection)--Yes. Mr. Speaker, there are many people in today's society who commute 50, 60, 70 miles daily and I consider that they do a fairly good job, so I would like the Minister, when he is closing debate on this bill, to explain to us exactly why he wants the Chief Justice to live in the Eastern Judicial District.

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

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there a number of points that have been raised and, as the Member for Birtle-Russell stated, he was reiterating the comments which he had made in respect to the introduction of Bill 15, the one dealing with The Queen's Bench Act, insofar as the need for two separate courts. I want to first, of course, indicate that this is a matter which is of federal nature, a constitutional question insofar as the development of the court system and separated between the Queen's Bench and the County Court. I think it can be reasonably stated that over the past number of years there has been a gradual assumption of greater jurisdiction by the County Court. For instance, a few years ago we saw the increase in different areas that the County Court was able to deal with, including an increase in the amount of the sums for which one could undertake action within the County Court for collection of moneys and damages.

I would say to the honourable member that in principle there is no strong reason for being of the opinion that this present division between County Court and Queen's Bench need necessarily continue into an infinite type of future. The Law Reform Commission, Dominion level, has been interested in this entire question of the division of the courts into Queen's Bench and County Court, and are presently analyzing this, I gather, and it has been argued in different circles that there is no practical reason to continue the division of one court from another. But again let me repeat that this is a federal matter and does not really reflect upon the substance of the amendments before us. Insofar as the certified mail and registered mail is concerned, I am advised--of course certified mail, as we all know here, is a new innovation of the post office brought in during the past year. It is similar to registered mail although it is cheaper and more convenient. With certified mail the sender obtains packages which are obtained from the post office. As with registered mail, the receiver of the mail signs a form acknowledging receipt or proof of delivery. In this way once a certified mail package has been purchased from the post office, everything can be done from the office of the claimant or from the court office. In particular there is no requirement, as with registered mail, for an attendance to be made at the post office for the letter to be stamped and the particulars inscribed in some record book.

The third matter raised was in respect to residence. I think there is a very sound and practical reason for inserting within the legislation that each judge will in fact live within the judicial district in which that judge has received his commission for. A judge has to be available at pretty well any time for emergency situations, emergency services, calls, night calls, injunctions, bail, which are required to be dealt with on a very quick basis, expeditious basis,

BILL 16

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) and certainly the judge for the Western Judicial District, for instance, who was residing in the City of Winnipeg - in Winnipeg - rather than out in the area which the Honourable Member for Birtle represents, and one of his constituents required immediate service because of some emergency situation which was occurring and required service in order to obtain an injunction, I think that the Honourable Member for Birtle would be quite embarrassed if in fact that judge was not available because he was residing within the City of Winnipeg, and a matter of an hour, two hours, might be involved. One could list many many different instances where immediate night service is required on weekends, Sundays, different times that there just is not . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member state his point of order.

MR. GRAHAM: I was not at any time referring to a County Court judge, I was referring only to the chief County Court judge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the honourable member was referring only to the chief judge, that the same arguments hold true there for the chief judge as for other judges, and more so because the chief judge, County Court judge is responsible for developing the administration, for the rotating of the judges, for substantial work within the Eastern Judicial District in which the large bulk of the court work is done - and I can just think of the chaos the malfunctioning, the difficulty which would occur if the chief County Court judge, because he was a resident of some community 175 miles from the City of Winnipeg insisted on his right to live out in that community, to return on weekends, or in the evenings, just what sort of difficulty that would create. I don't foresee that sort of thing happening, because I do think that it would be very rare indeed that a chief County Court judge would so inflict himself with this, but I think it's very important that we ensure that the courts of this province are handled in a smooth effective way and that we do not permit without very good cause, which is provided for under this section, for a judge to be living far distant from the area in which he is primarily responsible for.

So with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would permit this bill to proceed to committee.

