

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Friday, July 7, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions; Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the release just made that Thompson has the eighth highest wage in Canada, I wonder if he's having more success directing welfare recipients and other people from Winnipeg to Thompson?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, there's very good working relationships between the approximately 35 job placement officers that we have within the Department of Health and Social Development that has proven very effective in all parts of the province and including Inco at Thompson. I should have a press release regarding the results that have been obtained by the job placement officers in the Department of Health and Social Development and what is planned for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked a question, which the best that it was able to transcribe and to make available to me went as follows: "Can the Minister confirm whether there was any business relationship that existed between the staff of the Manitoba Development Corporation and officials of Chemalloy or General Host prior to the decision of the Board of Directors?" Mr. Speaker, the insinuation that is implicit in that question is serious enough that it warranted my specific checking out and assuming that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition intended to imply that there may have been such a business relationship, I have checked and I've been advised that if the member was implying that there was any pecuniary interest, the answer is negative. Now if any honourable member opposite has reason to think that there may have been a pecuniary interest, I would ask them as part of their public duty to so advise us, and if reasonable proof can be established that person or persons will be fired within one hour.

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

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and in the absence of the Attorney-General at this moment, I'd like to direct this question to the First Minister and ask him whether anything is being done about excessive and dangerous overcrowding in various provincial campgrounds on these summer weekends, in particular at Grand Beach Provincial Park?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice. Frankly I confess, I apologize for the Member from Fort Garry, my mind was preoccupied with the statement I had just finished making. I'm really at my wits end to know how to deal with this matter inasmuch as the Leader of the Opposition has succeeded in insinuating that there is some serious reason to believe that there is a pecuniary interest on the part of a person in the employ of the Crown with respect to a business agreement between the Crown and General Host or Chemalloy or Tanco and I'm sure that the news media has already plastered this all over the front page and I don't know whether the news media is amply represented here now so before any restitution can be made, before this matter can be properly dealt with . . . Let me . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Is the Minister now handling the question of the Member for Fort Garry or is he making another statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . give an answer prior to the Member for Fort Garry asking his question. The Member for Lakeside wasn't in his seat so he wouldn't be aware of the nature

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . of my answer -- and I was merely apologizing, I was merely apologizing to the Member for Fort Garry that I did not hear all of his question. Now I can take it as notice or I can ask the honourable member to repeat it so that I can attempt to -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if there's any apologies certainly they're not due from me with respect to the other question I've referred to, this allegation or insinuation of pecuniary interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I accept the First Minister's answer and maybe I can re-direct my question to the Attorney-General now that he's here, and ask him whether anything is being done about excessive and dangerous overcrowding in provincial campgrounds these summer weekends, in particular in the Provincial Park at Grand Beach?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to accept the assumption that is contained in the question that there is some overcrowding. Obviously the honourable member seems to have that view, and since he does it certainly could be looked into and if there is a problem I certainly think it would be attended to and I'll take it as notice.

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

MR. I. H. (IZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Have you had an opportunity to examine the details of Order for Return No. 22 in response to the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie detailing the government entertaining expenses of \$48,000?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe information of that kind is common to everyone. There should be no reason for a question on it. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: On the assumption that your ruling is that the mere filing of the Order is notice to all members, my question to the First Minister then, in the light of the information contained in Order for Return No. 22, does the First Minister intend to instigate a new set of directives on expenditures for entertainment and general entertainment and promotion expenses for government staff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in the first place there is again implicit in the honourable member's question the insinuation that there is something untoward or unacceptably high with respect to the allowable level of expenditures, and I would advise my honourable friend that while he may not have had the opportunity to observe at close and firsthand the allowable expenditures with respect to the public service of Canada, I have and, Sir, we do quite well in comparison.

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

MR. ASPER: Reading as an answer, the answer being then that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to once more, and I would like to have a bit of co-operation from all members, the interruptions on all sides are just as difficult for me to try to cope with as by the rest of the members. I should like to indicate to the honourable member when he has received an answer, it is an answer. There is no rule which says that the answer has to be to his liking. There is no debating the answer. I've asked the honourable members that once before. The answer stands, and if the honourable member wishes to ask another question, he's entitled to that, but there is no debating the question, or the answer.

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

MR. ASPER: Is the First Minister satisfied that the expenditures for promotion and entertainment contained in Order for No. 22 to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is satisfactory to him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return, the Return was filed by the Minister of Finance, I am advised that the Minister of Finance did peruse it. The Minister of Finance did not advise me that there is any cause for undue concern, and I certainly accept the judgment of the Minister of Finance infinitely above that of the Member for Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Has a freeze been placed on further funding of Day Care Centres for children, that is, until next April?

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion and according to the information that I get from my colleagues and officials within the Department of Health and Social Development there has never been a freeze on Day Care Centres. There has been limited funds pertaining to construction of Day Care Centres, but not a freeze.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Can he advise whether inasmuch as the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro's contract expires in July of this year, whether a new contract has been let to Mr. Cass-Beggs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a subsequent question to the First Minister as to conditions of the second contract of Mr. Cass-Beggs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the enthusiasm on both sides of the House to my reply was such that the member's question was drowned out a little. Would he mind repeating?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I shall rephrase the first question. Is the second contract any more lucrative than the first contract let to Mr. Cass-Beggs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, two points in reply to that, the first point being that Mr. Cass-Beggs was not the highest paid public servant in Manitoba, there were others who received as much or more. The second point is that in relation to the salaries paid to other Chairmen of Hydro Corporations across Canada the salary was well in line and intended to be in the lower percentae.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: A final subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Are the fringe benefits compared to any others in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, in relation to merits, Mr. Speaker, they were perhaps lower than is the case for my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Legislature, I must say that the conditions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Question . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the First Minister. Can he advise whether a contract is yet been out for a second term for Mr. Briant of the MDC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when there is anything that merits announcing in that connection, the Minister of Industry and Commerce will make it known.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Is it a matter of government policy that when senior members of government take or enjoy lunch or drinks at the Fort Garry Hotel with any person, that they pay at public expense those drinks and lunches?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of long-standing government policy that when people are prepared to spend their normal relaxation hours in the interest of the business of the province that it is perfectly in order for them to charge the bill for it. In addition to that if in connection with their business operation on behalf of the people of Manitoba it is deemed advisable for them to be the entertainers, if that is the word the honourable member would like to have, then that too -- the host, is the word, and that too is a long-standing practice and I wonder whether -- and of course I'm not inviting an answer, but I would like to think that the honourable member will in due course indicate whether or not he agrees or disagrees with this practice -- in due course, in the right time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): My question is for the First Minister. What is the salary of Mr. Cass-Beggs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The question asked is what is the salary for Mr. Cass-Beggs? Mr. Speaker, I believe that that question was asked some time ago. I believe that an Order for Return was filed showing salaries of all Deputy Ministers and heads of agencies; in fact I did so, Sir, about thirty days ago in this Chamber, Mr. Cass-Beggs, the Deputy Minister of each department, Dr. Warner, the head of the Clean Environment Commission, and others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Because of an interruption I was unable to hear the last of his reply to my first question, but does the limitation on funds made available for Day Care Centers mean that Day Care Centers developing now will be unable to secure provincial assistance and the subsidy under Canada Assistance Plan?

