

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 27, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 100 students of Grade 11 standing of the Gordon Bell High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Desmet and Nickarz. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

We also have 55 students Grade 6 standing of the Wellington School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Slobodian, Mrs. Murray and Miss Franeo. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Morris.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a Cabinet I wonder if I could direct my question to the House Leader and ask him if he could undertake to find out why a report that was tabled in the House yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture was delayed nine months before submitting that report to this House. The report is dated May 31st, 1973 and we received it yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I hardly know how to answer in view of the prologue. I don't know whether the honourable member will consider that I am able to answer not being one of the Cabinet, but I will try my best in any event. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any requirements for the tabling of the report. The Minister of Agriculture felt that it should be tabled and the timing is relatively shortly after the commencement of the Session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour who is now in a position to answer it, or at least to respond to it. Can the Minister advise the House whether the conciliation officer appointed in the dispute between the City of Winnipeg and its police force is meeting today with the Police Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether there is a direct involvement between the City and the Police Association and the Director of Industrial Relations. There are conversations going on at the present moment between them. What I mean by that is, could be by the media of the telephone rather than meeting in a room.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are the two sides in the dispute meeting or are they meeting independently with the conciliation officer?

MR. PAULLEY: I can't go beyond what I said, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware and cannot really answer as to whether or not the committee of council and the representatives of the Police Association are meeting or not without the involvement of the conciliation officer. I would be aware if the conciliation officer was meeting together with them.

MR. SHERMAN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister in a position to reinforce or revise his estimate of the possible outcome that he gave in the House earlier this week?

MR. PAULLEY: I am still of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the matter will be resolved and that the conciliation department of the Department of Labour will do everything possible to bring about a resolution. I don't think there's been really a deterioration in the situation. And I might say in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, that if I as Minister of Labour felt that this was a possibility I would undertake to contact the chief citizen of the City of Winnipeg, namely Mayor Juba to see as to whether or not he and I may be of assistance. In any eventuality I

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . don't think that this would be required, Mr. Speaker, in direct answer to my friend, but I'm sure that Members of the Assembly would agree that if in the final analysis this was necessary they would agree with me, take the step.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Autopac. Will he confirm that the \$3.00 service charge that he described recently in the House for deferred payment on Autopac premiums is equivalent to a charge of between 24 percent and 77 percent of the premiums which are deferred. I'm referring to his words, the service charge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I answered the question the other day that was posed by the honourable member and the charge is a service charge to cover administrative matters in handling Sir. No interest charges insofar as the - a person who wishes to borrow money can go to the bank. I was informed by one of my colleagues the other day that - I'm given to understand that a service fee of \$5.00 is normally charged by banks for overdrawn accounts, so that the service fee charged by the Motor Vehicle Branch on behalf of Autopac wouldn't be out of line.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Would he give consideration to reducing that service charge for lower premiums in order to make the effective rate of charge more conscionable as opposed to a 77 percent of premium charge.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the same type of service would still have to be provided and the costs of maintaining a record system for deferred payment would still have to be maintained.

MR. ASPER: Well then, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Would he give consideration to the feasibility of changing the deadline for payment of Autopac premiums say for next year some time to late spring or early summer in light of the fact that the current deadline of February 28th hits the public at a time when their cost of living is at the highest for heat, clothing and that sort of thing.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the deferred payment of Autopac is deferred until 90 days hence after the renewal date of March 1st. There is a portion of the payment has to be made on the renewal date and the remaining portion - if the member is suggesting that the total licensing procedure be changed to a different month of the year that would be a matter of policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question by the Honourable Member for St. James the other day relative to truckers in relation to Churchill Forest Industries. I would like to repeat the questions and the answers that have been given to me by the Forestry Resources Limited Corporation. Question: Can the Minister advise the House if CFI will have to shut down for part of this year due to shortage of pulpwood?

The answer: The management of the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited does not anticipate there will be any need to shut down production in 1974 because of a shortage of pulpwood arising out of poor road conditions.