MR. SPEAKER put the question - MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 18

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker when Bill No. 18 was introduced into the House, I recall that this was a bill that was put forward last year, never received final approval, and we find that it's back in the House at this time.

This bill very basically is a simple bill dealing with a new term that they want to use in the Highways Department in the classification of an industrial road. The Minister when he made his statement on second reading said, it's just a matter of designating another type of road dealing with what we like to call under this bill, an industrial road. Mr. Speaker, if that is all that is involved, then I need say no more at this time; but the Minister fails to identify what he would classify as an industrial road. I asked questions last year on what he would call an industrial road and what he would not call an industrial road, and I did not get the answers at that time.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have in the Province of Manitoba our main highway system, which is the Provincial Trunk Highway System. Then we have a provincial road system, then we have a municipal road system, and up in northern Manitoba what we call a winter road system. Now--(Interjection)--well, there's some debate as to whether we have a winter road system or not, and I think that debate is quite legitimate. And now we find we're going to have an industrial road, and I don't think it will be a system, I think it'll be isolated cases that the Minister wants to bring forward from time to time, and he can classify and unclassify a road at his own request practically; he doesn't have to bring a bill into the House to state that this will be an industrial road and that one will not be; he has the power under the legislation to give

BILL 18

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) a temporary classification or a permanent classification, he can also abandon it after he has classified it, almost at any time.

And herein, Mr. Speaker, lies the basic problem. We don't know what use that road is going to be put to; we don't know what the purpose is going to be for the original classification in the first place. He has indicated in his remarks that there are roads that are presently being used where there is overwidth, overweight and overlength vehicles presently moving, and at the present time they have been to get a permit every time they move, and under the industrial road system they would not have to .

He does not tell us whether in this bill the public at large will be denied the use of an industrial road. And we know, Mr. Speaker, that there are roads in this province at the present time, roads that are being built with public funds, and they are being denied the use of the public. They're classified, I would suspect they would be classified as an industrial road. And I refer specifically, Mr. Speaker, to the road that has been built by Manitoba Hydro from Gillam to Kettle Rapids and thence on to Long Spruce. And, Mr. Speaker, there are guards on that road at the present time to prevent public use of those roads. People that have paid license fees, Autopac insurance, have complied in every aspect of the law, who are not being allowed the use of roads which are built by a Crown corporation, which spends public money. Now if that is what the Minister is intending to classify as an industrial road, and that is the use that it's going to be put to, and the public is going to be denied that right of the use of that road, then I have to object to this type of legislation. If that is not the case, then let the Minister tell us so. So far he has said nothing.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, there are other roads that have been built, and I refer to roads in the pulp industry, built by private money. These are contractors who year after year have taken out contracts through the Department of Mines and Natural Resources to cut pulp, transport it, and over the period of time they have spent considerable of their own money to build a road which is a private road, and I wonder if this is the type of road that the Minister is talking about taking over, and classifying as an industrial road. And if he is going to do that, Mr. Speaker, is he then going to open it to the public, and if he takes it over as an industrial road is he prepared to pay the person that built it? Some of these people, Mr. Speaker, over the years have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to build and maintain those roads, and are these the types of roads that the Minister is talking about classifying as industrial roads, and taking over without compensation to those that built them?

Mr. Speaker, these are but two of the concerns that I have. When this bill goes to committee I would hope that the Minister has the answers and is prepared to identify the intent of the industrial road system and the usage of it, whether it will be open to the public use or whether it will be closed at certain times. So far, the very few words that were given on second reading, Mr. Speaker, leave more questions than the answers that he gave us. So, Mr. Speaker, I have some reservations that I hope the Minister would answer when he closes debate and when the bill goes to committee I hope that we get further clarification at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Virden. (Stand) The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

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

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the last day we were on my estimates there was some question as to whether or not I had used an unparliamentary expression. I should like to say that I have checked Hansard and it appears that I indeed did, and I wish to withdraw that expression at this point of time.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

You know, members should know and should appreciate that while the rules provide that one should not use unparliamentary expressions, that we should not attempt to circumvent those rules and that if indeed the fact is accurate as stated, the fact is that the rules should prevent you from stating it, and I would not want to be breaking the rules of the House, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding what I believe the truth of the matter is.