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

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the last part of my question was that there was, to my knowledge, no freeze insofar as the application pertaining to construction of Day Care Centers. There are limited funds as you so well know that were accepted within my estimates. This does not prevent any group from applying and from the department and/or municipalities from referring cases, if need be, to Day Care Centers that meet the requirements under the regulation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. He indicated a moment ago that if there was any pecuniary interest found by the MDC people that he would fire them within the hour. I wonder if he would consider having shares in any of those companies by MDC officials pecuniary interest?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question, but before proceeding on to the main part of it I should make it clear that when I said that if it were established that there was in fact a pecuniary interest on the part of any employee of the Crown in any of the companies in which the Crown entered into a business relationship in the case of Tanco, that such person, I did say, would be fired primarily -- but let it be clear that after the establishment of all reasonable evidence that such was the case, not merely the allegation that that was the case. Now then to answer the honourable member's question, of course, if the MDC itself had any pecuniary interest then that of course would be a pecuniary interest accruing to all of the people of the province and there would be no private gain as such. And that's of course entirely legitimate; in fact I think most members on this side, if not all would agree that that's desirable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether the government is satisfied that they know who the owners are of the owners of the companies that they are dealing with?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that the question that was asked earlier this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition, as to whether a Mr. Kilcherre, Swiss -- I have the transcription here, Mr. Speaker. "Has the Minister investigated the relationship of a Swiss Kilcherre in Tantalum and Chemalloy?" I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that Tanco is owned, up until this point in time, 100 percent by Chemalloy. Chemalloy in turn is owned by approximately 7,000 to 7,500 shareholders. The MDC has obtained a list of all shareholders as of a certain date. It would require updating I presume because shareholders change from time to time. But, unlike the CFI matter, Mr. Speaker, in this case the list of shareholders is available.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the approval of shareholders has been attained for the negotiations that have been completed?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question was asked earlier this afternoon whether the approval of the shareholders of Tanco was obtained prior to entering into this agreement. I answer affirmative because the shareholders of Tanco is Chemalloy and Chemalloy was party to the agreement and a signatory thereof.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the First Minister can indicate whether the shareholders of Chemalloy have approved the transaction of Chemalloy with respect to Tantalum?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is then asking in effect whether the 7,000, 7,500 shareholders have given approval. This is a matter for legal advice I'm sure, but it would be my impression and understanding that the executive officers of the company have entered into this agreement on behalf of the company and are answerable to the shareholders at the next regular meeting and will have to account to them at that meeting.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister made reference to a transcript that he has received of today's proceedings. And I know that there have been situations where transcripts have been asked, I think this is the first occasion in which I find a transcript being used in a debate before it has been received by the members of the House. Now, unless he's doing it -- (Interjection) -- well if the source is not the Hansard then I think the First Minister should indicate it. My impression was that he said he received, and I think the record will show, "a transcript of the proceedings today", and I assume that he is referring to a transcript of Hansard.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the only reason I rise now, Mr. Speaker, is because, if it has caused you some embarrassment, Sir, because I realize full well that transcripts, official transcripts of official proceedings are something completely under the purview of Mr. Speaker. And what I referred to as a transcript is in effect a transcript taken by shorthand of a secretary in the employ of my office. And that, Sir, is a pretty common practice. Perhaps -- well as I already said, Mr. Speaker, if I have embarrassed the Chair I apologize, but certainly I feel it's completely unnecessary to explain further to my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to indicate that I have complete confidence in my staff and I'm sure there were no transcripts handed out. There was no matter of privilege in that case. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In the light of the answers given yesterday by the Minister to my question about the confidentiality of medical records on individuals kept by his department, can the Minister advise whether he or an official of his department authorized the release, or obtained the release of medical information about a woman who was produced as a witness at Wednesday's inquiry by the College of Physicians and Surgeons into the complaint that she was given drugs from the Mount Carmel Clinic without ever having seen a doctor? Can the Minister advise whether he authorized or obtained the release of those documents?

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not authorized the release of such documents. I've been informed that such documents were released and this is being investigated at this stage.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In the light of his reply that he authorized no release, can he describe for us what security exists for the protection of an individual's personal medical records, and how this information could have been obtained by a lawyer for the Mount Carmel Clinic? What security exists?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I attempted to answer to the best of my ability the first question that was posed of me pertaining to the release of some information and I did indicate that it was being investigated by officials of my department. Until the report is before me, a full report, until I have involved perhaps some other members or colleagues in Cabinet I am not in the position to give any other information to this House.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it only your department that could have had access or could it be other departments of government?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, so far as the specific question that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party asked, to my knowledge, and again I'm not going to be too specific, the information in question was held by my department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a further question to the Premier for clarification. The question I asked was not about the MDC now but some members may have bought shares in previous years as a matter of investment in some of these companies that are involved now and just for clarification, is the Premier saying that they may be subject to penalty if they had shares in the last few years prior to the deal without any foreknowledge that at some future date there may be an investment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I get the point of the honourable member's question now.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . The direct inquiry I've made has to do with any current pecuniary interest on the part of any staff person of the MDC that was involved with the negotiation and the transactions. And of course I've already advised the House, although this information is in itself not conclusive, that the answer is a definite negative. I add that if any member in this House has reason to think that in fact there has been such an interest I ask them to give us the information upon which we can proceed to investigate as required. Surely that would follow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of what Minister is in charge of the Civil Service Commission but in the absence of such knowledge can I direct a question to the First Minister? Did Mr. Cass-Beggs sit on the selection board in the choosing of Mr. Briant, Dr. Briant, as head of the MDC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that question bespeaks a good deal about my honourable friend's understanding of the function of government. My honourable friend was a Minister of the Crown for some time; he should know that a selection board such as he refers to has to do with appointments that are made below the rank of a Deputy and Assistant Deputy Minister.

A MEMBER: That's the way it was when we ran the show.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: When you ran the show that's what you think it was but it wasn't.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as most of us are aware of the formal proceedings in the selection of Deputies and Assistant Deputies, can the First Minister answer whether or not a selection board that chose the new Chairman of MDC within the last year included Mr. Cass-Beggs?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's easy, it's relatively simple to answer the question. First of all there was no such board and therefore it follows that Mr. Cass-Beggs was not a member of a non-existent board.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Can the First Minister advise if it wasn't called a board what was it that selected Mr. Briant and included Mr. Cass-Beggs in that selection?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that if he wishes to make noise there's a better place than this Assembly. I've asked all members to keep quiet. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If you'll allow, Sir, I would advise my honourable friends that before we proceeded to make any such appointment we did ask for references and seek certain information and we did receive a reference from the Science Council of Canada. Now if the Science Council of Canada is in some way suspect as being a party hack organization then of course I apologize abjectly to my honourable friends.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel. Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate the same suggestion to the Honourable Member for Radisson as I did to the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Federal Government Science Council has now been brought into the question, may I ask whether the Science Council of Canada was consulted before the selection of Mr. Cass-Beggs as the head of Hydro?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, every word carries with it a nuance. I'm not sure I know what the honourable member means by "consulted". Certainly the senior people of the Science Council were spoken to with respect to Mr. Cass-Beggs and his work that he was carrying out with the Science Council. It's significant to note that Mr. Cass-Beggs was in the employ of the Science Council of Canada for sometime and certainly would have continued there had we not asked him to come here to assume the duties which he did. And it strikes me, Sir, that if Mr. Cass-Beggs was assumed to be adequate in every respect to carry on working with the Science Council of Canada why there should be any question as to his suitability with respect to the responsibilities that he carries here.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I ask a final subsequent question. Would the Minister be prepared to table any formal correspondence with the Science Council prior to the selection of Mr. Cass-Beggs as Chairman?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can advise my honourable friend, as I believe I already did on one occasion if not two, that the Head of the Science Council of Canada did request of me

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . the suggestion, did request of me the authorization rather to proceed with the publishing of a work of Mr. Cass-Beggs with respect to Hydro developments and environmental considerations. Obviously his work is considered to be quite meritorious in the eyes of his peer groups. Men capable of scientific analysis which I'm afraid my honourable friend isn't capable of.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would be willing to table that fine piece of work?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd be quite prepared to table that but I'm afraid that it would receive the same blank reception on the part of my honourable friend as other documents we've tabled with respect to Hydro development projects and policies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Could the House Leader indicate when he's going to call the Utilities Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, my answer to my honourable friend, that I have called the Public Utilities Committee on a number of occasions. I don't know where my honourable friend has been.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to that of the Member for Churchill. When can we expect the next installment of the Public Utilities Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Would the House Leader agree that there was some unfinished business on the Utilities Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the House Leader is not a member of the Committee on Public Utilities and it could be a matter of opinion by the Honourable Member for Churchill or any other honourable member as to whether or not they completed the business. I'm not in a position to know. All I do know is that no request has been made to me at this stage for the calling of the Committee on Public Utilities.

MR. BEARD: Would the House Leader then consider this an official request by a member of the Utilities Committee to call that meeting?

