

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 5, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery, where we have 35 students of Grade 6 standing of the Tyndall School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Michalow. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, the Constituency of Lac du Bonnet. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions, Reading and Receiving Petitions, Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees, Ministerial Statements and tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

STATEMENT

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): I have a brief report on the flood prospects for the province. I have been informed by the committee concerned with flood matters that weather conditions over the past ten days having been very favourable in this area, causes us to be very optimistic about the flood situation. Precipitation has been light and the below normal temperatures have retarded further snowmelt and have allowed runoff already in the stream channels to move through the river systems. As a result, crest levels on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers are forecasted to be well below flood stage this spring. The Red River is forecasted to crest at Emerson five feet below flood stage between April 6th and April 8th and in Winnipeg between 12 to 14 feet of City Datum between April 8th and April 12th. Flows on the Assiniboine River are well below normal and are forecasted to remain so. A rapid and sustained snowmelt accompanied by some rain of course would result in peaks somewhat higher than forecast.

Mr. Speaker, I have copies of the statement for the perusal of members of the House if they so desire. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Other Ministerial Statements or tabling of Reports? Notices of motion, Introduction of Bills, Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C.(Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder whether he can indicate to the house when the budget will be presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Finance has already indicated when that would be. It certainly is intended to have it brought down this week; that's the intention.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question -- I wonder if the First Minister can indicate when the Estimates of Capital Expenditure will be tabled in the House?

MR. SCHREYER: That too, Mr. Speaker, would be soon. Perhaps not as soon as the budget.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. How can we possibly discuss the budget unless we have the estimates of capital expense?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that that necessarily follows in the sense that the honourable -- if I understand the Honourable Leader of the Opposition he is suggesting that it is not possible to take under consideration the budget address without having the estimates of capital. . . beg pardon? --(Interjection)-- past practice. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition may wish to revert back to relying on past practice which I don't quarrel with him about but I do say, Sir, that it is intended to bring the budget down later this week. I believe that answers his question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has had two supplementaries.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's really for clarification of the answer, not for a direct question again. I just do not understand what the First Minister said - is he suggesting we are not going to have the Capital Estimates before the budget is presented?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly before the consideration of the budget is concluded the estimates of capital spending will be submitted to honourable members so I believe that that should allay any fears that he may have in that respect.

MR. SPIVAK: With the opportunity to be able to examine the capital . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I have already noted that there was an irregularity in that procedure. Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. In his proposed price support for coarse grains will this be accompanied by production control?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the regulations are not yet developed -- I don't believe that there will be production control.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker -- I understand that the Minister's proposed program has been released to the press. I heard it over the radio a couple of times today and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member make his question. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): . . . the Minister would check the regulations of the Gazette of January 15th in which indeed there are such regulations.

MR. USKIW: . . . regulations which the Honourable Member for Morris refers to are regulations enabling the establishment and interim operation of the board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Is the Minister now in a position to give us floor or support prices that he proposes that this Board will have for the coarse grains' markets?

MR. USKIW: I am not sure at this time, Mr. Speaker, just when we will be operative. There are discussions under way between Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Canadian Wheat Board and federal authorities. I don't know to what extent we are going to have full involvement of all three provinces and the Government of Canada.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources. It is with respect to the provincial-federal study group that were to assess any possible damage on the Lake Winnipeg control and the Churchill River diversion, so my question is, has a preliminary or first report been received from this group yet by the government?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding it is not the purpose of this particular board or committee as referred to by the honourable member. However with regard to the latter part of the question I can take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Would the Minister make available to the members of the House copies of the report of the investigator who looked into the use of taxis by welfare clients?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question - can the Minister tell us whether as a result of that investigation there are any changes in the policies or procedures for authorizing the use of taxis.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that the Honourable Member is asking the wrong Minister for that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Environmental Management. Can he indicate yet whether the transcripts from the Water Commission meetings are going to be available, and when?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I hope to be able to answer this question tomorrow.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I return to the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources. I have a supplementary question to my original one. When . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Yes, I wonder rather than the supplemental, because there has been an intervening exchange, if my honourable friend from Portage in order to adhere strictly to the rules would ask a question.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you. Will the Minister make available to the members of this House any reports received from the study group that is assessing the situation with respect to the Lake Winnipeg control and the Churchill River diversion?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'll take the matter under advisement.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the Acting Minister advise us who the Manitoba representatives are on the study group?

MR. EVANS: Well, I'll take the question as notice and be very precise on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable First Minister. Can the First Minister tell the House whether an inquiry was conducted into the use of taxis by welfare clients and if so, from what Minister's department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I hope I've heard all of the Honourable Lady's question. There have been some internal analysis made of the utilization factor in that respect but I am not aware of the information at the moment.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question then of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the Minister made any or caused to be made, any inquiry into the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is becoming repetitive. The member has asked it three times. --(Interjection)-- Order. As I have understood the question, it relates to taxis and I have heard it at least three times this afternoon. I have also heard it before in this House. I am not debating the issue with honourable members. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the House Leader, and ask him when we can expect the Public Utilities Committee to meet so we can examine this utilization factor that the First Minister talks about -- Public Accounts, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going to correct my honourable friend but I notice he was nudged by one of his colleagues -- in order to correct what he said. As soon as I can conveniently call the Committee on Public Accounts it will be done and at that time -- and I would respectfully suggest to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge the questions she is posing at this particular time -- because we are dealing with the Public Accounts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is debating the question. Would he answer it?

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't quite hear you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair indicated the Honourable Minister is debating the question, not answering it.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . my answer, Mr. Speaker, to be precise, the answer to the question of my honourable friend will be available at Public Accounts which I hope to call soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker I apologize for being late in coming into the House. I understand some questions have been asked relating to my plans for House business. I would like to inform members of the House that so far my plans are on schedule and appear to be A-Okay and I would expect that I would be able to bring down the budget tomorrow at 8 o'clock on the assumption that there is an understanding that -- as it probably will go beyond the hour -- that it will be the order of business until its conclusion. --(Interjection)-- Those are the rules of the House and I would still think even if they weren't that honourable members would want to make this arrangement.

May I say I'm informed that the question was asked whether Capital Supply Bill would be available -- I am satisfied in my own mind that this has not been the practice, necessarily the practice in previous years, that Capital Supply came whenever the Minister of Finance had it

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . available and was ready to do so but it's a coincidence that I had already made arrangements to hopefully -- and assuming His Honour is available to give a Message -- I was hoping that I would be able to file the schedule, and I think there is a resolution that goes with it, on the conclusion of the budget address tomorrow -- but that is a coincidence only and I don't think it should be accepted as a precedent, because I don't believe there is such a precedent up to now; so I am told the question was asked and I'm responding only by saying it so happens that I had already made plans to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Services and ask him if when the Public Accounts Committee is called that he will make himself available to that committee to insure that the Member from Fort Rouge is in possession of all the facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is placing a hypothetical context on the question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Is it the intention of the government to furnish the House or Public Accounts Committee with a report with respect to welfare use of taxis, welfare recipient use of taxis in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the committee -- the Standing Committee that will be considering Public Accounts -- can ask for whatever information it wishes and the committee will decide what reports, documents, etc. shall be summoned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that same point raised. Will the government see to it that recording equipment will be supplied to the Public Accounts committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Speaker, as House Leader and a Member of the Committee if this is the desire of the committee I believe that arrangements will be made accordingly.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Could he tell us whether the Public School Finance Board report is ready and when he expects to table it in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the Public Schools Finance Board report will be filed within the time that it's required by statute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Can he indicate whether it is the intention of his department to prosecute Hearing Aid dealers who solicit business? I assume I'm directing the question to the right Minister, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, might I ask first of all who is now in charge of the Hearing Aid Act? --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, may I direct this jointly to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Minister of Health -- can he advise the House whether he is intending to prosecute under the Hearing Aid Act regulations those people who solicit business for hearing aids?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think I have indicated on numerous occasions the intentions are not valid to this Assembly. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps my question was not phrased to your liking. Can he tell me whether it is the government's intention to by the regulations under the Hearing Aid Act to see that prosecutions may be carried out for those people who solicit business for hearing aids.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, as and when complaints are registered with the Board set up under the Act or with the Attorney-General -- as and when or if and when they will then be considered for prosecution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, assuming now that the correct Minister in charge - can he advise me whether the governmental person in charge, Mr. Sam Grower is in fact distributing hearing aids from his office?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of the allegation that is being made by

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) form of a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question. Would the Minister take the question as notice and advise the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can tell the House if the Director of Manitoba Statistics Bureau was hired on a full time basis.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the newly appointed director of the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics is a full-time civil servant. In an interim period he will be continuing his functions as Secretary of Economic Development Advisory Board for an interim period but he is a full-time civil servant.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Was the job filled by normal civil service competition process or was he appointed by Cabinet?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the position was filled in accordance with the Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether the government will be abolishing the voucher system from mothers on welfare.

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Quite a few answering for me here on the front bench -- it is a matter of policy decision.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether it's the government's policy or the policy of the Department of Health and Social Development to allow one year to elapse for the request for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Policy questions are not to be asked in that form. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Services and ask him if it is his intention to make those policies public.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise because that last question was asked in a form that really anticipated no answer -- certainly it didn't deserve the dignity of one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he would indicate if the government is considering any changes under Medicare coverage in view of the astronomical increase in the barbarous abortions just reported in 1971, and will the government consider taking this money to pay for Medicare cards to be distributed free of charge to pensioners . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister can answer the first part; the second part is argumentative.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could best reply to that question by indicating simply that we have run comparisons on expenditures under health care for the purposes that the honourable member is referring to and we find that there is no undue level of expenditure on the part of the Province of Manitoba for this purpose any more so than in other provinces and indeed other countries in the western world.

MR. BOROWSKI: May I ask the question another way then, Mr. Speaker. Is the government prepared to give consideration putting more important matters under Medicare and taking abortion out from Medicare?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question again is argumentative. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Has he as Leader of the Manitoba Government or as Leader of the New Democratic Party sent a specific -- supports the position of the National Leader of the New Democratic Party in his recent statement with respect to the further liberalization and legalization of abortion matters here in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside knows that I have been a loyal member of the New Democratic Party for about 18 years.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Youth -- or Cultural Affairs, Recreational Affairs. I wonder if he could indicate why the government was not prepared to pay the reasonable legal expenses of the former Boxing Commission before the hearing is to be conducted in this next period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: In the absence of the answer by the Honourable Minister, I wonder if he can indicate whether the government intends to defend the action now before the courts to take place on Friday with respect to the claim by the former Boxing Commission for their legal expenses to be paid.

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Yes.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be convenient to follow the Order Paper for Orders for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I see he's absent at the present time. I'd be prepared to allow that to stand if that meets the convenience of the House. Then, Sir, I ask you to call the adjournement on Bill No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): . . . stand.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed).