The Member for - well, I'm not sure which member it was, drew to my attention the fact that - yes, it was the Member for Birtle-Russell, that we have particular problems in Manitoba, and indeed peculiar to Manitoba, with respect to the farm machinery prices and with respect to the trade practices of farm machinery companies. And I should like to advise the Member for Birtle-Russell that that is not peculiar to Manitoba, that indeed, Mr. Chairman, all four western provinces are unhappy with the way the farm machinery business is conducted in western Canada, and as a result they have agreed at the Western Economic Conference only a few weeks ago, to set up a four-province review committee which would be asked to call the various companies before the committee to justify (a) prices; and (b) their trade practices. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the companies are attempting to play one province off against another in terms of setting the conditions of operating within each province. That was reflected, that kind of opinion was reflected at the Western Conference of Premiers. So, Mr. Chairman, I should remind the members opposite that we're not the only province in western Canada that are having some problems with respect to the sale and distribution in the supply of spare parts in the farm machinery industry.

Now, it is true that Manitoba took somewhat of a lead a few years ago in bringing about an updated piece of legislation and much of which, Mr. Chairman, conforms with the Consumer Protection Act; much of which conforms - it was updated to conform with the Consumer Protection Act applying to other commodities. And so it is true that when one makes those kinds of dramatic changes that there could be some hostility for the moment. But, Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of advice on the subject, and our engineers advise us that we are not onerous with our legislation and that the conditions that we lay down in the Act are really minimum requirements that should be adhered to, that they are not an exaggerated demand on the part of the government as against the farm machinery industry.

I think it's true to say, Mr. Chairman, that we could bring about some improvement, and obviously no piece of legislation, Mr. Chairman, is perfect, and I think there is room for amendments to be brought in on farm machinery legislation; and indeed members opposite will have an opportunity to discuss that at this particular session. It is hoped that we will make some changes in particular in the area of relaxing the - or changing the bonding requirements with respect to certain types of operation in the province where we found that we did run into some difficulty. Legislation is never put on the books to be there forever, it's to conform to what is practical and hopefully we can refine it as we go along.

The western Premiers also have asked their Ministers of Agriculture to include the question of fertilizer in their deliberations and in the meetings that they have with the fertilizer industry, so that we will have some input on that aspect as well.

They have also made known to the Government of Canada their concern about the importation of American cattle to Canada and indeed Manitoba, that could contain DES and have asked for a ban on those kinds of shipments. And I think that is something that members opposite would want to agree with.

I should like to now deal, Mr. Chairman, with the comments of the Member for Lakeside because it seems that he got overly excited the other day, Mr. Chairman, when we talked about the land-lease program and the objectives of that program and the policies of our Crown lands program and so on. I should like to remind the Honourable Member for Lakeside, as well as the Member for Birtle-Russell, that as far as the Crown lands program is concerned that the policy decision not to sell Crown lands was made away back in 1964 and it is a decision that was made in the best interest of the public as far as I'm concerned and we are continuing with that policy. Members opposite should not try to leave the impression that that is something new.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit a . . . for clarification, for his information sake, I do not blame him for not knowing. He is quite right that a decision was made to freeze Crown lands; dates back to some time certainly in the previous