MR. PAULLEY: Why certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared at any time to listen to the request of my honourable friend the Member for Churchill, and certainly I will take it into consideration.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister appears to have done some considerable research into the events leading up to the Tantalum Mining acquisition this morning between the time the questions were asked this afternoon and now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I don't know why I have to remind some members more often than others, but this is the question period and I would suggest that they adhere to that rule. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: In view of the foregoing, can the First Minister explain now why the Government of Manitoba chose to pay \$1.5 million today for something that was paid \$300,000 for only one year ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm flattered by the suggestion of the Leader of the Liberal Party that I have been able to find time to do the in-depth research that he suggests I have. However, I have been in a position to draft some key questions and, to be brief, can advise my honourable friend that while the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who has already undertaken to provide a fuller report on this early next week, nevertheless I can tell my honourable friend in the interim that his suggestion in his question that the Crown has paid 1.5 million for 15 percent of the equity while Chemalloy was able to obtain 40 percent for one quarter the amount a year ago is quite incorrect, Mr. Speaker. The amount that my honourable friend is referring to was not the full transaction; it was the final payment of a transaction entered into more than two years ago; not in the last year, more than two years ago, and at that

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . time Chemalloy Corporation entered into an agreement to purchase what is now effectively 30 percent, for an amount of approximately 2.2 million dollars; not one quarter of 1.5, but 2.2 million dollars approximately for 30 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that has to be compared in practical terms with a payment of 1.5 million dollars by the Crown or 25 percent equity, because my honourable friend will say it's 1.5 million for 15 percent equity and the remaining 10 percent equity will be obtained by virtue of the \$2 million additional guarantee. But does my honourable friend realize that if that \$2 million guarantee were ever exercised, ever had to be applied, then the Crown would obtain 100 percent ownership of a \$15 million asset.

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

MR. ASPER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. In view of the dribbling of information before the House, will you now accede to our request to table the agreements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I oftentimes think that fault is never on one side exclusively but often is on both sides of a problem, and it may well be that in a sense we have erred by not making the repleteness of the information available at one time; but on the other hand I would hope that my honourable friend would admit at least this much, that by asking questions on the basis of hasty assumptions which provide very misleading information, is also not very helpful or useful. So without being critical, Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has undertaken to provide more detailed information and I suspect that by Tuesday morning we will be in a position to advise my honourable friend as to the possibility of tabling the whole agreement, all of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, would the First Minister undertake to supply me a copy of the report that was tabled this afternoon - the Manitoba Water Commission, Lake Winnipeg Regulation Volume II?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, much as I like my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, he always insists that he has a certain sort of rights of access here which really according to the rules apply to the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party. My honourable friend the Member for Rhineland from time to time as a matter of courtesy is provided with certain documents, but wherever it's not possible then he really must provide himself with access to the Clerk's office where a copy will be available.

MR. FROESE: Another question to the First Minister then. Would he not believe that after spending thousands of dollars on the various reports, that to table extra copies to members is a very small amount, and a very small cost to provide members with the information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland is appealing to sympathy now, I think. Anyway I should say that his desk mate the Member for Churchill has been given a copy -- not on my instructions, Mr. Speaker. So the Member for Churchill perhaps could be accused of acting like a polar bear and is hoarding it somewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest shown for Tantalum Mining, I wonder if the Premier could indicate if there are any restrictions on the 25 percent that the government or the MDC has, are there any restrictions of selling the stock on the open market in the event, say, it doubles next week or six months from now, the value of the shares double and the government could double their profits, is there any restrictions on selling them on the open market?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no restriction in that sense, though there does afford the Manitoba Development Corporation a substantial degree of protection with respect to the Treasury, the corporate treasury of Tanco, in that by virtue of having 25 percent ownership of this operation now, this corporate operation, the MDC, the Crown, the people, now have a control with respect to pay-outs, the MDC is a co-signer, and with respect to all payments in excess of \$500,000. And that, Sir, is a substantial safeguard in the public interest.

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



MR. ASPER: My question is to the First Minister. In view of his very generous disclosure proposal on Tantalum, perhaps he would indicate to this House when he might take the same view and make full disclosure on the King Choy investigation.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what prompts that question from the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party, but if it gives him any comfort, I say now as I've said before that the King Choy episode was a matter of wrong, bad judgment on the part of the Manitoba Development Corporation for which this government takes full responsibility. It is one of the few, perhaps the only case, Sir, where we can be accused of error in judgment with respect to development policy in the interest of the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable the First Minister also consider opening the file on Manitoba Distillers?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has asked the question in an extemporaneous way and it's certainly a proper question. However, I apologize for the fact that I cannot give an extemporaneous answer. I'm not certain whether it would be proper. However, the member's question is important enough to make some further enquiries.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, it's customary in this House when someone quotes or uses a document that any member can rise at the time and ask for that document to be tabled, and I did try several times but I would suppose that I wasn't noticed. So at this time I would ask the First Minister to table the document that he was quoting or reading from with respect to questions to do with the Tantalum Mine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I was not quoting from anything other than the questions that had been transcribed by a shorthand secretary. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubts as to whether or not that kind of material is tableable.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I directed my question to you, not to the First Minister, to have the document tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest questions of procedure are not asked of the Chair in the Assembly, which is one of our rules. If the honourable member wishes to have an opinion in respect to procedure I shall see him privately. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Every member in this House when he quotes from, whether it's a magazine or a document or a letter or whatever, on demand of a member, according to our rules -- Mr. Speaker, would you ask the clowns of the back bench on that side to be quiet while I talk on my point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the same rule apply to all members. The rule is that when a member in this House quotes from any document, upon request that document will be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister, on the same point of order?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, hopefully so as to expedite the business of this House. What the honourable member contends on his point of order I disagree with completely. But Sir, should you wish to take it under advisement and if it is your considered opinion that the transcribed notes taken by the secretary are the kind of document or material that should be tabled, then, Sir, it will be tabled. It's as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when taking this matter under advisement I would ask you to consider that members often quote from their own notes, which are not tableable; that members often quote from newspapers which are a public record; that members often quote from magazines, Mr. Speaker; and before you make a ruling on the honourable member's questions I wish you to have these facts known to you so that we don't have a ridiculous ruling which nobody could ever comply with. As I understand the rule, Mr. Speaker, a member must table a document where it is in the nature of a document of which he has exclusive knowledge and which he wishes to rely on in making a case. Such as a letter; such as something which quotes somebody else or which pretends to quote somebody else, which a member can ask verification of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the First Minister and ask him why the apparent contradiction in the statement he made earlier when he first quoted from the document in which he said it was a document obtained from the press. Now he claims it was a document obtained from a secretary in the gallery.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris, like all of us, makes mistakes from time to time but this is one occasion when I really feel that I should help him to avoid embarrassing himself. I certainly did not at any time say that I obtained these notes of the questions, simply a notation of these questions from anyone in the Press. I said it was taken down by a stenographer, which my honourable friend from Morris knows full well is common practice.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I presume you're taking my point under advisement. I would like to ask a question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I haven't indicated that yet. I was listening to all the honourable members, but I wonder whether it's really necessary to take the matter under advisement when we have the assurance of an honourable member of this House that the only thing he had before him was not a document, that it was just notes which had been taken and which contained the information he required in order to answer the question. Now if we can accept that we can forget the matter. Agreed? (Agreed) Very well. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. In view of the fact that mention was made in the Throne Speech nearly five months ago of amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act, could the Minister advise us as to whether or not, when the amendments come down, will one of the amendments allow for the election of the Mayor of Winnipeg by popular vote?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the question was asked. It gives me an opportunity to inform members of the House that I've received assurances that by 12:30 tomorrow morning I will be in a position to have both the bill distributed and the notes which have been prepared for me dealing with all the sections of the proposed bill as if prepared for third reading. I hope to be able to distribute both documents before 12:30 tomorrow morning, at which time the honourable member can take the bill home with him, and the notes, and over the weekend acquaint himself with all the material in the bill.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Industry and Commerce I would direct my question either to the First Minister or the Acting Minister of Industry and Commerce. It has to do with the McKenzie Seed operation at Brandon. Could either the First Minister or the Acting Minister advise us how many resignations are pending at the present time from management?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that surely is the kind of question that one describes as whether or not one is still beating his wife. Mr. Speaker, if it makes my honourable friend feel any better, I rather suspect it won't, the answer is that I have been advised only recently that there is no impending mass resignation as was suggested here by some honourable member a few days ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to yourself, Sir. Have you received notification from the Honourable Member of Portage la Prairie that he is resigning?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is out of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up any misunderstanding on the part of my honourable friend from Inkster, I have no intention of resigning.