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Sir, would you kindly call the motion on the Gift Tax Bill No. 6.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance -- the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, before commenting directly on the principles of taxation involved and contained in Bill No. 6, I would like to acknowledge the procedure by which clause by clause explanations were provided to caucus members of all the parties in the House on both these bills through a series of meetings -- of three meetings convened by the Minister of Finance and assisted by the Legislative Counsel, Mr. Tallin. I attended all three of these sessions, Sir, and found them extremely helpful, but I would like at the same time to indicate that exposure to this form of explanation should in no way limit my right to misinterpret any of the legal passages contained in the bill when they are again presented to us in the Committee of the Whole. I feel, Sir, that my inherent right to err in the interpretation of tax laws should not be compromised in any way by having had the short course. With these few words of salutation through you, Sir, to the Minister -- and I'm sorry he's not in his place at the moment -- I would like to say first of all that I found his introductory remarks on the second reading of this bill in contrast to his preceding statements on the Succession Act very brief, almost terse to paraphrase and the Minister may take issue with my interpretation of his remarks. I think he said that this bill No. 6 won't produce much revenue, it won't affect many people, but it is needed to plug the loopholes in the Succession Duty Act and to make the idea of a tax to promote the redistribution of wealth more effective.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say that this bill anticipates a number of escape procedures and in some cases effectively closes them. But as those who drew the bill will probably admit there are many many more possibilities of evading the intent of the legislation and these will be most apparent perhaps to a man and wife who see the opportunity for tax savings in transfers between husband and wife. Sir, this bill has as a basic premise the notion that provincial taxes can be imposed and effectively enforced by the provinces of Canada working in isolation. There can be no argument that the Province of Manitoba has the right to enact such legislation but as long as Canadians retain the right of freedom of movement as long as there are no provincial border restraints, there will be a tendency of estate wealth to flow to provinces having the lowest succession and gift taxes and avoidance of succession and gift taxes by those

(MR. McGILL cont'd) in the upper age group particularly will be made relatively simple with the help of Air Canada and their estate consultant. It's regrettable that Canada has been Balkanized by the complete failure of tax reformers to come up with a comprehensive plan for the co-ordination of federal and provincial taxes. It is regrettable that we don't now have a single system. The failure is most apparent in the field of estate and succession taxes. In 1968 the Federal Government did introduce a new gift and estate tax system but in 1971 decided to abolish these taxes in favour of a capital gains tax. This became effective on January 1 of this year -- and since the capital gains tax includes gains realized at death, to have continued the estate taxes would have produced a form of double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, since the federal capital gains tax applies to those leaving Canada, the havens offered by Alberta, Ontario, Yukon and the Northwest Territories become very practical considerations. In my short experience and reading of this Act and in conversation with concerned taxpayers and people of the province, the question that is most frequently asked is why was it necessary for the Government of Manitoba to impose restraints on husband and wife transfers. The unity of the family in social and economic matters is surely a cornerstone and a pillar of strength in our province and should be preserved rather than weakened by legislation which tends to divide the husband and the wife. They are an economic unit and should be able to share jointly not only the responsibility for failures but the rewards for success. For most Manitobans, this failure to recognize the combined effort of spouses as having produced the estate values is the most unacceptable feature of the bill.

Another remarkable provision, Sir, is the requirement that all gift taxes -- that all gifts must be reported annually whether they are taxable or not. The cost to the province in terms of additional staff alone to produce a return from everyone in Manitoba who gave anything to anyone else -- not to mention the man hours contributed by the donors -- would be greatly in excess of any possible revenue. It would be a ludicrous exercise and bureaucracy at the expense of the taxpayer.

Another major impediment to the effective administration of the proposed legislation is that it contains no complete definition of gifts. It fails to fully describe the circumstances under which a gift shall have been considered to have been made. As an example, a husband who is the breadwinner in the family unit has provided for the needs of his family during the year by buying them food, clothing, transportation, heat and all the other normal amenities of life. Has he made a gift? A second example which comes to mind is that of the father who sends his son to school perhaps in another community or another province where living expenses and fees and books might well exceed \$2,000.00. Is he liable, Sir, under this proposal? Another inconsistency which appears to exist between the Gift Tax Act and the companion bill would appear to rest in the area of gifts to recognized charities. Under this bill gifts in any amount to a charitable organization are exempt while bequests to charity under the proposed Succession Duty Act are limited in Manitoba.

Of interest to landowners in our province, and particularly to the proprietors of the family farm, is the comparison between the father with sons on the Alberta farm and the Manitoba father with his sons on the Manitoba farm. In Alberta the father may reward his son or his sons by gifts of property during his lifetime without tax while in our province if this Gift Tax is adopted a father would be impeded by the limitations imposed by the Act and restrained in his desire to help his sons and thus to retain their interests in the family farm by his having to produce cash in order to pay the duty on his gift. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, lest anyone be under the impression that the proposed Gift Tax applies only to the rich, let me cite the example of the lady in her declining years who finds herself almost completely dependent upon the return of a mortgage which she took as a part payment when she sold her house on her husband's death. The mortgage is presently worth about \$10,000.00. Because she has become forgetful and unable to properly manage her own affairs she decides to give the mortgage to her son so that he can make the collections and pay her bills. Now if the government proceeds with this bill she is liable for a gift tax of \$1,200.00. She might also be liable for a penalty of up to \$600 or more plus interest on the whole thing. Ironically, if she were to die and leave the mortgage to her son there would be no tax.

Let me conclude, Sir, by summarizing those features of the bill which appear to us to be most difficult to accept. Firstly, it fails to support the principle that spouses are jointly involved in the production of estate values and should not be restrained from inter vivos transfers during their lifetime. In the interests of providing as many job opportunities as possible in

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) Manitoba and of maintaining those small businesses which might otherwise be sold or wound up on the death of the husband, a free and unlimited transfer by gifts should be permitted.

Secondly, this bill fails to clearly define the meaning of the word "gift" as it falls within the scope of the Act.

Thirdly, it encourages legal manoeuvring to avoid the intent of the Act and will undoubtedly cause some citizens with portable estates to leave the province for residence elsewhere. They will seek other parts of Canada which have more hospitable tax laws.

Fourthly, the revenue provided by this bill is likely to be small as the Minister has indicated and may well fall short of the loss of income tax revenue occasioned by departures.

Fifthly, added to the existing high income tax rates in Manitoba the proposed gift and succession taxes will be a further deterrent to entrepreneurial investment in our province with the resulting loss of employment opportunities and, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that there is no way in which this effect or this impact can be estimated in its totality.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the light-hearted quip that is frequently heard from members of the government side that the answer to this dilemma of gift and estate taxes is to spend your money and die poor is perhaps for those who see merit in state control in life and death a good kind of socialist advice, but it's not likely to appeal to the people of Manitoba who take pride in making it on their own and who regard the preservation of the family unit as vital to the future of our province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris that debate be adjourned -- seconded by the Member for Rock Lake, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, will you call the motion dealing with the amended Rules of the House, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion -- moved by -- should have been moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with the report from the Committee of the Whole on the rule changes that have been brought in at this session. First of all, honourable members will recall when we dealt with this at an earlier stage that I took strong exception to certain proposals made under the new rules and certainly I haven't changed my mind on a number of these. I was rather surprised - was it yesterday - when mention was made by more than one of the members on the government side that a committee meeting had been held where these new rules had been considered last week. I would like to know what committee, Mr. Speaker, there was no committee set up to which this matter could have been referred. All committees are dissolved when a new House is called into session and there was no existing committee. I still would like to know what committee dealt with that report. The Member for Inkster says a secret committee. There have been a number of secret things going on of late. And this is supposed to be all above board and I'm questioning, Mr. Speaker, whether you as Chairman were in attendance at this meeting. --(Interjection)-- I think these meetings are highly improper and certainly if meetings of this type are called that members of the House should have been notified so that we too could have considered the new rules as they are now before us in present form because this House had not set up a committee and therefore it wasn't incumbent on them to take that prerogative in their own hands and I criticize them very strongly for this.

The Honourable the House Leader says that this committee has to be reconstructed - a new committee set up - I'm not surprised at this one bit because for the last number of years that they have been in power they've had this committee functioning for one purpose and that is to take away the rights of the opposition and they've done it -- time and again. The Honourable Member for Inkster outsmarts the Member for Morris every time when these matters come up. --(Interjection)-- No, every time. --(Interjections)-- In fact, the government didn't even have confidence in the House Leader to pilot this thing through the House; they had to rely on the Member for Inkster to do that. --(Interjections)-- This is the assumption that not only I make but I'm sure other members do as likewise. --(Interjections)--

We had -- earlier in the session when we set up the committee to set up committees we

(MR. FROESE cont'd) had the First Minister call a meeting in his office just inviting members of that committee. Normally this committee is meeting at a place where other members can come in and make themselves heard, explain to them their wishes, but this is now also denied. And then yesterday the House Leader deplored the fact that an adjournment made and that the rules could not go into effect yesterday. My goodness, since when is this type of business that urgent that members of the House shouldn't have the time to peruse reports that come in and especially new rules that have been drafted. They were on the tables, on our desks, for the first time yesterday afternoon. Are we to immediately discuss them without knowing what's in them? --(Interjection)-- This is beyond me. --(Interjection)-- Yes, in fact they have to have the Member for Inkster on this committee to do the work for them.

In my opinion the restrictions -- the new rules are very drastic. One of the major ones has to do with the matter of debatable motions, and here I want to point out that this year when reports were tabled and brought in the new rules were not in effect yet I was barred from debating or discussing them and ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- I did challenge him, but I'm just pointing this fact out that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't mind my honourable friend chastising the House Leader -- I expect that from him -- but I think, Mr. Speaker, he's going beyond due bounds when he chastises Mr. Speaker and refers to a matter which was the subject matter of a debate that has been concluded at this session, namely his ruling of your decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I fully realize that the matter had been concluded, but not to my satisfaction. --(Interjection)-- The government might not think that this is important, the rule change -- and that is under the former Rule 34, it's now Rule No. 36. We're no longer able to debate the receiving of reports. This has been deleted from the debatable motions and this is a very important one because last year the biggest and strongest debate that we had was on the reports that were brought in from the various committees. That's where we had the largest, the strongest and the most participated in debates. No longer can we do this. --(Interjections)-- The rules have been changed, this has been deleted -- and the thing is this that once -- (Interjection)-- No, I'm not wrong. --(Interjection)-- There have been reports brought in and I've tried to debate them and I was unable to and you will find that as other reports are being brought in we will not be able to debate them and once they are passed, received, that the government is no longer obligated to bring these forward for concurrence. We have a rule whereby we can as members bring in a motion of concurrence but I think that should also be extended for non-concurrence because how would I as an opposition member try and bring forward a report with which I don't agree. This is ridiculous to have a situation of this type and this should never have been allowed to happen that this be removed from the debatable motion. It's not only a mistake it's a gross error.