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) administration's time. He should also be aware particularly in the region that he speaks of, the Interlake, one of the major reasons for that freeze was that there was a massive land inventory program started in conjunction with the Federal Government and it was a decision, and I think as he says a wise decision, not to make any further disposal of those lands until this land inventory was complete and until further policy decisions could be made. The suggestion is not quite the same as suggesting that the previous government initiated a land-freeze program that was to be there for all times. In fact I can indicate to the Honourable Minister that I myself would have attempted to have influenced the government of the day, once the information was before us, to make those decisions, various judgments as to which lands should be best kept in the public domain for game management purposes, for recreational purposes, indeed for other reasons, if they had marginal agricultural aspects, and which lands might indeed have been put up for private sale.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I appreciate the comments that the member made and it is true that any decision that government makes at any given time in history is not an irrevocable decision--including the decisions that we make, that is very true. It depends on the needs of society at a given moment in time. For example, at this time in our history it is thought that we don't need the indiscriminate development of virgin lands to supply the market that we must supply and the food needs and so on, that it is probably premature to talk about agriculture going away up to 53, you know, for the moment. But some day, Mr. Chairman, technology and all other things having changed and the demands on society having changed, we may attempt to have agriculture as far north as Churchill, depending on what could be produced in that area. So one could never take the position that a decision made at any given moment is irrevocable. And so it is true that while the previous administration did put a freeze on the sale of Crown land in 1964 and maintained that freeze throughout all of the years up to 1969 when they did give up the reins of government and which were continued by this administration. I think it's fair to say that that is a matter of policy that could change. No question about that, Mr. Chairman. But at this point in time I would agree with my honourable friend that it is desirable not to change.

Now the Member for Lakeside took a great deal of exception to the land-lease program as being a tool towards giving people opportunities to farm or to produce agricultural products through the use of agricultural land. He believed that that was an unnecessary approach, and I really question that, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that I've already given to the House, the fact is that not everyone has access to money, to credit notwithstanding their abilities, their qualifications. So it is indeed an opening up of new opportunities for that category of people that may want to participate in that way.

I should like to point out to him that while he relied in his comments so much on the credit aspect, he forgot one important decision that he was involved in making, Mr. Chairman; and that was that the Government of Manitoba in 1968 went out of the credit field completely, Mr. Chairman, completely. So that he was not even concerned about assisting those that were able to get into it through a financing program.--(Interjection)--The Member for Arthur says that is not right. Well I will recall the debate at that time and the subsequent debate, Mr. Chairman, when this government was elected, when in 1968 the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was put on the shelf and all they had left, Mr. Chairman, was the guarantee credit program where they would guarantee loans made by private institutions. Mr. Chairman, if you look at the record of what happened between . . .

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I want to point out to the member that at that time the Natural Products Act actually had two sections. One was still for credit from the Manitoba Agricultural Credit, and the other, the second, and it's on record, was for guaranteed loans through the banks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. That is not a point of order, that's a difference of opinion between two members.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the record will show, and I will table the record for my honourable friend from Arthur, the record will show, and I'm speaking from memory here, Mr. Chairman, but I believe there were no more than 19 loans as I recall it - I may be out a bit but I will check--(Interjection)--That's right, there were no more than about 19 loans guaranteed, Mr. Chairman, in a whole year, guaranteed. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because the money market was at its peak, the cost of borrowings were at an all time high at the moment

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) and the private institutions had a greater demand for money than to provide agriculture with financing. They didn't consider agriculture as a high priority and therefore they were using their capital resources, Mr. Chairman, in other areas, completely ignoring agriculture, completely ignoring. Now, my honourable friend says because that was a tight money situation that's right, we didn't make many loans, or didn't guarantee many. Mr. Chairman, when does government intervention arise. Is it at a time when there is all kinds of similar services available at reasonable cost, or is it a time when there are no services available, or if they are, they're at a very high cost. If there is a need for intervention, Mr. Chairman, it should have been the time to stay in; it should have been the time to stay in, when the private capital sources were drying up for agriculture. But that's the time they went out, Mr. Chairman, that's the time they went out of business. And you will recall, Mr. Chairman, you will notice if you check Hansard the debates in this Chamber arising out of the reconstitution of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the need for it; the need was because of the drying up of private capital and where there was a need to get back into the program. So my honourable friend should not stand here and tell me that the way to transfer farms from one generation to another, Mr. Chairman, is through credit, which he pulled away from the farmers in 1968 and through 1969.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I know the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. ENNS: I know the Honourable Minister and I assumed that he would be putting the other side of the coin on the up to now correct description of the events of '68. It's quite true as he said this major change is made with respect to the Provincial Credit Corporation. However he also knows, he also knows and didn't really object too seriously at that time, that the service to some extent was a matter of duplication; we had some indication from federal authorities of their intent to increase their federal credit corporation program and it was a judgment made by the department at that time, under my leadership, that we could well use our resources in other fields. I don't really argue with the Honourable Minister's description.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. What is the honourable member's point of order?