MR. SPEAKER: Again I must remind honourable members the procedures of this House are during the question period -- questions only. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A question of clarification to the Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker. When he refers to 12:30 tomorrow morning, as he did, does he mean 12:30 tomorrow morning or 12:30 tomorrow afternoon?

MR. CHERNIACK: 12:30, tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. Could he indicate to the House that there will be ample time given when the announcement will be made as to when the Agricultural Committee will be held, so that people can be informed from outside the City of Winnipeg, so that they have proper time to come down?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I direct a question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Is it still the Minister's intention to ram through Bill 81?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable the Minister of Labour doesn't ram through anything. There will be ample opportunity for all and sundry to consider Bill 81 -- if it ever gets out of this House in order that people might consider the same.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the end of the question period . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I was going to ask whether we were going to go another five minutes to make it a full hour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I can ask a couple of questions but I won't. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you would entertain some motions on third readings moved by myself.

THIRD READINGS

BILLS Nos. 57, 68, 97, 66, 72, and 96 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave I could move the first reading of the Real Property Act?

MR. SPEAKER: Leave agreed to. Any objections? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. FROESE: Is it on the agenda?

MR. MACKLING: By leave, first reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Rhineland object?

MR. FROESE: No, it's all right, I was just wondering whether we had -- on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. We will proceed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, I notice that Orders for the Day were distributed for Leaders of the other parties. The same thing wasn't done for us. This is why I'm asking whether it was on the Order sheet?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, the Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Act is referred to in Votes and Proceedings as a Notice of Motion and I merely ask leave now to introduce it on First Reading.

MR. MACKLING introduced Bill 112, an Act to Amend the Real Property Act, (2).

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would call the adjourned debate for second reading on Bill 81. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege now to add to those who have already made their contribution towards Bill 81, and let me say at the outset that I recognize that, particularly from our side, the presentation made by our lead off speaker, the Member for Emerson, the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for Riel, and this afternoon the Leader of my Party have in my judgment all made specific challenges to the bill that is before us. They have asked for further explanation which has not been forthcoming from the members opposite. We've heard rhetoric from the members opposite. We've heard the challenge from the Member from Crescentwood that challenges the concept of industrial peace; he, if course, prefers industrial revolution and war and chaos, so that's his privilege. But that does not take away, Mr. Speaker, the valid and sound arguments that have been put forward the concerns that have been put forward by members of this side of the House spoken on Bill 81; and that does not mean inclusively members of my own party, but indeed other members of this side of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I want to make today is not to in any way put down those arguments that have been made because what I have to say may leave that impression, because despite the sound and reasonable arguments that were made, they have up to now really missed, you know, the fundamental and basic point of why Bill 81 is before us.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the very naming of the bill, Labour Code or Labour Relations Act, is a misnomer. You know, Mr. Speaker, I can recall my high school days, I was a fan of Gilbert and Sullivan and participated in the Gilbert and Sullivan operas, and there was always, you know, duel titles; you know, there was a short name, like The Mikado, and then there was a longer name that explained the opera, you know the H. M. S. Miss Pinafore, the lass that loved the sailor kind of situation. And this is the way I feel about Bill 81. I mean Bill 81 really - you know let's just now put the cards on the table, let's call it what it is. Mr. Speaker, Bill 81 is the bankroll of the New Democratic Party facing the next election coming up next year. Mr. Speaker, Bill 81 is designed to insure that the war chests of the New Democratic Party will be properly filled in the coming election. Bill 81, Mr. Speaker, is designed to make sure that the Member for Ste. Rose, the Member from Point Douglas, the Member for St. Vital, the Member for Gimli, the Member for Crescentwood, the Member from Winnipeg Centre, all of them will have four or five or six thousand dollars of eastern money - eastern money in their pockets to run the next election. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, it is to make sure that they will have Yankee money, American money, because they support the cause of International and American unionism. That's what this bill is all about, Mr. Speaker, so let's understand that, and that's fine. Mr. Speaker, we've stood on this side so often of having been accused of certain biases, you know, Conservatives stand for big business. Where do we get our money from - Toronto, Bay Street - and we're expecting, you know - so let's, you know, let's understand that eh? We appreciate fellows that you have your problems and you're going to need to need to finance your problems, you're going to finance your next election, and that, Mr. Speaker, that, Mr. Speaker, is why the haste with which this bill is being put before us; that, Mr. Speaker, is why this government, which otherwise, which otherwise is quite prepared to give time to public representation but is not prepared to give time to public representation on this. Mr. Speaker, this government, this administration wants to have all its options open as they leave this session.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, exactly when the First Minister intends to pull the plug. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there were those that suggested as a result of a few remarks that were made last night in the session on another controversial issue, namely the question of aid to private and parochial schools, that he may well want to pull it before some of us suspect; so it's doubly understandable why this government needs this bill in their hip pocket, because they have been told, Mr. Speaker, they have been told in no uncertain terms by the internationally controlled, American controlled, Yankee controlled, organized labour, that you do this, you do that, and you will get you dollars for the next election. That's what they been told, and I like to see the Honourable Member for Crescentwood jump up and applaud that; I like to see, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood run his next election campaign on Yankee

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . dollars, I love that, Mr. Speaker, that has a little touch of irony that even, you know, tickles my sense of humour, Mr. Speaker; that tickles my sense of humour.

Mr. Speaker, in Bill 81 -- you know, we are the party that sometimes espouse you know, somewhat cliché written thought called free enterprise. Myself I don't use that particular phrase I like to use the phrase "freedom to enterprise", whether it is for a farmer, whether it is for a small businessman, whether it is for a professional man, I use the word freedom to enterprise. But, Mr. Speaker, where in Bill 81 is the principle, the concept of free enterprise better expressed. This government is all in favour of free enterprise when it comes to organized labour's rights, you know, to exercise, to pull out whatever the market will stand. Freedom to enterprise for organized labour, and I congratulate them for it. What's wrong with that? Freedom to enterprise for organized labour; but in any other field, in business fields, it's regulation upon regulation, it's restriction upon restriction, it's compulsion upon compulsion, but when it comes to their friends and organized labour then they're all in favour of the free enterprise concept.

The Minister of Labour said it is with pride he says, that he is removing in Bill 81 the presence of that third force, government, he is leaving to the full market play -- my that sounds like free enterprisers -- you know, the market play, the market play, the forces of organized labour versus management. He's prepared to fully acknowledge the collective bargaining strength of organized labour versus management. Free enterprise, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I could not enunciate the principle of free enterprise better than the Minister of Labour has done in presenting this Bill 81. And, Mr. Speaker, for that I have a tremendous feeling of affinity and charity towards my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, who only last night accused me of having a head filled of concrete, among other things, but none the less the philosophical bind that binds, binds so tightly that I'm about to embrace him tonight for the reasons that deep down I believe that he is a free enterprise; and he, in the fundamental concept of Bill 81, in the fundamental concept expressed by him, by the Member for Inkster, and others, really indicate to me that they are not really that far down the path of totalitarian socialism that I sometimes accuse them of in this House; that they do believe actually in a degree of freedom that I at most times do not credit them with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, why, why then will they not acknowledge that same principle in other spheres of economic activity; Autopac, farmers with the capability of producing their goods and selling them, in many other fields. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker the reason why -- and I don't want to take up the time of the House unduly -- the reason why this government is not prepared, is not prepared to entertain a most reasonable suggestion a most reasonable suggestion, let's entertain that suggestion. The suggestion has been made on this side of the House. We don't particularly want to vote against the bill, you know, we don't particularly want to vote against the many clauses in this bill that are worthwhile and that we can support. Mr. Speaker, what is the urgency of passing this bill at this time? Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Labour stood up on his Chair and told me about these needs, contracts that are terminating now, that need the protection of this bill so that they can negotiate? Has the Minister of Labour told us how many present applications for certification for bargaining units are before the Department of Labour right now, that need the passage of this bill right now? Not one has he mentioned to us, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, this is not one of those kind of issues. This is not one of those kind of issues that depend on the passage you know, today, tomorrow; it is a milestone. I believe the Member for Crescentwood said, if I quote him correctly and I want to be correct, he said, "it's a milestone for labour".