The Conservatives probably believe it isn't that big a matter -- well, I'm reminded of one thing. Recently we had a senior citizen who has passed his 100th birth year in Winkler and he made this statement that he expected to live for quite a while. After all at his age very few people died and this is fact but common sense tells us that longevity after 100 years isn't that long. So I feel that they will find out sooner or later the mistakes that they did make and that this is a great loss to us, not to me only but to other members of this House as well and I think they should have given greater consideration to this and objected to this and not have allowed this to happen. If the Conservatives feel that they're gaining on these rules changes, I think they have one coming.

I have mentioned the matter of the receipt of reports. There is another thing that goes with it. When reports are received members who were not on that particular committee are not knowledgeable as to what that report contains. It's only put into Votes and Procedures following its tabling. --(Interjection)-- Yes, and therefore how can we even debate an issue without having the right to adjourn it and to consider it. This doesn't give us any opportunity to discuss those reports and if we do want to discuss them we'll have to discuss them during time of estimates and this will take away further of our time that we can devote to estimates. The matter of the 90 hours as some will try and lead us to believe that we've actually lengthened the time from 80 to 90 -- this is absurd, too, because we spend more than 10 hours on Interim Capital and the additional supplies, supplementary supplies that the government brings forward

(MR. FROESE cont'd) so that we're not gaining, we're losing -- and when we're going to discuss Capital Supplies from what department are we going to deduct that time? Mr. Speaker, I would like to know because the time has been divided between the various difference departments once these rules go into effect.

I know that for one -- the Northern Task Force report last year that was brought in received very strong and very great debate and I certainly was looking forward to debating the Agricultural Committee's report this year because it's very, very weak and in my opinion doesn't present the facts as I felt we were experiencing them in the various hearings that were held throughout the province, and that the report once it's received the government will then claim the committee endorsed it -- it's got the endorsement of the committee; naturally they had the majority of members on the committee so they could endorse it. Once it's received in the House why should they bring the matter forward still further. It's not required; they can just leave it at that stage and bring it in by way of legislation and piecemeal.

So that, Mr. Speaker, we've lost a great deal through the present rules as they are now before us. We note that we have to differentiate between reports and bills because bills when they're first read we don't know what they contain either but we know that we will have a second opportunity when they come up for second reading. By that time they're printed and distributed and we can debate them. Not so with the reports of the committee.

I could touch on many more of the various items to which I made objection, but I noticed under the new Rule 74 which deals with concurrences that concurrence motions will not be subject to amendment and will have to be voted on as they are brought into the House. I feel very strongly on this particular section that we should have incorporated into that -- if we can't pass concurrence motions then members should also be able to bring forward non-concurrence so that we wouldn't be shown up as being stupid by bringing in a concurrence motion and then having to speak against it and vote against it.

We also note that Orders for Return -- this is probably not new, but certainly from a few years ago the changes that have come forward that Orders for Return are no longer subject to amendment and if they're approved they're not subject to debate. All this has gone by the board, this is all given up. We now find that there is going to be a restriction on concurrence motions - on the estimates, you can only bring in one motion per department. Again this is a restriction. The 90 hours I feel is a restriction. I already mentioned the capital and we still have supplemental supplies to come forward. We don't know what they contain at this time and how much time we will need to discuss them. They might be very important, there might be things in them that we feel we should have more explanation on by the government as to their programs, not necessarily confined to the dollars that we are discussing at that time but also the programs behind it and what's involved.

I feel that we are -- by accepting these rules we are going back -- it's a retrogressive step and the final one is Crown corporations. I took exception to that item the last time and I want to reiterate that with the establishment of many more Crown corporations in this province that we need more supervision; that we need a greater opportunity to discuss the report of these Crown corporations; that we should have the right to examine and question these boards and have them appear before committees; that this not only applies to Hydro and Telephone but that all boards of these corporations be subject to call by members of the committee set up to deal with it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in rising at this point to frame a few remarks in connection with the work of the Rules Committee and their report, I do so with a measure of reluctance, realizing that we are all concerned to see this report passed as expeditiously as possible so that the new rules can be given a fair trial at this session.

I feel moved, however, to address a few remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, although as a result of the discussions that have gone on in this House particularly the observations that were made by the Honourable Member from Morris -- he quite rightly pointed out that no matter what the rules unless there is good faith in connection with an interpretation and a working with rules, we won't get the kind of scrutiny and analysis of estimates or any other work of this Legislature that oftentimes the estimates or that other work deserves.

And I fully subscribe to the remarks of my colleague, the member from Inkster who in his concluding remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, on the subject indicated that really despite the rules, we would be able to get the work of this House done. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) in our society many, many institutions that are governed by very formal procedures -- and these are cherished by some to a far greater extent than others -- and I for one, want to come to know and understand these rules much more thoroughly and become much more firmly imbued with the historical worth of the parliamentary tradition. But one of the things that is obvious is that in our society if everyone works to rules we really can't get all the work done that we might otherwise because rules are made for institutions to work with. The people aren't made for the rules -- and so the committee has worked on a report and I subscribe to the basic recommendations that are there. I disagree with the Honourable Member from Rhineland that it's an attempt on the members who participated in that committee to thwart effective discussion and debate in this House; I don't believe that's the case. But I do return, Mr. Speaker, to the concern for good faith because it's only on good faith that we can have that kind of effective participation of honourable members in this House.

Now during the course of the remarks of the honourable member from Morris, Mr. Speaker, he questioned my good faith, not once but several times. He has every right to do that, every right to make aspersions against my character. The honourable member in debate of yesterday -- and Hansard is now before honourable members and they can turn to page 600 -- said and I quote: "It's a pity that the Attorney-General was not apprised of that good faith because he started up where he left off during the last session. Instead of giving an opportunity for a number of questions to be asked before he answers, and sometimes there may be duplications, he'll give three answers to every single question that is asked."

Now, that's fair comment from a legislator; he can say those things. But really, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I understood when I took my seat in this House is that members that sat in this House were honourable members; that they had a predetermination to be factual in this House, to represent things as they are, not as they would like other people to believe them to be but as they are, because that is one, surely the hallmarks of good sincere debate, presentation of facts -- not fiction.

Well the Honourable Member from Morris, if he refers to the Hansards of the debate that pursued this session in his presence, or at least partly in his presence -- because I admit all members can't be in the House all the time -- would have found that on March 23rd -- and I have the notes of the Honourable Member from Logan who was the chairman of the committee and he kept very accurate notes and I'm deeply indebted to him for that -- that on March 23rd, I spoke from 2:45 to 3:40, 55 minutes. Then without any interjection on my part, there followed the following submissions on my estimates as Attorney-General. Mr. Bilton -- pardon me, the Honourable Member from Swan River.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have been trying to follow the argument of the Honourable Attorney-General in respect to the motion we have before us adopting this but I do think that his latitude is getting a little wide of the mark of the motion we are trying to adopt.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, my good faith and the good faith of all members in this House is uppermost when we are determining the nature of the rules that we are going to work with and I feel it incumbent on me to put on the record, some rebuttal to the remarks that were extensively made without any interjection on anyone's part by the Honourable Member from Morris. During the course of my estimates, the Honourable Members from Swan River, Churchill, Assiniboia, Rhineland, the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, the Honourable Member from St. Vital, the Honourable Member from Brandon West, the Honourable Member from Pembina, the Honourable Member from Lakeside, the Honourable Member from Souris Killarney, the Honourable Member from Rock Lake, the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye, the Honourable Member from Emerson, the Honourable Member from Roblin, the Honourable Member from Flin Flon, the Honourable Member from Morris, the Honourable Member from Transcona, the Honourable Member from Morris again, and the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek all spoke in succession -- (Interjection)-- all spoke in succession, Mr. Speaker, after my introductory remarks, without any interjection on the part of the Attorney-General.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the statement that was made that's reported in Hansard on page 600 of this House -- the submission in argument questioning the good faith of the Attorney-General is accurate and in accordance with the fact and what happened in this House during the course of the estimates of the Attorney-General -- not one but twenty speakers including the Honourable Member from Morris who spoke twice, makes submissions without any interjection, without any rebuttal on the part of the Attorney-General. Now that is

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) a submission of fact, Mr. Speaker, not fiction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member makes further argument that in respect to the debate on estimates, really this is opposition time. Well I'm sure that if I were sitting on the other side, I would agree with the Honourable Member for Morris, I would make that same observation, that same argument, that estimates largely are the time of the opposition. But surely, Mr. Speaker, what the government must do is lay before the legislators the estimates of expenditure of each individual department and presuppose that the honourable members of the House really don't know what the department has been doing and why it is spending the kind of money that is reflected in the estimates brought before it and therefore argue during the course of the debate on estimates what the proposed estimates are to cover, what the department has been doing is justification for a vote of confidence to pass those estimates. Surely that is a prerequisite of every government member to justify a vote of confidence in his salary.

Now I'll answer the honourable members's question when I'm finished, if he has a question, and I'm sure that he may have one. Surely to suggest that the government member, the Minister responsible merely lays the estimates before the House and says nothing would be an abdication of the responsibility that the honourable members of the House expect from the individual Cabinet Minister presenting his estimates. So I disagree with the argument that has been made, Mr. Speaker, as to the provisions of the rules in debate on estimates. It's not a debate purely for the opposition; it's a debate in which the government must argue and justify its expenditures.

Now the honourable member in questioning my good faith suggested that three quarters of the time of the debate on the Attorney-General's estimates was taken up by the Attorney-General. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. If the honourable member had listened to the contribution in the debate made by the Honourable Member from Logan, he would have learned that the time was approximately equal in this House and certainly, certainly Mr. Speaker, in debate on the estimates -- I'm talking about the way that I would consider practice to be fair -- I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that an individual Cabinet Minister would want others of his colleagues on the front bench to participate in debate on his estimates. I know that that occurred during the course of my estimates, I believe more so in respect to my -- I think probably only in connection with my estimates as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Internal Services. But I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member from Morris that those were not at my behest or at my request, but speaking generally about members of a government caucus participating in debate on estimates, I think it would be absolutely impossible even if the Honourable Member for Morris was sitting in this seat -- for him or for anyone else to suggest that the government of the day will always be in a position to say, or would want to say to honourable members of the government caucus you must not participate in the debate on estimates of an individual Cabinet Minister. Because as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, I think the most scathing criticism of my estimates, particularly in respect to Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Internal Services -- it's a terribly awkward handle -- that the most scathing criticism came from one of my colleagues in the New Democratic Party caucus and I didn't like it, and I'll tell you I didn't like it and it's difficult to sit here and get that kind of attack from one of your own caucus members, but to suggest that I prompted -- and that's the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that was made in the remarks of the Honourable Member from Morris -- that I in bad faith prompted that kind of attack and that kind of contribution into the debate on my estimates is completely unfair. Now, Mr. Speaker, good faith -- good faith in debate surely must be based on fair play, trust and understanding of honourable members telling -- not telling stories, but telling facts, as near as possible the facts.