MR. ENNS: I think, Mr. Chairman, it's a point of order to at least bring to the Honourable Minister's attention . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member is on a point of order and I'm asking him to state his point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well the point of order is that a misrepresentation of fact would not be of deliberate intent on the part of the Minister to leave standing on the order paper.

MR. USKIW: The Honourable Member for Lakeside is quite correct, Mr. Chairman, I would not want to misrepresent his position. But let me point out to him, Mr. Chairman, that it is a matter of fact that the previous administration withdrew from the credit field at a time when it was most needed, at a time when it was most needed and when the federal authorities did not provide the service as he envisaged.

And let me point out another event, Mr. Chairman, because he hasn't recollected his own statement. When I made the remark here a year ago that we are going to get out of mortgage financing because the Federal Government is providing it at a much lower rate of interest and there was no need for duplication, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lakeside said, hear hear, I agree with that. And I think you will find remarks in Hansard. I haven't checked but I'm sure they're there, and he still agrees with me, Mr. Chairman. So how then does he tell this House, Mr. Chairman, since he's agreeing with all of the points that I have made, that land-lease is not important. We can rely on credit as a means of transferring a farm from one generation to another or allowing a farmer that already has a farm but too small to be economic, to acquire additional land resources without undue and heavy mortgage obligations, or, even for those that can't indeed incur greater debts. How is he going to bring that about, Mr. Chairman. I would like him to give me an answer to that before this debate is over, because we are not in the credit program. The federal credit program is not responding to at least I'm sure 50 percent of the applicants in this field, therefore there is a real need that has to be met. If we are serious, Mr. Chairman, that we want to maintain a reasonable population

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. USKIW cont'd) balance between rural Manitoba and urban Manitoba. I assume that my honourable friend for Lakeside who repudiates the TED report, that he is sincere in that; and therefore if he is sincere in repudiating the recommendations of the TED report that we don't want to have a reduction of our farm numbers down to 20,000, then I solicit his support, Mr. Chairman, for the only option that will allow people to maintain a reasonable population balance as between rural Manitoba and the urban--(Interjection)--an option, yes. That's right, I agree with my honourable friend for Lakeside, Mr. Chairman, it is an option and not the only one and therefore we have two facilities. For those that can find credit resources, that can qualify under the federal credit program, they can get mortgage financing and they can transfer lands from one generation to another, they can add to their holdings. But for those that are rejected there, Mr. Chairman, they will come to the Manitoba program and present their case. And if they are qualified entrepreneurs they will enroll in our program, and therefore we have the best of all worlds. A person with money can buy his land and get into production through financial arrangements; a person that hasn't access to money is able to get into the industry without any long-term capital and we are prepared to finance the short intermediate term capital requirements for that individual. So it's a well-rounded program, federally, provincially, we are able to do the job that has to be done, Mr. Chairman.

I would like the Honourable Member for Lakeside to tell me how we otherwise would bring about that kind of opportunity and those options so that people have a true free choice, a truly free choice as to the kind of industry they want to be involved in, as to where they would want to live, as to how they are going to accomplish those wishes.

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