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned whether it be a gravestone for industry. I don't particularly want it to be the gravestone for industry. A milestone for Manitoba. All right, let's not make it a gravestone for somebody else. Let's at least take sufficient time to examine the question. Let's, at least, take sufficient time to have proper consideration of the question, because, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, as I suggested to you, this falls on deaf ears, because that is not the purpose, the fundamental purpose for having this bill before us at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, if this was such a burning issue within the hearts and bosoms of the members opposite then surely it would have been presented to us among the first, or at least the second sessions that they had the opportunity to present the bill. Mr. Speaker, the reason why it is before us is that they're not just that sure whether or not they'll be around the next time. They know that they will need bucks, dollars to at least try to be around the next time, and that's why they're passing this legislation that has been written for them by eastern organized labour, and as I said before, by American organized labour.

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I only express this disappointment, that at least if I am to be lectured morally and scriptually by people who tend to put themselves up as a step above me in terms of their approach, in terms of their purpose in life, then I feel hurt and disappointed when they fall short in the particular respect, I find myself, Mr. Speaker, often having been criticized, unjustly, Mr. Speaker, of representing or belonging to a party that represents certain establishments, that receives a degree of its funds from business or from corporations, very often outside of this province. I now find myself somewhat disillusioned that this party, this Premier, this government finds themselves forcing through this particular piece of legislation for what reasons? For reasons of monetary return, for reasons of financial support at the coming election. It's obvious, Mr. Speaker, whether it's obvious to anybody in the House, but it is obvious to many people that you speak to on the avenue, this is their reaction to Bill 81. They don't know the nature and the content of the bill; they don't know the clauses of the bill, but they have heard just sufficiently enough through the press that it is a very pro-labour, bias-labour bill, and the reaction on the avenue, on the street is, well that's quite understandable the government faces an election the next year and they need some funds, and so it's expected of them to pass this kind of a bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that they're satisfied intellectually with putting this kind of a bill forward at this time; with giving this bill the kind of consideration that - the lack of consideration that it obviously is getting and, Mr. Speaker, I only hope that they are aware of the consequences that some of the measures in this bill that they are obviously going to force through, ram through. Oh, there have been suggestions by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood who is on - I don't know what kind of a leave he's on right now, sabbatical or otherwise, from his university job - so he wants to sit for the next three or four weeks. That's fine. We'll sit with him for the next three or four weeks too, and we'll be here for that reason. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the real, that does not afford the kind of opportunity of moving such, by their own admission, a basic and a radical change in labour legislation into Manitoba, and they're prepared to give it three weeks, or two weeks, or one week, or five weeks. Fine, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when they consider doing something radical with the doctors, like introducing community health clinics, so they're prepared to issue white papers; they're prepared to try out trial projects; they're prepared to give a year, two years, three years, to study the matter, but then the doctors really don't contribute too much to their political fortunes into their coffers. So there's no urgency for that. They can take the time, Mr. Speaker, to make a reasonable and sound judgment on the kind of decisions they're going to make. But there's a pressure here, there's a pressure here that is somewhat different. Mr. Speaker, when they're giving time to consider such other radical, you know, innovations, measures of education and so forth, they're prepared to give the time. But, Mr. Speaker, they display their Achilles heel as to how ordinary and how cunning they are with respect to the immediate need that they face, which is dollars to fund the coming New Democratic Party election in the coming year, and they have prepared to sacrifice interests of the people of Manitoba, both labour and management, and put forward a measure, and put forward a bill, without giving it the kind of consideration that it deserves to insure that that kind of support is forthcoming. Thank you.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that debate be. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I want to indicate that the Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. Well before --(Interjection)-- Order. I want to indicate to members that the Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. If no one else wishes the floor I will grant him the floor. Now let's get together. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I move then, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Well after that episode I don't know what. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Honourable Member for Morris will speak on Bill 98.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on Bill 98.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to speak on this particular bill. Mr. Speaker, I understand the reasons why the Minister of Agriculture is not here and I want to say

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . that we are in great sympathy with the Minister and although we would have liked very much to have had him in the House during the course of this debate, we understand fully why he cannot be here, and we hope that the particular problem that he faces will be resolved and that his son will be returned to good health.

But, that, Sir, is not going to deter me from making the kind of remarks that I want to make on this bill and I am presuming that either the Acting Minister of Agriculture, or someone in the government bench, will be taking note of the comments that are made on this side of the House because I think they are extremely important because this happens to be a very critical piece of legislation the government is introducing at this eleventh hour of this session. And for some reason, Sir, there seems to be a tendency on the part of this government when they want to slip legislation through this House, legislation that's going to have a tremendous impact and a tremendous effect on the welfare and the well-being of the people of this province, and indeed the province itself. There seems to be a tendency on the part of the government to attempt to slide legislation in at the very last minute in the hope that there will not be a full opportunity to examine it and its implications, and sometimes it does take some time to do that. When you consider that it takes months to draft a piece of legislation, one gets some idea of the time that is necessary in order to relate that legislation to what could happen in this country and its impact on the country. And so I must criticize in strongest terms the government's method of bringing legislation at this time when the session has been going on for as long as it has. We've been sitting here since March the 9th, Sir, and for almost two months of that period very little, if any, legislation ever appeared on the Order Paper. If there had been an opportunity of that legislation appearing on the Order Paper in the early months of this session, and then an opportunity provided from time to time for members to debate that legislation, what could have happened would be that the people of this province would have been alerted and made aware of its impact on the province. And I suspect, Sir, that the reason that it's brought in at a late date in the hope that it will slide through without any public notice whatsoever; that it's the desire on the part of the government to ensure that as little public knowledge as possible be made of what they're introducing in the House, so that there's as little public reaction to it until it's too late to do anything about it.

Sir, one of the traditions of this Chamber, and indeed all democratic chambers, and one of the purposes that this place exists, is to afford the opportunity of examination of legislation and spending programs. And in the process of that examination an opportunity is provided for the people of this province through the medium of the press to become aware of what the government is doing. Then when procedure is followed after legislation passed their second reading, and it's a tradition that is peculiar to the Manitoba Legislature, an opportunity is provided for the public to appear before one of the Standing Committees of this House for people to make their views known and what they consider to be the implications and the impact of legislation that is being proposed by the government.

Sir, this legislation is a classic example of the power of human error to go on repeating itself because of wrong-minded men who have made an initial mistake become determined to prove that they were not mistaken after all.

The history of this country in agriculture is rife with examples of how controls have destroyed agriculture and have destroyed opportunities for agriculture. And there isn't a better example of that than we see today. Sir, the newspapers carry reports of the rising costs of beef. And throughout the country, both the United States and Canada, from time to time you hear reports of the causes and the reasons for the increase in the price of beef. It's the general impression of course that the large part of the reason for that is that the price of beef is going up to the producers. Well I don't think that it's going up to the producers in this country as much as it is to the consumers. And I've heard several reasons expressed as to why that phenomena is taking place, and one of them appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune of a few weeks ago in which it was stated that, and this was from a New York Times service, that part of the reason for the increase in the price of beef was the infiltration of organized crimes into key positions in the New York meat industry. It goes on to say that racketeers, both in industry and in the unions that service it have reportedly been in collusion for at least two years to systematically extort week by week, month by month, as one source put it, vast sums of money from the supermarket chains and the wholesale suppliers. This is the price they paid to stay in business, another source said, the price of labour peace.