Now I'm sorry that I must return again, to the Honourable Member from Morris. The other day in Hansard, March 28th at page 495 confirms this. He used the manner of debate which I understand in the parliament at Ottawa and he is very familiar with that, is very fair and very proper and so it is here. But it is only proper so long as the argument is conditioned or introduced by words indicating that these are my remarks, in effect this is what I say and the honourable member has been saying or doing. This is appropriate and he did that. He did that on March 28th and I did not object -- what he said, what he said in effect, Sir, was that every rustler is entitled to one steer and he went on. I didn't object -- and he went on at some length -- (Interjection)-- yes, he went on at some length, Mr. Speaker -- and then near the bottom of that page there was a direct misquotation and if the Honourable Member refers to

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) that page of Hansard, he says and I quote: "That is the first responsibility of any government and for the Minister to stand up in his place and say, 'Oh, the first one is on the house', has to be about as ridiculous a statement as any Minister has ever made," and at that point, Mr. Speaker, I rose in my place and questioned that that was fair debate because he was specifically attributing to me a statement of words which I did not make.

Now, speaking about rules and their applicability to debate, obviously the Honourable Member for Morris or any other member can say that a state of things exist that don't exist. That's fair game -- you can use all manner of allegory, all manner of devious articulation of the Queen's English, but surely when attribution is made specifically to a member which is not in accordance with fact, it is within our rules -- and I hope that if it isn't in the rules we ought to change them now -- that that honourable member if questioned, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege or on a point of order, would have the good faith and the integrity and the honour that is attributable to members who sit in this House, to say I may, I may have said things that the honourable member did not say and if that be the case then when I see what I've said because after all, the Honourable Member from Morris sometimes may not have the wit to recall -- I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- I'll hear that.

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

MR. JORGENSON: What the Attorney-General is attempting to do on the pretext of speaking on the rules is to renew the debate that took place in this House a few days ago in attempting to justify the unjustifiable position that he took at that time. I submit, Sir, that that is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. Beauchesne's 148, Section 3, I was just checking it myself. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in generality let me say that any member may attribute a falsehood to another honourable member if he says: "That is what I believe the honourable member said." But I say, Mr. Speaker, as a rule in this House any honourable member who is being challenged about the accuracy of an attribution he considers has been made, a comment, a quotation from another honourable member should have the integrity when questioned to say that when pursuant to the procedure of this House, Hansard is available, if I have in fact erred then I will apologize. But what happens in this House, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a denial of any misquotations, much heat may be engendered and much ill feeling results.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who enjoy warm debate and good -- and good effective criticism. But the Honourable Member for Morris whose discomfort may be extreme -- now I don't know -- but the honourable, Mr. Speaker, what surely is a hallmark of participation in this House is good faith. The Honourable Member from Fort Garry is someone who has demonstrated that in this House when on another occasion there has been a question of the integrity of an honourable member in this House. And I say that is the procedure that is to be followed and not that of others particularly on the other side of the House who have participated in a way that takes away from the honour and integrity of debate in this House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in all sincerity the honourable members in utilizing the rules of debate in this House use them in such a way that there will be good faith and integrity, not to suggest a state of fact which they know or ought to know is not in accordance with the truth, and in debate therefore exhibit the kind of good faith that is necessary to the effective participation of the debates in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The Attorney-General was kind enough to offer to answer a question at this stage and he dwelt at some length about the necessity for the opposition --(Interjection) -- well I have to preface my question otherwise you won't understand it, your capabilities are limited. The Attorney-General dwelt at some length on the necessity of the opposition being in possession of facts. Would he not agree that one of the ways that the opposition could become in possession of those facts was for members from that side to answer the questions that are posed by members of the opposition rather than indulging in self congratulation when they present their estimates to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as is his custom and that is fair, the Honourable Member for Morris makes a speech and asks a question. The honourable member should readily appreciate that during the course of the estimates, some honourable members become

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) somewhat incensed if their question hasn't been answered as fully and as effectively as they considered necessary, and I would like the Honourable Member from Morris to recall that the Honourable Member from Roblin was somewhat indignant because I hadn't answered to his satisfaction the contributions that he had made. Now really, Honourable Ministers are damned if they do and damned if they don't by the Honourable Member from Morris. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in order to give honourable members of the House an opportunity to digest and to dissect the program of each individual department, it is incumbent upon the Minister to justify the expenditures of the department and highlight any significant increases or changes in that department and I believe that has been the practice and that ought to continue to be the practice in dealing with estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to indicate that the Chair has been most lenient in regards to questions but if they are going to open debate instead of being for clarification I shall have to disallow them. The same will apply to people who answer questions, if they are going to extend the debate I shall also have to rule those out of order. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster. — closing debate.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I believe I'll be . . . rather extensive debate on this question — I really found that it carried on much longer than I thought it would. Perhaps I should have made my opening remarks longer and then people maybe would have been a little impatient and kept their's a little shorter. However I didn't do that and as a result we've had what has been for the most part an interesting debate.

I was particularly intrigued by the suggestion by the Member for Rhineland that somehow some secret conspiratorial committee had been set up contrary to law and that that committee had somehow usurped the function of the members of the Chamber and that this was highly irregular for a committee to meet together. Well I think that I should inform the Member for Rhineland — and perhaps I should have known that he would not understand because he is a one-member group — that there are all kinds of informal meetings held by various members in this Chamber and that at those meetings things happen — and that one should designate them as informal committees in which case they have no House status and that the only decisions are made in the House. But seeing that my honourable friend does not know I want to tell him that there are much more conspiracies taking place than he is apparently aware of. I want him to know, Mr. Speaker, that the Whips meet, they actually get together and talk about things and that after they talk about those things it has an effect on what goes on in this House. And I want him to know as well —(Interjection)— I want him to know that roughly 22 — I always forget the number — that there are 22 people on that side of the House and they meet and they plot, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— and they plot as to what is going to happen when they get into this House. And the fact is too that there are about 30 people on this side of the House that meet — we meet and we plot strategy, we plot as to how we are going to deal with you, Mr. Speaker, so that you should be aware. I thought that you were aware of them but by your indication — and, Mr. Speaker, may I even say that even in addition to those meetings which are you know, semi-formal, that the Whips meet — 22 meet over there, 30 meet over there — that there are groups within the groups that meet . . .

A MEMBER: Oh, and how!

MR. GREEN: . . . that I happen to have a meeting with the Member for Winnipeg Centre in the washroom the other day, we were standing and minding our business — and we met and we discussed things and we discussed the way certain things were going to happen in this House. But none of those meetings —(Interjection)— none of those — some of them, yes. You know, I want the honourable member to know that if he's read Swift, who was one of the most profound writers that has ever written, that Swift said that some of man's best thoughts occur at stool so if he thinks that that is something to be ashamed of then I tell him to read Swift.

But the fact is that meetings of this kind take place all the time, that nothing happens without the Mace on the table, without the Mace on the table and without the Speaker in the Chair or the Deputy Speaker in the Chair and that is how laws are made. But as to what takes place between the time that the democratic process starts and I don't even know where it starts and when it finishes, there are all kinds of things that happen. I thought that my honourable friend was aware of them — apparently he is not, if he wishes to attribute these things to secret conspiratorial meetings, so be it. They happen, they take place and somehow they are effective.

The other remarks that my honourable friend made with regard to receiving reports, I

(MR. GREEN cont'd) thought that I indicated earlier that both sides in Rules Committee when they are making rules -- with the exception of my honourable friend who has no aspirations in that regard and I can understand his failure to have aspirations -- are thinking of where they are going to be sitting in the House and each of the sides think that when he is making a rule that rule will apply to him whether he sits in government or sits in opposition. I am quite sure -- you say that the Honourable Member for Morris doesn't do his job -- I am quite sure that the Honourable Member for Morris when he is thinking of rules is thinking of sitting in one of these seats and he wants those rules to apply in such a way that he will be able to do his business whether he is in government or opposition and I respect him for it. I ask my honourable friend to agree that I think the same way and that some things have been given by way of opposition time and I think that if one measures it, the amount of give and take I would hope came out relatively equal. Certainly no great concessions have been made by the opposition and no great concessions have been made by the government.

I was rather interested on that score at the -- and you say that we are somehow out-smarting them, Mr. Speaker -- I was interested in their tactic yesterday that now that we've got these rules -- which by the way they want as much as we do and it rather reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of what happens when you yourself are named Speaker. You know the traditional parliamentary custom is that the Speaker although he wants like mad to get into that chair, he has to be dragged by two honourable members -- he has to be dragged by two honourable members to get into it presumably, presumably so that when he is sitting there he can say as we have heard the honourable member say on so many occasions: "You know, I really didn't want this job and if you guys want me to do it properly you better be nice to me." And what the members of the opposition said the other day is that: "Look, you know you really threw us into these rules and we really don't want them, and now that we've got them you'd better be nice to us." Because that's what the Member for Morris said, that's what the Member for Lakeside said -- and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that they are very good tactics, it made for good parliamentary debate, it may even have affected some people over here. I can tell you it didn't affect me, that if I want to get into the estimates I'll get into the estimates whether I'm on this side of the House or on that side of the House. But I think that your -- the caveat that you placed and the manner in which you have placed it should at least satisfy the Honourable Member for Rhineland that the opposition is not being led around by the nose in dealing with these rules. These rules are intended to provide a better manner of proceedings. The honourable member says that reports, receipt of reports should be debatable. I am sure that the Honourable Member for Morris would say receipt of reports should be debatable if I'm on the opposition side. However, I know that if I'm going to insist that receipt of reports are debatable then that SOB on the other side is not going to bring those reports in until the last moment of the session. --(Interjection)-- Surely, surely all of the members in this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland, Point of order.

MR. FROESE: Did I understand the member to say SOB?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, . . . bad words in the mind of the Member for Rhineland because then it's in his mind, that those words are not in mine what I said. I used the expression -- the initials SOB -- that's right. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Morris and the Member for Lakeside who are experienced parliamentarians, they say if we insist that receipt of these reports be debatable and we know that not -- I wasn't referring to myself because it's the Minister of Labour who now has conduct of the House -- but that those reports would just not get in until after the government accomplished the rest of its business, and didn't you see it happen last year? So what's the point of beating a dead horse. Let's give unto Caesar what is Caesar's and let's give our best in the debates in another way. Let's get all the estimates in which is something we haven't had before and the fact that it's only five hours per department -- we can gauge those five hours, we can give up three hours, we can limit the Minister which they never could do before -- we can limit a Minister to a 30-minute speech in estimates. Now that has some value.

The Chairman of the House is going to recognize other people once the Minister sits down and the chances are and I would think that this is where good faith comes in and we do expect good faith of each other -- that that member would be an opposition member. So that there has been -- yes, there has been give and take -- the opposition have made their caveat, the Member for Lakeside with his usual good style, the Member for Morris in his excellent

(MR. GREEN cont'd) debating style have both indicated as has always been the case, Mr. Speaker. There are no lawyers on the other side at the present time - I've never had an accident settled where the claimant didn't say: "I settled but I didn't get enough," and where the insurance company said: "we settled but we paid too much." Now that's a good kind of a tactic and it's a good kind of a tactic for the opposition to say: "We went along, we passed these rules, but now let's see to it that they are properly dealt with because we don't want to have been taken in." Well they haven't been taken in -- we haven't been taken in -- even the Member for Rhineland hasn't been taken in. As I said at the outset of the debate, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the rules I expect honourable members will do a good job in this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour. Call in the members. Only three members. Hold it. Requirement is five members. In my opinion the ayes have it I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, now that that motion has formally passed, may I indicate to you, Sir, and to the House, that I believe it's desirable that the new rules come into effect as of 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed to? (Agreed). The Honourable Minister of Labour.

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

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

. continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 80 (a). The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I made some remarks on the Minister's Estimates last evening and the time ran out and I still have a few more points to bring to the Minister's attention. Last night I was dealing with Workmen's Compensation and my concern was the injustice in compensation that the wife receives with children and that she is better off when her husband is alive than when he dies. The point that I was trying to make was that the compensation should be higher to what it is now which is \$120 and I said in my opinion I feel that she should receive the same compensation as if her husband was alive and totally disabled or at least would be a proper step if the Minister saw fit to move at least to 50 percent of what the husband would have received if he would have been totally disabled.

As I mentioned, there still is a ceiling, Mr. Chairman, of \$8,000 and the disabled person through injury of an accident would only be entitled to a maximum of 75 percent and if this person was disabled through an accident it's quite conceivable that making say \$800 a month he would only be entitled to approximately \$500 a month, and if he dies his widow is only entitled to \$120 and she still has the difficult job of keeping the household, paying all the expenses, and having the same overhead as if her husband was still alive. And in many instances when he is alive he could do such chores as keeping the household or watch the children and in some instances the wife can get a job. So in my opinion I'm sure that the Minister has noted this down that this is an injustice and I would like to see him move a step forward, if he can't see him going all the way so that the widow would receive the pension that the husband would have received, then surely he can go at least to the 50 percent amount.

The other point that I wish to make is that I stated I would like to see an independent advisor appointed by the Attorney-General to assist workers when they are preparing and appearing at appeals against decision of the Compensation Board. I know that at the present time this is still a problem that many of the workers have and I would like to see the Minister take some action in that respect. I believe the Province of Ontario has done so quite a few years ago. I know that the Minister will say that the Labour Board will offer assistance and I just wondered if they feel that the Labour Board is somehow too closely connected with the Compensation Board's decision and it wouldn't be sort of a completely independent thinking.

The other area that I wish to cover is industrial safety. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that everybody will appreciate that the community benefits through greater industrial efficiency of our labour force in the form of savings and one cannot measure the benefits in the saving of human life and health. I think the industries would find profit accrue from safety programs, and as I mentioned yesterday, only a week ago Saturday there was an industrial fatality in Transcona in the riding of the Honourable Minister and I understand that the accident shouldn't have happened if proper safety measures would have taken place.

I think employee relations benefit too when workers are made aware that there's an urgent and personal interest in their welfare. The cost of workmen's compensation is ultimately borne by the consumer and the taxpayer; a completely unproductive expense, Mr. Chairman. My impression is that our injury accident fatality rate in industry, particularly this last year - I may be wrong but I wish the Minister to point out, give us the statistics - I feel that they have been on the increase. I think the work force of the community has a right to an environment in which it can work safely. I feel we are somewhat short of this goal and I feel that the Minister should try and improve this area.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to also bring to the attention of the Minister that I have had again this year brought to my attention from a few people about sheltered workshop programs which provide employment for those who are unable to compete in the open market. I understand this is short-term work in which assessment of vocational and potential can be assessed with a view to assisting the handicapped people and at the present time I'm made to understand that there isn't sufficient facilities and perhaps the Minister can review this area.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, there are still violations of labour laws. I think that we must have sufficient inspectors to deal with violations. I think the workers must receive prompt government action on their complaints. If the intent of the law is to be observed then I think we should have proper inspectors. I also wonder if there's particularly - - - we have now equal legislation, equal pay for men and women and I wonder if this legislation is enforced.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) I would like to hear the Minister respond in that area as well.

Mr. Chairman, the other area; last year the university students had great difficulty in finding summer employment and I know that there were programs by Manpower and various - even Chamber of Commerce - and certain employers had schemes that would try and involve students. - - (Interjection) -- Yes, somebody's saying the province. I believe the Minister of Colleges and Universities, but I feel the Provincial Government can do more to what it has done. I believe that the Federal Government budgets to each department a certain amount of money and I would like to see the same thing happen here. I believe last year when we asked the question the Minister said well we can't give any indication how many people were hired and I know at one time of the session there weren't too many and I feel

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. If the members who are conducting some of these meetings would carry them on out in the hall please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do appeal to the Minister of Labour that perhaps he can convey to his in the Cabinet that they do set a certain amount of money for summer employment. I know this will not solve the whole employment problem but certainly it will be a great help.

Mr. Chairman, the other area that I wish to touch on briefly, and that's to do with automation which I will be presenting a resolution to this House when it comes on the Order Paper. I think that automation to a great extent will be excess if we can teach people, train people who are displaced by automation. We have to teach these people new skills and the benefits of change will only be fully and properly shared only if we consider the need of these people who are displaced by automation. I think no society should permit workers to be made jobless through no fault of their own and at the present time some of them are displaced without enough notice being given, so I feel that our future success depends on the way we are able to plan to provide for these people with new opportunities and new skills who are displaced by technology. The only way this can be accomplished is the Minister taking some responsibility and perhaps will agree to the resolutions that I'll be proposing to the House to deal with this matter where technology causes significant layoffs in industrial and commercial enterprises, that there will be enough time given.

I feel that where 10 percent of the working force is given notice of a layoff then there should be at least 15 days notice. If there is 25 percent of the labour force to be laid off then there should be at least 90 days notice given prior to the effective date of layoff. -- (Interjection) -- I don't know where, at what stage . . . is at the present time, but this legislation I would have expected the Minister to bring in at the last session or one prior. This is not new, this is in effect in the Province of Ontario and I think it would certainly be very beneficial to the workers in the Province of Manitoba.

I will not deal with the resolution at the present time because I feel that I will have an opportune time when it comes on Private Members' day, but I'm sure that the Minister will agree that when there is a factory or an industry closing down with a large number of employees where at least 50 percent of these employees are affected surely there should be at least up to nine months time given before the layoff of these people.

The other area that I'll be presenting, my colleague will be presenting a resolution to do with increased minimum wages for the people in Northern Manitoba. I hope he can find support by the Member from Thompson and Churchill and perhaps The Pas, but in my opinion I think this is long overdue. The cost of living is much higher. There are many people in service industries who are not covered by unions and I think they are to a certain extent discriminated, so I hope that the Minister will give consideration that the people who live in the northern and remote areas of the province do have inequality of opportunity because of the high cost of living or higher cost of living that we have in this part of the province and will give due consideration to a higher - at least 10 percent - higher minimum wage. --

(Interjection) - - Well I'd be interested to hear if -- I can't see no way, shape or form how it would affect Hudson Bay because the employees of Hudson Bay are protected by unions and they have no problems. They make a wage - I understand that they make a wage much higher than the minimum wage so I don't think it affects Hudson Bay at all.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I would like to bring to the Minister's attention. I don't know if he will be proposing it in the new labour code that will be before this House this session. At least he promised us last night that it will be. Will he be presenting a 5 day, 40 hour week as has been an established practice in Canada which is part of the federal legislation code, which is also accepted by all bargaining units in all negotiations and contracts

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . and it is the practice, I believe, in some of the other provinces.

The Minister when he was on this side, he talked about a 40-hour work week. He's had an opportunity now, some three years, so I'm sure he would be able to tell us if he does intend to move in this area or not. I'm sure he's aware that there's many companies, in the hundreds now in Canada, who work on a 4-day week - I know they work longer hours, they work the same amount of hours but they get an extra day off - and in Manitoba we still do not recognize keeping highly skilled people in this province because we can't establish a 40-hour work week. So I would like to hear from the Minister if he has any intentions in this area.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is I know that the Minister last night was not his usual self when he presented the Estimates. On previous occasions he was a little more exuberant. He told us how greatly the legislation for the worker has been improved and to some extent I'll agree with him. But I wish to say to him at this time that the government did promise to do very much for some of our less fortunate people and that much thrust of the last three Throne Speeches was that the government is prepared to and has decided its human and directed its attention at human betterment. But, Mr. Chairman, what are the facts?

In some of the areas in Greater Metropolitan Winnipeg, and as I pointed out, the social service audit pointed out that at least the same amount of people in an area in central Winnipeg bounded by CPR tracks and Notre Dame Avenue, 16 percent of the families in Metropolitan Winnipeg are receiving less than \$3,000 annually and in the last three years their income has not improved and their condition has not improved. They still have the same problems they had before. So what I'm trying to bring to the Minister's attention is that certain studies indicate the proportion of the community poor in one populated area of Winnipeg, of the city, increased during the times when wages were increasing and according to the leading social workers at the present time the same poor remain poor and their conditions are getting worse.

I heard very much from the government even last session that there would be some income supplement so that these people, the ones that prefer to work, that they would be able to work and have some income supplements for them; instead many of them can take the attitude well I'm better off to be unemployed and be on welfare. The government told us some two years ago that they were going to try on a trial basis and I believe the government is probably still studying this matter.

So my point is that social unfortunate citizens of our city should have adequate access to education, they still lack adequate housing, they still lack jobs, and after three years in office, with all due respect to the Minister telling us how great things are last night, these people are still in the same position they were sometime ago. Until this government is prepared to move on some form of a level of income to be established where there can be a supplement, then the conditions for these people will not improve.

Mr. Chairman, these are a few of the points that I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention. I covered most of the areas that I wanted to cover. I think another thing that I feel that the Minister should look at is the employee's rights and such things as the right to have hazardous substances labelled and monitored; the right to medical examination to determine whether exposure is adversely affecting their health; the right to have results of medical examinations; the right to request a special inspection, to be able to inform the inspector of any alleged violations; the right to refuse to enter unsafe places to work; the right to have their employer keep them informed of their rights. I'm sure this isn't asking too much.

These are a few of the remarks that I wanted to make. I pointed out to the Minister yesterday that, or last night, that there was a slight increase in - I shouldn't say slight, there was hardly any increase last year in the labour force, almost none. This year there is. There is 8,000 total employment average 371,000 up 8,000 which is 2.2 percent from the figure of 363 from last year; and my question is, I know that there is at least 20 to 25,000 people come on the labour market every year and the increase in our labour force is only 8,000, so they must be finding jobs in some other provinces. There must be -- (Interjection) -- well I don't think that many are retiring. -- (Interjection) -- Well how do you know? That's right.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood seems to believe that everything is A-Okay and everybody's got a job in Manitoba and that nobody has left the Province of Manitoba and only 8,000 people came on the labour market this whole year. That's not true. At least, 20,000 to 25,000 came on the labour market, and I know of many people and some businesses have left, so there's no way that I would be inclined to agree with his remarks, because that's not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): ... Minister a question? Would the member advise his colleagues in the House whether the employees in the insurance office he works for are unionized?