I'm not sure if that is the reason for the increase in the price of beef - it might well be in the City of New York - but I think a more reasonable explanation, and one that I'm more

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . prepared to accept, is the very understandable fact that the consumption of beef in the world is going up. As nations in this world increase their affluence there is a marked switch from the consumption of high starch foods to the consumption of protein foods. Beef is the most acceptable of those protein foods. I'm told that in the Argentine which used to be a pretty substantial exporter of beef, they now have to impose consumption controls in order to ensure that they are going to be able to export the quantities of beef that are needed for exchange purposes. I'm told also that in Australia exports of beef into the United States are going to be drastically cut because of increased consumption in that country and the markets that are immediately in the area of Australia, such as Japan and China, and countries of that nature. It is also a known fact that the exports of beef to the United States from Canada have been reduced considerably because of the increase in the consumption of beef in this country.

Yet, in spite of these facts this government has the supreme idiocy of suggesting and recommending production controls of meat and farm products --(Interjection)-- Our honourable friend should wait until I'm finished before he starts complaining. Beef is a product that is very stable by the very nature of its production. And the opportunity to increase the production of beef rapidly, such as in pork and in poultry is not there because every pound of beef that is sold over the counter has to start out at some time or another as a cow and a calf on grass. And so the limitation, the limitation then is the availability of grass and the availability of breeding stock. And so when the consumption of beef reaches the proportions that it has in the last year that theoretically that was not predictable by anyone, otherwise steps would have been taken to meet that demand, then we reach this situation. But the tragedy of the situation that we face today is that because of the production controls that are being imposed by this government, substitutes such as pork, such as poultry, turkeys, are not going to be made available to those farmers who would readily go into the production of those substitutes and meet that increased demand. Because this government, Sir, believes in imposing production controls. They believe in imposing their wisdom, their forecasts, on the farmers of this province, who would have been able to be in a position to take advantage of that existing market and to meet that demand to their benefit, and to the benefit of the country as a whole. --(Interjection)-- I won't entertain any questions from my honourable friend until I'm through and if he's got any questions when I'm finished I'll be happy to answer them.

Sir, the philosophy of this government and the government at Ottawa, and they're in collusion on this because this bill, this supreme piece of idiocy that is now being proposed in this House, is part and parcel of Bill C-176. But the real tragedy of this is that the controls are not going to be imposed by the idiots in this province, and the bureaucrats in this province, but it's going to be imposed by the bureaucrats and the ivory-towered thinkers in Ottawa.

Sir, this government is supporting that. This government brings in a piece of legislation that supports the control of production in this province to the point where farmers are going to be unable to take advantage of the markets that are now existing, and will continue to exist and there is good reason for that, Sir. There's a good reason for it. Because the proponents of Bill C-176 like the proponents of the Dairy Commission were the farmers of Ontario and Quebec who sought to benefit from this kind of production controls, and this government fell for it, hook, line and sinker.

Now as far as the dairy industry is concerned we have another example of this kind of idiocy. The Dairy Commission was set up, proposed by the dairy farmers of Ontario and Quebec, for one purpose. The production controls that were established were established in such a way that it worked to the disadvantage and the detriment of the dairy producers of this province, most of whom were small dairy farmers, and if they couldn't meet an established quota they were thrown out of business, and they went out of business, we lost the quotas. This government, and I give them credit for it as far as they went, sought to return those quotas to the Province of Manitoba - 18 million pounds of butterfat lost to Ontario and Quebec. But the real joker in this whole deal was the limitation of three years imposed by the Dairy Commission. You either, they said in effect to the Dairy Farmers of Manitoba, you either get the 18 million pounds back, or whatever the amount was, within three years or you lose it. Now everybody knows, anybody who knows anything about dairy farming - it takes at least three years with the current calf crop, the current calf crop, this year's calf crop, which was already sold for veal before this deal was consummated --(Interjection)-- you know, my honourable friend from Radisson, these constant rude noises that emanate from that seat, Sir - and I



(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . happen to be a victim of some very unfortunate geography in this Chamber, because the sound echoes from up the roof and down here so that it comes booming across here all the time. --(Interjections)-- It so happens, and I might remind my honourable friend, that I have the floor and I am entitled to make these noises. I have a problem, Sir, because if I don't speak loud enough you admonish me because you cannot hear me and so I am going to try and accommodate both the Member for Radisson and you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying before I was so loudly and rudely interrupted, in order for a dairy farmer in this province to take advantage of those quotas that were set, he would have had to be able to save this year's calf crop. That opportunity's lost to him because the announcement of the dairy quotas came too late for that. That means, in order to meet those quotas, it's going to be necessary for dairy farmers in this province to go outside. They can't go to Saskatchewan because they're in the same boat. They have to go to Ontario and go to Quebec. The dairy farmers of Ontario and Quebec knew this all along because they're phoning in to Manitoba regularly, suggesting that there's ample numbers of dairy cattle in those provinces that the dairy farmers of this province can buy in order to meet that quota. Well, they knew that all along.

But what are they doing? They're doing what would come natural to a good farmer. They're culling out their herds. And what better opportunity is there for those farmers in Ontario and Quebec than to get rid of those bad producers that they've got, the older ones, and the ones that are ready for the stockyards anyway, sell them at an exorbitant price to the dairy farmers of Manitoba, and thereby get a good profit for an animal that would normally go for a pretty routine price.

But who's going to be stuck? It's going to be the dairy farmers of this province. They're going to be stuck with dairy cows that are non-producers, for which they paid a good price, and let's assume, let's assume that the price range, and I don't think this is an unreasonable assumption, is between 450 to 1,000 dollars per head. Well, dairy farmers in this province who are currently in production, one assumes that they have reached the maximum of the production that their operation is geared to. In an article written in one of the weekly newspapers just recently, about a dairy farmer who is just outside the City of Winnipeg in Oak Bluff, he said that he'd reduced his dairy quota from 90,000 pounds to 60,000 pounds because there was more money in the smaller quota. The increased quota created expenses that he was not prepared to meet. And so one assumes then if the increase in the dairy quotas are to be met they're not going to be met by the existing dairy producers, they're going to be all new producers.

An average or a normal herd, Sir, would be around 20 head. Let's estimate that on the average between 500 and 1,000 that would involve an initial outlay of something like \$15,000.00. Then there is the dairy barn, and then there is the expensive equipment that goes with it. And one can safely assume that before any of these young farmers get into the production of dairy products there's going to be an investment of upwards of \$50,000.00. That's a great thing for a young farmer to get started with. Perhaps it would be possible, and there would be some hope for those farmers, if they were able to get top flight dairy producers - but we all know the kind of dairy cow they're going to get they're going to get the culls.

The same thing happened, Sir, and we'll go now from dairy, we'll go to beef. The same thing happened, Sir, with the beef producers. Every time the government announces a program of assistance to the beef producers or, as they put it, to diversify production in order to get young farmers into beef - my honourable friend from Rock Lake and my honourable friend from Gladstone rub their hands in glee because they're going to get rid of their culls, and it's only natural when that kind of money is going to be made available. --(Interjection)-- No, they're not leeches; they're sound businessmen, sound businessmen, and that sort of thing you can expect. I don't blame them one single bit for doing it but the person I do feel sorry for is the young farmer who falls for this sort of thing in the belief that it involves some quick money, that it involves a rapid turnover, and it involves tremendous profits. That's got to be the most misleading thing of all because, Sir, you can't force a cattleman. In the first place to be a successful cattleman you've got to like the business, and secondly, you've got to know something about it. More pseudo-cattlemen have gone broke than you could possibly imagine simply because they went into the business without knowing what they were doing; they lost their calf crops; they lost their beef herds because they couldn't recognize diseases when they came into their herds; and it's only years of experience in this business that can enable a cattleman to be successful in this business.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

So, if you're going to encourage people to diversify their operations - it may be a very slow way of doing it, but it's the surest way - and that is to enable them to start in a small scale with topflight breeding stock, good management, and a reasonable chance of success. That is not inherent, that quality is not inherent in any of the government programs.