MR. PATRICK: No, but, Mr. Chairman, I'll gladly answer that. The employees in the insurance office -- at least, in my office, make probably more than double the minimum wage and I would agree that perhaps -- (Interjection) -- well the member says they don't need a union. I will try and explain to him that I don't think that anybody in this House doesn't believe in democratic unions. I have said so yesterday. In fact, I spent five minutes strictly on responsible democratic unions. I was speaking for myself, but I said I didn't think there's anybody in this House that doesn't believe this is an argument and a debate that probably took place 25 years ago and you're arguing the same debate today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. The hour being 4.30, the last hour of every sitting day is Private Members' Hour. Committee Rise and Report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne the report of the committee be received.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' hour on Wednesday. The first order is Orders for Return. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa - Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return before us is quite a lengthy one but it's self-explanatory I think. The questions have been asked for information purposes and I must say that I have sat in the House now for some three weeks and some of the information that I had expected might be forthcoming and forthright has left me a little disillusioned in some ways with the way the business is carried on here but I suppose I'll become accustomed to that as I become a veteran of this side of the House.

In order that we are to determine the size of each department it is necessary that we have the information that we have requested and this will also probably give us the function of the departments but if we have the names and staff members this way we can determine possibly who is doing what in the department and find out if they are doing their job or earning their money or if they are bogged down in red tape, and also we can justify the expense of the department, because it increased I think 11 percent last year and this year it's increased 35 percent to \$1,352,000.00.

Now as I said before, by having these questions answered we will be able to determine who is doing what, and from this make our assessment of whether or not the thousands involved in the department are being spent wisely or whether they are being squandered. I think this is our job, or at least, this is what I feel is one of our jobs. It will also enable us to probably answer some of the questions that we are receiving from citizens or people in the constituencies who are asking if we are keeping an eye on the cost and why the costs of government continue to rise, and for this reason we have made some detail in our question and have asked for the names, because having the names, we will then be able to determine how many of these posts are filled with supporters of the present government. And we are aware that there are quite a number; in fact, I think they've possibly made the old line parties pork barrel look like a small jam pail in comparison. We would also like to determine if the voters of the province are being wooed with their own money and I think this might turn up in some of the answers to these questions.

As I admitted at the start of my remarks the question may appear a little lengthy, but it doesn't seem unreasonable for someone who has been in the business world -- I have worked for a firm that had quite a large staff, that we always knew where they all were and we hoped

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) . . . we knew what they were doing most of the time -- so I don't think it would be unreasonable for us to ask the answers to the questions that we have placed on the order paper.

I think being a bit naive and new to the House we allowed the order for return on the Planning and Priorities Committee to pass with some amendments - I'm not just sure what they all are now - but we allowed the names of the employees that we had asked for to be deleted, so I don't know just whether we will get all the information on the Planning and Priorities Committee that we asked for or not. But hopefully, we will get enough information from this particular order for return to serve our purposes and I don't think we are being unreasonable in requesting the information that we have asked for.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable ~~the~~ First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when the motion was presented by the honourable member a few weeks ago, requesting the same information but relative to another committee of cabinet, I indicated at the time that we were prepared to accept the order subject to certain caveats or conditions, and I believe I indicated the same thing with respect to this particular motion. The honourable member in the debate that has just started, has indicated that he is somewhat at a loss to understand just why we wouldn't be prepared to accede to all of the requests here, in all of its detail, etc. I believe I have already answered that when I said that we would be prepared to provide information by class of category and numbers but not with respect to individual names.

Now it is open to the individual members opposite if they wish to, to submit questions or orders with respect to individuals, if they so wish, but I say again that a general omnibus kind of order for return of this kind, asking for all names of every individual engaged in a given department or Committee of Cabinet is something that we are not inclined to accept. There is, maybe the honourable member is making a plea now, an argument that we should depart completely from past practice and precedent with respect to the conditions which govern the acceptability of an order for return. Perhaps he is making a plea that we ought to depart completely from reliance on rules, past practices and ~~Beauchesne~~.

Citation 213 of ~~Beauchesne~~ does point out in a very simple and clear way that Orders for Return have on numerous occasions in the past been rejected on the simple grounds that it is not in the public interest. We are not invoking that particular argument or precedent, Mr. Speaker, but we are invoking the argument that there ought to be at least some greater specification as to what individuals my honourable friends are interested in. If they want to assume the onus of specifying the individual we will give him the information, but let them at least take that much onus.

Then, of course, ~~Beauchesne~~ does also indicate that in the past there is ample parliamentary precedent for rejecting an Order for Return on the grounds that the mere answering of it would require so much research and administrative preparation that would involve unreasonable labour or expense.

My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition does have a very strange sense of humour because he laughs at something which is longstanding parliamentary practice. I will actually read this paragraph from ~~Beauchesne~~, Citation 213: "That a motion for a return may be opposed on the ground of public policy, such as, that the disclosure of the information sought is not for the public interest or, that its supply would involve unreasonable labour or expense".

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that one of the Orders for Return asked for the names of each individual employed by Boards and Commissions, which in the case of the Manitoba Telephone System, the Manitoba Hydro is a Board or Commission of the Crown, would involve the listing of several thousand names, etc., etc. Quite frankly, on a request of that kind I would have no hesitation whatsoever to invoke Citation 213 of ~~Beauchesne~~ on the grounds that its supply would involve unreasonable labour or expense.

The request coming from an opposition that has been trying to make hay, not always with intellectual honesty about it, that the increase in the civil service size in Manitoba is somehow unduly large and unjustifiable, they have been making that argument despite the fact that comparative figures for all of the provinces show levels of incremental growth in civil service size, to be, if anything, higher in some other jurisdictions including the jurisdiction of Alberta and Ontario. Even in proportionate population terms that provinces such as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, have higher ratios of civil servants per thousand population

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . than Manitoba. All of these things appear to contain no interest to the Opposition. They prefer to blithely keep on ignoring that simple fact of the matter. So if they insist on ignoring the facts and trying to make something about civil service size then certainly I will not give fuel for their fire by agreeing to Orders for Return that will involve considerable staff-man months and staff-man weeks.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I still make it clear that had the honourable members opposite been prepared to accept the order on the basis upon which I laid out the conditions, then we would have supplied the information. They have now however transferred it for debate; it must come to a vote in which case we reject it in its form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on this resolution. First of all the First Minister brings up the past practices of this House and we have on occasion last year, and this year, asked without Order for Return for the names and the salaries of the deputy ministers and the heads of boards and commissions and, Mr. Speaker, this has always been the practice of this House, and I was very surprised on those occasions on asking the question, and particularly from the new House Leader for him to stand up and say that he was - that this was a practice of which he was unaware in this House. Mr. Speaker, this used to be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CRAIK: This was provided before the Estimates in previous years under the former administration without filing an Order for Return. Now this government tells us to get this information we must file an Order for Return, and now we file an Order for Return and in order to get the information we find that it's going to be very qualified, that is, there's not going to be some conditions of the order accepted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, furthermore the Premier, the First Minister says that under Beauséne's rule that if the numbers are too great the job becomes too great and it doesn't justify undertaking to do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, on Planning Priorities and on Management Committee when this government took over you could count the number of employees in each department on two hands. That's how large the staff was. There was a very very limited staff. It was a case of listing it in about - 15 minutes is about what it would take. Now if that staff has grown in Planning and Priorities and in Management Committee to the size where they cannot accept an Order for Return in order to provide the information, then, Mr. Speaker, that's justification alone for them to go through the exercise and find out just how big that they've grown, because they have grown from almost nothing to a massive size, a very significant part of the bureaucracy in a very short period of time, and, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the phone book alone if you want to see over the last three years what has happened in these two agencies of the government. So if they're too big to provide answers to an Order for Return by quoting a Beauséne rule, then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the whole government has grown too big and that there's no ground for refusing the order on that basis.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister also brings up the case of whether or not the ratio of civil servants in Alberta is not greater than it is in Manitoba and therefore Manitoba - that the Opposition is trying to prove something by this but the fact that Alberta has a greater ratio means that we have nothing to prove. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Alberta does what is Alberta's business and Alberta has far more royalties to draw on than Manitoba with which to finance and pay for civil service staff. The two are not comparable in any way, shape, or form. The royalties on gas and oil in Alberta alone amount to one-third of the total Manitoba budget, and if Alberta wants to administer their gas and oil business, or the rules and regulations to rule that business, to govern that business, to put into effect its regulations, that's Alberta's business. But Manitoba does not have an oil and gas business and mineral business that provides it with \$200 million a year in income and therefore it does not also have to administer that business in the - through government regulation. So I think there's good reason if the First Minister wants to quote Alberta, he'll find good reason for their civil service staff being larger per capita than it is in Manitoba. They simply have a larger stake in the natural resource business than Manitoba does.

And the final conclusion is that there is no comparison. Manitoba civil service is a concern. The size of it is a concern not only to the opposition but to a great many people in Manitoba and the questions come about because we get the questions from the people, as I'm sure the government is getting them. So I want to conclude by saying that I consider it

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . intellectually dishonest, if we're going to talk about that, for the government to say, first of all, the past practice of this House does not allow the divulgence of names and salaries whether it was the custom year upon year, upon year, to give not only the names of the deputy ministers, the boards and commission chairman, but to supply them at the time the Estimates were tabled, in an addition to that give a list of the total numbers of civil servants in each of the departments. And, Mr. Speaker, if the question is going to go any further, let me supply the government with the list that was filed on March 31st, 1969, which gives exactly what was done in every year through the sixties right up until the change of government in 1969 in which we've been unable to obtain from the government since it came to power.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the honourable member if he would table that document and possibly we could participate in debate.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I . . . table it. I'll get a Xerox copy; it's the only one I have in the House. Thank you.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter this debate because I think that much more than what has been said has to be said now. I was absent when the Planning Priorities Order for Return, which was similar, was accepted with the conditions and I read with interest the way in which the government has handled this. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have requested the names of the people who are on Management Committee, and, Mr. Speaker, I think we are entitled to know who they are and their salaries. We will get that information a year later when Public Accounts come through, and a year later we can debate that again. But we don't want it a year from now. There are too many questions that have to be asked as of now.

Mr. Speaker, the salaries of Planning Priorities have risen 35 percent in one year. Now the people of Manitoba are paying for that and there is enough question raised all over Manitoba about the way in which the government is spending the public purse for us to ask the government to list the names, to tell us the salaries, to give us an indication of their responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, when we talk in terms of a budget for this year of Management Committee, of \$1,350,000, surely we are entitled to know why there's justification for \$350,000 to be spent this coming year. Mr. Speaker, it is our belief that the government, although they have tried to maintain the posture of being responsible in handling the administration and management of the affairs of the province, have failed to adequately come to grips with the kind of restraints and controls that should have been exercised with respect to spending. Mr. Speaker, the government, with full knowledge of what they were doing, and with the design that we think has failed, attempted to set up both within Management Committee, and within Planning Priorities, a group of people who would ask the various departments to answer to them for their actions and at the same time as a result of doing that, the various departments then expanded their own research branches to have people hired by them to be able to answer the Management Committee and Planning Priorities for what they were doing. And so what we have had is the spendthrift way of several million dollars being passed around in a game that is being played by the government in their attempt to control the expenses, which obviously has not done that because of the substantial rise that has occurred within the civil service and within government spending, and which we believe is failing adequately to provide any kind of reasonable set of priorities for any kind of course of action for the government to take. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have not been given any goals; we have not been given any targets of performance to be examined, to be established, and this was the work of this committee, and, Mr. Speaker, if we were successful in arriving at the position of being the government we would dismiss with . . . certainty and very quickly, substantial numbers of people who we believe are not performing a function in the interest of the people of Manitoba in the best way. Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for the government to stand up and say to us, it's tradition. Mr. Speaker, they are hiding the information from the people of Manitoba, and they are hiding it and hiding it for a reason. They are not prepared to list the names of the people for an examination to take place as to their function and for us to be in a position to try and scrutinize them, as they should be scrutinized, as to why in fact the justification for the rise in this situation should take place.

Now let's go back to the year before. There was a rise of \$350,000 or 35 percent; there was a rise of 11 percent or \$100,000 the year before that. Now what has happened? You know we go through this constant battle where the members opposite say the Legislature is for the purpose of the people through the Opposition getting information and yet every time we stand up, and every time we make and try and present a case, we are told, present your facts. If you don't have the facts, don't ask the question, or prove it. The First Minister has said if you have a specific question to ask about a specific person, tell us and we will give the information. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the First Minister that we on this side do not know who is in Management Committee, and I want to tell him that very few people on the other side know who are Management Committee, and I want to tell the First Minister that the people the Management Committee don't even know who's on Management Committee, and that applies to Planning and Priorities. You've got a group of people who have been running wild all over this province, and in this building -- and this is known -- and who have in fact undertaken projects that are not known by others, who are in fact following through on things that are not coordinated, or not dovetailed, and the result has been confusion, duplication, resentment within the civil service, a completely unproductive waste and effort on the part of departments who handle people, who have been trying to justify their actions to a group of people who answer to somebody who sometimes meet with some of the ministers, and the First Minister, out of which we get a budget and get through on Estimates in a given year. We then examine and

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) see what they have done and find very little because, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: What about the relationship between government and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, that's interesting. We're going to go back to 1969, to 1968, to 1967, and we're going to talk about 1966.

Mr. Speaker, if a government has nothing to hide about listing the names of the people on Planning and Priorities and Management Committee, then put them on the table. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the First Minister doesn't even know who's on Planning and Priorities. I'm not sure that the Minister in charge knows who's in Planning and Priorities. I'm not sure that the civil service knows who's in Planning and Priorities. I'm sure that there are very many people in Manitoba who really, and who can put together a list, because frankly they have been allowed to run wild in the activities that they've undertaken without any degree and control. And, Mr. Speaker, with a government that is going to come to the people tomorrow in a budget and say to them, we have handled the stewardship of this province, and expect us to justify a 35 percent increase in a Management Committee which is a million, three hundred and fifty dollars of public money being spent in one particular committee, and not be prepared to give us the names of the people who are involved, if a government expect that kind of openness to be accepted by the Opposition, and expects that kind of position to be examined by us on the basis that we have no suspicion, then I think they have to reject it, because, Mr. Speaker until the government is prepared to put the names of the people whom they've hired on the table when requested by the Opposition, both in Planning and Priorities and Management Committee, until they're prepared to do that we will be suspicious, the people will be suspicious, and as the Honourable Member for Minnedosa has suggested the complaints that have been registered about the patronage that has been exercised by the government; the fears that the people have that the New Democratic Party relatives have been put on the public purse, will continue to be perpetuated over and over and over again because of the refusal of the government to stand up and present a reasonable request and reasonable information to the Legislature that's entitled to it, and all the pontificating on the part of the First Minister, and all the attempts of the First Minister to suggest any intellectual dishonesty, will not in any way take away from the basic suspicion that exists all over the province with respect to what I've said.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest if you want to judge the arguments between the First Minister and myself, and you want to talk about intellectual dishonesty, it is intellectually dishonest for the First Minister to stand up and say, you tell us who you want information about, rather than give us a list of people who are employed by the government and who are paid by the public purse. What have you got to hide? Past tradition, nonsense! You don't want that information. You don't want the information on Planning and Priorities, because, Mr. Speaker, the basic point that I've made, and I'll repeat it once more and then I'll take my seat, is that the government has set up a structure and a bureaucracy which in turn was supposed to control the government expenditures and which has had the exact opposite effect. It has made the departments and forced them into hiring additional members of the bureaucracy to be able to prove their case to the group that have been set up to hold this restraint and on the course of this you have the game in which one is fighting the other with the public being the loser because they are paying out millions of dollars that have been wasted in this exercise, and which has not accomplished the very essential, necessary action of government which is to cut government spending today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has again justified a statement that I've made in the past that he is one of the great assets that we on this side have. He has again made violent, flagrant statements, repetitious, unsupported; he has continually in the past and today talked about suspicions which he himself has helped generate, talked loosely in the way that he has done in the past, in such a way as to cast a shadow on all that is being done in government, including many civil servants who are loyal to government and not to this government. He has described to us the operations of some form of government which he may have been familiar with. There is no doubt in the world that the Leader of the Opposition flanked as he is now by former members of the Cabinet of the former government, he as one of them had a great deal to do with the distribution of patronage of the previous government -- I have no doubt but that he was very much part of the decision as to who would

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) handle the advertising contract of that government. I haven't the slightest doubt about it, I haven't the slightest of doubts that he knew just who they were, and what role they played in the Conservative Party, and the contributions they made to the Conservative Party. I haven't the slightest doubt about that. And now he's dictating to the Member for Lakeside to make sure that he has the proper responses and possibly the Member for Lakeside will be able to give us the information of who indeed were the people that were the beneficiaries of the patronage of that government. Name by name, amount by amount; no doubt he knows it as far as lawyers were concerned, as far as advertising agents were concerned. Not the slightest doubt the Member for Lakeside, who obviously intends to speak very soon will give us that information because that was money that was being spent by the former government and it may be all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to disassociate himself from the previous government. The fact is that we all recognize him as a member of that government and a person who cannot slough off responsibilities for what was done by that government. There is no doubt in my mind, having examined his speeches in the past, that he would like it best to separate himself. As a matter of fact I read somewhere where he is really a Roblin government but really it's a government that has changed -- I mean party -- it has changed in terms of the input, the personal leadership input, and the thinking and the philosophy of the Leader of the Opposition. I know that may be true because I know that there are members in this Opposition who don't quite go along with him in many of the concepts of the Progressive Conservative Party, but that is a healthy sign and one which I think may some day persuade the Conservative Party to really make the word "progressive" meaningful and not just an adjunct or an attribute.

But now, Mr. Speaker, having commented on the attitude of the Leader, I want to talk a little bit about this document that was flourished by the Honourable the Member for Riel, because the document before us that he has is a document listing the deputy minister or head of board or commission. And I remember on one occasion during this session, he asked if this would be made available and I think he was not told it would be, nor do I believe he was told that it would not be. This is a list of the senior civil servants and heads of agencies of the government. It's the kind of information that could be readily obtained in the Public Accounts, and I agree that those are late. It is the kind of information that could be readily obtained -- (Interjection) -- just let me finish my sentence and I'll sit down. May I finish the sentence? It can be readily obtained during the Estimates procedure where every Minister, I am sure, would be prepared not only to name his deputy but to laud him if indeed he deserves that kind of comment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order, the Minister of Finance says there was no indication that the information would not be given. That is not the case, The indication was, both last year and this year, that this information would become available only through examination of Public Accounts at least 12 months after the fact, and this is not what this document is here. This is a current document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm really not sure what kind of a point the honourable member rose on but I was glad to hear him make that statement even though I don't think it was in order for him to interrupt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've already said that I'm sure every Minister would be prepared to give the kind of information that is contained here and frankly I'm under the impression that he may have been invited to file an Order for Return on this kind of information. That is, the deputy of every department and the chairman or head of any board or commission. But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Riel made it appear as if the information in this document he was waving around is the kind of information that's being asked for in this Order for Return. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition shakes his head, so I can only assume that he didn't listen to the Honourable Member for Riel because it was clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that in waving this two-page document he made it appear as if that's the kind of information that's being requested.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me refer to history for a minute. And the history is the history that took place on July 15th -- I'm not talking about election day. I'm talking about the day when this government took over the management of the affairs of the government of the Province of Manitoba. And we then learned -- from then on we learned a great deal about the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)administrative structure in government. It's amazing how much there is to know, and I would guess that it would amaze members of the opposition who never did reach the stage of sitting in the Treasury Benches, how much there is to know in the administration. But one thing we found was a document which was prepared after a study made - I think it cost in excess of half a million dollars - by P.S. Ross and Associates, prepared at the request of the previous government to review all administrative operations in government, and that document recommended the setting up of a Planning and Priorities Committee and of a Management Committee of Cabinet. I recall how when we were in opposition we learned about this by the fact that there was a news release issued by the government giving the names of the members of Cabinet who were sitting on each committee and, as I recall it, the names of the secretaries of each committee. Gordon Holland was named as a Secretary of the Management Committee of Cabinet and Bob Wallace was named as the Secretary of the Planning and Priorities Commission. Those gentlemen are still with their -- committee I mean. Those gentlemen are still with the Cabinet Committees I have mentioned, and in case the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition didn't know it, they are the people whose names are widely known even to him, and if he's not sure of their salaries I'm sure if he wants to broadcast them across the province, they can be made available to him.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we came into government we found two embryos in those Cabinet Committees. They were not developed. They were not performing the full function that was planned for them in that very study which the previous government caused to, recommended. They were just staffed by a nucleus of people and it became immediately apparent that in order to fulfill the function which that government planned for it, which was recommended, there had to be a substantial broadening in the scope, in the personnel, in the expertise that was required, and this we proceeded to do and, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and that of many of my colleagues, we did too slowly. I believe that we took our time looking for the right kind of personnel to make sure that we had trained people who were planners, researchers, who had management competence, and who could therefore play that very role which was planned for these two Cabinet Committee Secretariats. I for one make no apology for the fact that it has grown. Had it not grown it would have meant that we would have been the same stick-in-the-mud kind of government that preceded us. It was because there were things that had to be done; because there was planning that had to take place; and because there were priorities that had to be established, that we wanted to develop and give strength and needs flushing out, those very committees that were only, as I say, in their embryonic stages.