Then, Sir, we come to the matter of hogs. Just recently the Hog Marketing Bill was passed and the Minister proudly announced as a part and parcel of this program, was going to be the effort to reduce production. That was the criteria of setting up this Hog Marketing Board, to reduce production so that prices would go up. What do we find now? That the increased production that would have been available to Manitoba farmers to supply that market that cannot be filled by beef, is not available to Manitoba farmers, it's going to go to somebody else. We've lost that opportunity. We've lost the opportunity for our producers. And, Sir, we have said time and time again, there's only one sure way to success and that's to exploit success, not reinforce failure. The most successful economic operation in this province, because this province is particularly suited to it, is the meat industry, and its related and associated facilities: the meat packing industry, the processing industry. There should have been an effort as there was on the part of the former leader of this government, the Honourable Walter Weir, to do everything to encourage the development of the meat industry, and the processing of meat, in this province so that we could have been able to take advantage of those markets that become available to us, and then once having got our foot into those markets, to keep them. To keep them by keeping our costs down, our quality up, and our prices competitive. That's the way to help and to encourage and to foster the agricultural industry in this province, Sir, this government is doing exactly the opposite. This government are so preoccupied with a concept of dividing the pie into smaller and smaller pieces that they forget to go out and bake new pies. This is not the way, Sir, that we're going to develop this province, not the way we're going to find markets for our products.

Sir, I have before me an address given by Robert L. Houston, President of the Canada-Japan Trade Council, and it's entitled "Can Canadians Make Up Their Minds?" Well, he says some rather interesting things. He goes on to point out that if Canadians are to capitalize on the market for meat that is available in Japan, then they're going to have to pull up their socks - and I note that in the Province of Alberta they have recognized the significance of that market and are taking steps to try and capture it. He goes on to point out that in Australia that synthetics have knocked the bottom out of the wool market, so therefore there is a shift taking place in production patterns of agricultural commodities in that country, moving from wool production to beef, to pork and to grain, and they're doing that for the express purpose of getting into that Japanese market.

Sir, let me point out one paragraph that Mr. Houston enunciates in his speech to the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce. He says, "Let me at this point emphasize, as I have so often done before, the critical importance of meeting the Japanese on their own ground if you would do business with them. There simply is no business for going to Japan, looking at the market firsthand and making personal acquaintanceships." In an excellent article on Canadian-Japanese business prospects in the most recent edition of the International Journal, Mr. Lorne Kavic wrote - you can substitute producers for manufacturers in this passage - "Canadian manufacturers have not revealed either a willingness to study the markets thoroughly or to tackle sales prospects aggressively. The need for a personal salesmanship is not properly appreciated, and until Canadian manufacturers recognize that the Canadian Government Trade Service is a useful supplement to rather than a credible substitute for the personal approach and the intelligent follow-up, the rich Japanese market will remain relatively untapped." Sir, I fear that that is the philosophy of our producers and, even more sadly, the philosophy of our government.

If we are to take advantage of the opportunities that are available to us then we have got to rid ourselves of the depression complex that seems to grip honourable gentlemen opposite and seize the opportunities that are available, and rather than restricting production as they are doing, and what they propose to do even further in this piece of legislation, then we should remove all those restrictions and encourage our producers to go out and seek those markets. They are there; and the present price of beef in the world today is a clear indication of the availability of that market, not only in Japan but right next door in the United States, and indeed, right in our own country. And the tragedy of this situation, Sir, is that while we in this province pursue this depression complex, this restrictive approach, this balkanization of this province, there are other producers in Canada, particularly the Province of Alberta

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . and British Columbia who are taking advantage of the opportunities that lie before them. They are going to seize those markets, Sir, to the benefit of their producers, and to the benefit of the economies of their provinces. All that will be left for us will be the satisfaction of knowing that we have maintained mediocrity in prices and in production, Sir, that simply is not good enough.

Sir, the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa has for a long time been an advocate of the concept of supply management, and he's had a lot of willing support from the farmers of Ontario and Quebec, because the farmers in those two provinces can by the very nature of the market that is available to them, by the very nature of the quantity of the land that is available to them, can almost balance their production capacity with the available market demand. That's an ideal situation for those who want to balkanize their products. It works in those countries, it works in those countries that cannot produce quite enough to meet their own demands, or just about enough to meet their demands; and it works fine in those provinces as well, and that's the reason they advocate it. But it's got to the height of idiocy for any government, or any province, to pursue, or support that kind of a policy when they are dependent upon exports to survive.

There seems to be a determined effort on the part of this government to restrict production to meet the effective market demands in this province, and Sir, if that philosophy is going to be a part, and it seems as though they intend to apply it with a vengeance, there will be more and more people moving out of this province which will reduce the market possibilities even further, and will reduce the opportunities for production even further. It is the formula for self-destruction that is being applied by a government, that like Christopher Columbus didn't know where he was going; didn't know where he was when he got there; didn't know he had been when he got back; and he did it on borrowed money.

Sir, wherever this philosophy of restriction has been imposed, it has proved to be disastrous. Wherever this restrictive approach to markets has been applied, it has destroyed the initiative and, worse still, it has destroyed the competitive ability of the producers operating within the framework of those restrictions. And what is happening, the government bringing in this piece of legislation is that it is the final straw in the desire of the government to balkanize this province to the point where there are no market opportunities outside of the Province of Manitoba at all.

Sir, one of the clauses that is contained in this legislation suggests that it's going to take out of the hands of the marketing boards, of the producers' marketing boards themselves, the right to make their own regulations. That is going to be transferred, Sir, to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. A further effort at centralization, a further indication on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite that they believe that their collective wisdom in applying controls and in making decisions for something like 39,000 farmers in this province is greater than the wisdom of the farmers themselves each making their own individual decisions.

Sir, I urge the government not to proceed with this folly, with this piece of legislation that contains a mechanism to self-destruct. If they are sincere in their desire to want to retain the farmers on the land in this province as they say they are, and I sometimes wonder how sincere they are in that platitudinous statement when you find that every piece of legislation that is brought in is designed to do exactly the opposite, but if they are sincere in their desire to keep farmers on the land, then they could do no better than to throw this supreme piece of idiocy in the junk heap where it belongs.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Bill 106, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, dealing with Bill 106 we had the introduction for second reading the other night, and in his short remarks the Minister indicated that some of the amendments in this bill are strictly of a housekeeping nature, and in that I have to agree with him. Some of them are also for clarification, and some, Mr. Speaker, in attempting to clarify, in my opinion rather than clarifying the issue that in fact they have clouded the issue even more so than it was before. And as an example of that I would ask the Minister to look carefully at the definition of place of business, as he has used it in one particular section, where it is referring to the operator of a truck, and I think, in my opinion,

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . this leaves a bit of doubt about the intent in the definition because to me the operator of a truck, his place of business can be varied and wide, and I don't know whether it covers his area of business, or his place of business, and I would ask him to, when he looks into this, to clarify that or at least indicate to the House what the intent of including the definition such as a place of business, where it didn't exist before.

Mr. Speaker, there appears to be an attempt in various sections of this bill to return the power of discretion to the courts with respect to the various penalty clauses of the act, and Mr. Speaker, I think this is good. It's my opinion, and I'm sure it's the opinion of many people in this province, that the discretion of the courts in the interpretation of law should not be tampered with to the extent that the hands of the officer, or the judge, are pretty well tied and the penalties are just cut and dried with no discretion whatsoever left to the courts to take into consideration some of the peculiar circumstances that might arise from time to time with various cases. But, Mr. Speaker, while I say that, there seems to be a little bit of inconsistency here because where there's some section of the act where the Minister is leaving, or reducing the restrictiveness as far as the judgment of the court is concerned, we find other sections in the penalty clauses where the Minister is in fact doing the opposite. He is spelling out in no uncertain terms what type of penalty the judge should apply, how much it should be, and so forth. And, Sir, I say that that is not good and I would like to see the Minister reconsider that part of it so that the judge in a court can truly try a case, assess the circumstances involved, and award a penalty, if you want to call it that, or a judgment, which I think the Legislature may have some powers to set a minimum and a maximum on, but leave the rest of it to the judge.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot agree with all of the amendments that the Minister is suggesting although I think the instance, or there are more instances of relieving the strictness than there are of increasing. Inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, in legislation whether it be impunitive measures, or whether it be in directive measures, in my opinion is not good for this province nor the people that live in it.