Now I don't think that this government will back away from the fact that the committees have grown, I mean Committee Secretariats have grown in size and of course in budget expenditures. Peculiarly enough, these people who have brought forward under Private Members' Day, their own time, the kind of resolutions that they've brought, is something that clearly could be, and I believe should be, discussed under Estimates because it is there that the Minister responsible for each of the various committees would have to account for the required monies for the expenditures in these two Cabinet Committees. Now it's fine, we could debate it on Private Members' time, or we can debate it on Estimates time, but the information really would be available there and it would be much more helpful especially since the rules that we've agreed to are now changed -- I mean with the changes we've agreed to have now made it possible to have Gordon Holland sitting right here with more detailed information available if the Minister responsible would like to make use of his knowledge, and then information can be given, but to what extent does it matter to the Leader of the Opposition that the Chairman of Management doesn't know the name of every person that is in that department. I wonder the extent to which the former Minister for Industry and Commerce knew the names of all the people that were working in his department, and if he did, if he did maybe that shows how much time he found necessary or advisable to spend with each individual member of his department. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm sure they knew his name, and so they should have, but then by extension I would guess that the Honourable Minister who was responsible for Health and Social Services should also have known the names of all the people in his department because that is the implication that I draw, or the inference that I draw from what was implied by the Honourable the former Minister for Industry and Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, what was indicated earlier, and by the Premier, is that the information as to numbers, as to amounts, that information should be made available, and indeed in the Planning and Priorities request which is already accepted, it was agreed that that would be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) given, but naming individuals, I believe, is something that honourable members should be reluctant to ask for, and I say that in the sense that civil servants' names should not be bandied about. That's my opinion. And the Opposition -- as a matter of fact I remember the Leader of the Opposition, who I don't think had attained that status and acceptance at the time, wanted to know from one of the Ministers which member of the department gave him certain kinds of information or advice which he was reporting to the House. The nerve that I felt then that he had to ask which member of your department was the one who told you, or advised you along certain lines. I say it's none of his business because in the end it's the Minister and it's the government that takes responsibility for the advice and for the questions asked and answered in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: The Minister of Finance has made reference to a question that I've asked - I don't recall it - but I would like the opportunity for him to examine it and if it is so, to produce it in the House, or make reference to it, or apologize for the statement if it is not so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly not going to apologize for the statement because I rely on my memory and I will certainly try to check it out. Unfortunately, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition both before and after he acquired that chair, and the location of the chair -- oh, I'm sorry, he hasn't really moved from there, he's just moved in his job -- has the unfortunate habit of making many of his speeches while seated on his seat and there are many occasions in the past and continuing where he asked questions and throws out challenges which may well be unrecorded in Hansard. And therefore . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege I would ask then that the Minister withdraw that remark unless he's in a position to prove it. I do not recall it, I'm prepared to indicate that I may be incorrect in my memory but unless he has the ability to be able to prove it by reference to the Hansard, and I'm prepared to wait until he's examined it, I do not think that the representation that he's making to this House is a correct statement of fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I've never involved myself in this kind of discussion as to what is privilege and what is in order. That is one of the fields that I've never studied too well but, Mr. Speaker, I know that if I had accused the honourable member of being a liar I would have to retract it. I know that if I had imputed motives to him that were wrong, I would have to retract it, but, Mr. Speaker, I am only speaking from memory of a definite impression I have of recollecting that the honourable member made a certain statement. Now if he considers that an insult, then I would be happy to accept the fact that he would agree that had he made such a statement it would be an insult. I don't consider it an insult but if he does, that's a different . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege because I suspect that what the Minister of Finance is now doing -- he is creating a fairly dangerous precedent which can work both ways and he's prepared to continue on in the way that he has along this line, then having set this precedent I want him to be aware . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate that I was trying to determine the matter of privilege. I find that the question that is involved is a matter of opinion and recollection and it's also a debatable issue. Therefore I cannot find that it's a matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker . . . -- (Interjections) -- No, I thought the Minister was finished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: No. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly accept a statement by the honourable member that he did not make the statement. I'm still prepared to go back to Hansard and look for that but it's such an unimportant thing that I doubt if it is indexed properly enough that I could read three sessions of Hansard in order to support my statement, but if he says he didn't say it then I'll accept his statement that he didn't say it, subject of course to my being able to locate it if I can.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to what I understand is the position of this government

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) and that is that as to numbers, as to amounts, there should be no objection by this government to giving that information, and indeed I'm sure now that it will be asked for during Estimates debate and would be given by the Minister. As to names of individuals, I still have a peculiar idea, and it may be traditional, but although I'm no great believer that tradition must be followed at all times I do respect tradition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister has four minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I do respect tradition to the extent that I can study it and evaluate the reason for it. One of the reasons I've accepted is that one should not bandy about names of people in this House who are not in a position to respond and who indeed, I believe, as civil servants are accepted to be loyal civil servants of government, of any government, and should not be discussed in the House. -- (Interjection) -- Well, of course, that involves all employees who are involved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may well be that the honourable members want to discuss the work that is being done by the employees, be they casual, be they consultants, be they temporary, be they permanent. That is the meat of what should be discussed. That is what the opposition should be involved in discussing. They should want to know what is the work being done by these committees; what is the nature of the work; what are the benefits of it; what are the justifications for spending money? I shouldn't be teaching them. Of course I was in opposition longer than they but since I expect that they will be in opposition much longer than I will have been, then I am still ready to advise them. Questions of that, or questions of moment, and questions of concern, but this bickering and fighting about names of individuals is to me something that should be beneath the dignity of the members. I recall that there was an agreement made, whether it's legislative or otherwise, that all salaries paid, all monies paid to people in excess of \$7,500 is reported in Public Accounts. And the honourable member, again speaking from his seat and proving my point that he does speak from his seat, said "a year later". I don't know whether he can't think about having rephrased this motion in such a way as to make it a sensible one and a logical one and not one that was like one submitted by the Honourable Member from Swan River, asking for all the names of all the employees of all the Crown Corporations, meaning every employee of Manitoba Hydro, every employee, and the salary and other information asked. If that's the extent to which they want to go, then they can play their games, Mr. Speaker, but surely we don't have to play according to their ridiculous rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to be brief because I think one or two others want to enter the debate before the closing hour. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think we really expected the information to be supplied, the information that is requested in this particular Order for Return, but we wanted to put the government's words and intentions and widely publicized philosophy to a test.

Since the election of this government we have heard at length and in public forms as well as in this House that the kind of information that is being legitimately sought in this order for return, by the opposition and by the people of Manitoba, would be readily forthcoming. So sir, we put that expression of confidence and that promise of that kind of style of politics to the test, and as I say, although we did so purely from that perspective, and also had the hope that we would receive the information we wanted, we really have not been confident that the answers would be provided.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SHERMAN: What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a cleverly played poker game on the part of the government in which, now that their hand has been called they don't want to play according to the rules any more. This Order for Return, Mr. Speaker, cuts to the very core of the argument of the efficiency, the efficiency of the management of the public affairs of the people of Manitoba. That's precisely the point at which it strikes. It examines the degree of efficiency, the degree of confidence applied by this government to the management of the affairs of the people of Manitoba.

There has been a continuing debate on this subject and I think my honourable friends on the government side of the House would concede that, a continuing debate on the question as to whether the public affairs of the people of Manitoba are being handled efficiently and realistically and economically. They for their part argue justifiably that those affairs are being so handled. We for our part, and those Manitobans whom we represent and whom we speak for, argue precisely the opposite. What this order for return does, in essence, it asks to have

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) that question looked at realistically and answered insofar as it can be answered by the kind of information requested here. There has been a debate since this government was elected over the size, the continuing expansion of the bureaucracy, over the merit of the size of the bureaucracy, over the merit of expansion of that bureaucracy's size. There has been a debate since this government was elected as to how the bureaucracy of the Province of Manitoba under the present administration, Sir, compares with the bureaucracy of Manitoba under the immediately previous administration and administrations prior to that.

Now my friends opposite, the First Minister and his colleagues cannot deny that that is a continuing and a widely followed and provocative debate, that not only engages the members of this Legislature but that engages Manitobans generally at large throughout the province. One is influenced in his or her approach to the question by political affiliation and political partisanship to be sure, but that doesn't detract from the legitimacy of the debate. It doesn't detract from the fact that it is a valid question for Manitobans of any political persuasion to be asking themselves; the question of whether or not the bureaucracy of Manitoba has been expanded unrealistically and inefficiently and uneconomically by this administration in comparison to its size and its performance under previous administrations. I suggest that that is really the basic debate in which Manitobans find themselves engaged today because it involves and implies the whole question of government efficiency, the whole question of the proper management of the public's money and the proper spending of the public's money.

All this Order for Return does, Mr. Speaker, I submit is play its valid and legitimate role in that debate. It's an order for return asking for information related to that specific question and that specific debate. What the order does is call for the government to show the poker hand that it has been playing, Sir, in terms of the administration of the affairs of the people of Manitoba and the proper disbursement and proper management of public monies. We've called that hand and now that the hand has been called, the government is unhappy about the rules of the game in which it is involved and is unwilling to disclose its hand. But in the early going, in the early going, in the early days of this administration's life and in the days immediately preceding its election to office, there were proud protestations and promises it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, heard by all Manitobans of the kind of open, informative, confidential government and approach to politics that this party would bring to the province, and bring to office should it be successful.

Well, perhaps now it will be up to the voters of Manitoba to judge, Mr. Speaker, whether that high promise has been fulfilled and whether or not -- (Interjection) -- well, my honourable friend from Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works says "any time", but I suggest to you that that's contradictory, Mr. Speaker, to the practice of this government. He says any time, but we have been waiting for some time now, some substantial period of time for that mandate to be put to the test in the constituency of Wolseley, and if my friend, the Minister has any influence with his colleagues, and with his principal and senior colleague, the First Minister, I suggest that he say to him, that his attitude is that he's prepared to put his record and his government's record and his colleagues' record on the line any time. That doesn't jibe, Sir, with the position that's been taken by the First Minister and I say to you that the vacancy of the seat in this Legislature for Wolseley is graphic illustration of that fact.

So Mr. Speaker, I return to the point I was making before my friend the Minister for Public Works interrupted, that the voters of Manitoba will not be called upon to pass judgment on the degree to which this government has fulfilled its promise of open confidentiality. When they talk about providing the information that was withheld by previous administrations, by bringing an open style to the affairs of public life here, which was denied and rejected by previous administrations, they have one simple method of demonstrating their sincerity and that is by responding to the kind of legitimate request for information that is contained in the Order for Return filed by my colleague from Minnedosa. Their rejection of it and repudiation of it, their decision to hide from it and to ignore it is a testimony I think, Mr. Speaker, to the kind of insecurity that they feel with respect to the confidence they have in Manitoba at the present time, a kind of insecurity that has demonstrated itself in the Wolseley situation.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague has asked here for information that is the legitimate right of any Opposition representing any sector of the Manitoba public and all the arguments that have been put up by members on the government side to avoid providing this information are smoke screens and cover-ups, Mr. Speaker, for inefficiency and mismanagement and wastage in

April 5, 1972

659

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) government that is becoming more and more apparent to the voters of Manitoba and which I think probably, Mr. Speaker, will produce the kind of result in the next election in Manitoba that we on this side are hoping to give the people of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.