It would appear that this legislation is asked to pass recommended amendments which on one hand seems to tell the courts or judges, or administrators of our courts, that you should have the freedom to weigh the circumstances in every case and judge accordingly, while at the same time in other amendments we appear to be taking an opposite view by being restrictive in the nature and narrowing the limits in which the administration of justice can use reason and weigh the evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to find that the Minister is asking for the opportunity by regulation to increase weight limits on commercial and PSV licenses on Provincial Trunk Highway No. 1, I've stated in this House before, Mr. Speaker, that concern that is prevalent throughout this dominion for the rather restrictive limits that have been placed on Trans Canada transportation in this province and our neighbouring provinces to the west. And while I like to see regulation included in the act wherever possible, I realize that the Minister must have the freedom in this particular case so that he can negotiate with other jurisdictions, whether they be provincial or dominion, or federal, and if it's a policy that will be consistent throughout the country, I think that he should be given the freedom by regulation to provide some limits on a particular Trans Canada highway which are consistent with other jurisdictions. However, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I would hope, I would sincerely hope that the Minister would not just look at the one highway, or look at transportation that only moves in an east-west direction, because we in the Province of Manitoba have a tremendous market to the south of us, Mr. Speaker, which manufacturers in this province can develop to the point where we in Manitoba can increase our industrial output and provide increased employment for our people. So I would urge the Minister while he is, at this time, only looking at PTH No. 1 that he also look at PTH No. 75, and PTH No. 10 which are north-south routes and main routes just as important as No. 1, because I think it's in the interests of all the people in Manitoba that if we can move goods at a lower cost to the markets in the United States, that all the people will benefit.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the - while I'm dealing with PSV and commercial licenses - I want to express a real concern over another amendment in the act where the Minister's announced his intention to remove the jurisdiction over registrations for commercial trucks from the authority of the Highway Traffic Board and place it in the hands of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Mr. Speaker, for many years we have had a Highway Traffic Board in this province which has attempted to co-ordinate and, to some extent, to regulate the

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . movement of goods through this province by the actions and the directions given by the Highway Traffic Board. In the field of PSV licenses I think we all know that a PSV license is a fairly restrictive license, it's not the easiest license to acquire in the province, but the service that is demanded from the operator of a PSV license is quite strict. And especially those people that live in small rural communities are very sensitive to any interference in the operation of a PSV transfer or trucking service in that area. More so today, Sir, than 10 or 15 years ago because we find there is a movement from the rural area to the urban area. Many of the smaller communities are not increasing and service is diminishing. We find this is supported by applications from the two major railways in our country to abandon certain railway lines. We have this from the applications of those same two railways to change their type of service to a Servo-Centre type of operation which, in the opinion of many people in this province, has not been proven to be beneficial to the area. So there is an increased need to protect the operation of a PSV license in those areas.

If we remove the commercial license from the control of the Highway Traffic Board I can see many things happening which, in my opinion, Sir, are not good for rural Manitoba. We have already witnessed a movement on the part of suppliers, major suppliers, to quote prices of their goods delivered to the destination of the purchaser. And in doing so, Mr. Speaker, that same company can then apply for a CT license and operate in competition to the operator of a PSV license, and we all know, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of a CT license as compared to the cost of a PSV license is minimal. And it's a rather surprising thing, Mr. Speaker, that the owner of a CT license has a far greater area to operate in than the owner of a PSV license. Because while we charge the owner of a PSV license the highest license fees, that same operator is most restricted in his sphere of activity. Those are just some of the reasons that I would urge the Minister not to proceed with his proposal to transfer the CT license from the control of the Highway Traffic Board.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if such an action is taken there will be a lack of co-ordination of the operations. I think that the Highway Traffic Board will not know what the intent of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is, nor will the Registrar of Motor Vehicles have the same feeling of intent or direction that the Highway Traffic Board would like to take. And I say that at a time, Mr. Speaker, when there is no direction in the present Highway Traffic Board, for over a year, Mr. Speaker, we have had a Highway Traffic Board in this province which has been operating without a permanent chairman. We've had acting chairmen who have been changed, and in doing this, Mr. Speaker, we find that a continuity of program, a direction that is so necessary and vital to the operation of a good transportation system in our province, is being destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly asked the Minister in the House when he was going to appoint a chairman and he has answered on more than one occasion with the word "soon". And I would hope that before too long has passed, Mr. Speaker, that the word "soon" will be changed to "now", because without this, Mr. Speaker, our Highway Traffic Board cannot function properly, our trucking industry, our transportation in this province is undecided, and we need to know what the intention of government, as expressed through the operations of the Highway Traffic Board, will be so that those operators who are dependent on the operation of that board for their very livelihood can then plan their activities to co-operate with the government in providing the best possible service to the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, there are many other points in this bill that require considerable consideration. Of the whole works though, I consider this action on the PSV and the CT license to be probably the most important within the entire bill.

It's rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, to notice a change in an amendment which extends the length of a bus from 40 feet to 41 feet, and I would ask the Minister if this is done to accommodate the most recent plans of Flyer Industries within the province.

Mr. Speaker, we notice an increase in the penalty, particularly dealing with weight restrictions in the spring - and I don't quarrel with that - but at the same time we find in the act a very vague description of a peace officer and the powers of a peace officer, and I would like to ask the Minister if the operator of a portable weighscale is in fact a peace officer because every trucker in this province would like to know. And if he is a peace officer, I would sincerely hope that the Minister would by regulation make it mandatory that he be identified as such by a particular uniform or another. I think it's most unfair to the motoring public to find that they could very well be in violation of the law for refusing to obey a peace officer unless he

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . . is clearly identified so that all and sundry can clearly make themselves aware that he is a peace officer. And I would not want to see the present practice carried on where some people have been hauled into court for so-called disobeying the actions of a peace officer and their reason was that they did not realize that the person was a peace officer. It's been said before that ignorance of the law is no excuse but at the same time I think there's an onus on those that prescribe the law to make it as easy as possible for those that have to obey the law to be able to identify those who are administering the law.

Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable amusement that I read where a couple of amendments have been placed in this act which in effect allow the Registrar of the Motor Vehicle to extend the license period past the normal deadline, and another administration when that occurs to have the new year become retroactive to the regular starting of the year. And I would say that the reason this came about was because of a condition that existed last spring when Autopac had difficulty getting their registrations out in time so the year was extended. But we have had the Minister who is responsible for Autopac repeatedly stand up and say that we're having problems but they will be cleared up. But I don't think that the Minister of Highways has that same confidence. Because he is going to be prepared just in case the Minister responsible for Autopac has not got those problems cleared up. So it would indicate to me that the Minister of Transportation, or the Minister of Highways, really has not got too much confidence in the Minister who is responsible for Autopac.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time we have gone through some of the general comments, I view with some dismay some of the little penny ante amendments that occur in this act. I think it is rather a shame that we should be asking for a 50 percent increase in the fee that will be charged for an operator who has lost the plates of his PSV license. At the same time the very next amendment in the act works in the direct opposite and reduces the fee from \$2.00 to \$1.00. So this just doesn't seem to be consistent anywhere throughout. But when we get to committee, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Minister will be able to give us all the answers to the questions that will be asked; the reasons for the specific amendments that he is seeking, and I'm sure that when it's all finished that the Highway Traffic Act will be a better act than it was before these amendments came in. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I haven't had time to peruse the various sections of the bill. This is an amending bill; it amends many of the sections of the Highway Traffic Act. However I read a resume in the paper, and some of the sections - well there's some talk on the other side of the House, I don't know just what it is, whether newspaper reports can be relied on, but if I rely on the report that I did read I think that some of the actions taken and some of the subsections are rather strong and severe and I certainly have some reservations in connection with some of them. I will try and do my homework between now and when the bill appears before committee so that I can make my comments on those sections at that time. I do not want to delay the bill at this particular time but as pointed out, I certainly have some reservations on it and I wouldn't at this time give concurrence in the amendments as being proposed in the bill. That doesn't mean that I don't subscribe to some of them, but I certainly have strong reservations on others.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Saturday morning.