Question: Can the Minister confirm that 16 out of 45 trucks that are hauling for Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited in the Cranberry Portage area have been pulled off the job in the past month because of dangerous road conditions in the 20 accidents that have occurred this winter?

The answer from the company again: As of this date Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited has 43 trucks on a direct company contract log haul. To the best of their knowledge the management of the company is only aware of one truck contractor, one truck contractor, who has removed six vehicles from the haul because of alleged dangerous road conditions. The road conditions from both a management viewpoint and in the eyes of 86 truckers who are transporting wood over these roads are normal for the area and weather conditions. The management believes that drivers who are inexperienced with driving logging trucks on secondary roads covered with snow and/or ice contributed to a slight increase in the amount of damage to vehicles caused by accidents. The number of accidents is not greater however than would be expected under prevailing conditions.

Question: I wonder if the same minister could confirm if it is the responsibility of Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited or CFI to maintain these roads.

Maintenance on five of the all-weather access roads is the responsibility of the Highways

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . Department. Maintenance on one winter road comes under the Department of Northern Affairs. Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited is responsible for the maintenance of side roads and supplements maintenance to the above roads when weather conditions demand this action. Provincial trunk highways are also used for hauling where this is possible.

Now in general, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that there is a difference of opinion between the Corporation and at least one contractor according to the company as to conditions of road. The one contractor apparently had some disagreement with the company and has sought to take his matter to the public forum which is his every right and that is a responsible thing to do, there is no criticism of that, but I think the House should be aware that there is an argument between the Corporation and one contractor in particular.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister if he had met with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and Council and some other municipal people in respect to the Canadian Football League and the problems they are experiencing with the new football league coming in, and has he got anything to report from his counterparts in Western Canada and the Federal Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to meet with His Worship the Mayor of Winnipeg today. I was informed that it would seem advisable if possible that every Mayor and Reeve in the Province of Manitoba make their thoughts known to the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare in regard to not only protecting the CFL that we have in Canada, but in expanding the performance itself of the Canadian Football League and their fears in regards to the World Football League entering Canada and jeopardizing the existence of the Canadian Football League. I would, by answering the question, Mr. Speaker, advocate that every municipality in the Province of Manitoba make their thoughts known to the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare in Ottawa.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Minister now launched an inquiry into the dramatic increase in the price of Manitoba Sugar, in light of the concerns he expressed in this area yesterday when he said that the area was ripe for inquiry and the revelation today that sugar led the price in food cost increases across Canada for the month of February.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have not launched an inquiry into sugar prices as yet, although I am perturbed and concerned about the increase in sugar prices.

MR. MARION: A further question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister had any further word from bakery representatives on whether the price of bread will be going up by four cents a loaf as indicated by the Bakery Council of Canada?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, since my meeting with the representatives of the baking and milling industry, I have had no further word personally from them.

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A last question to the same Minister. Has the Minister had any success following the meeting with the bakery industry of influencing them, does he feel with respect to minimizing that increase?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the determination of the success of that meeting in terms of influencing the baking and milling industry to reduce the announced rate of increase will only be determined when the price of bread does or does not go up. I would hope, of course, that the baking and milling industry would not see fit to raise bread as much as four cents for a 24 oz. loaf.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources with regard to his report today. Could the Minister tell the House how many trucks were under contract as of January 1, 1974 and total numbers with CFI for hauling wood, and how many new contracts or how many new trucks have been hired since

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) . . . that date?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: No I couldn't, Mr. Speaker. I presume the honourable member will wish me to get the information and I will undertake to try and do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and relates to the comment in today's press that the Minister considers a government takeover of Simplot Chemical Company as a possibility. I would simply ask the Minister if this comment represents a considered opinion of his government and the cabinet at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't even cover my own considered opinion. All it is is speculation.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the evidence of the defendants to be placed publicly has not been heard, does the Minister consider that this kind of a statement is in the nature of an off-the-cuff statement that we had from another Minister in the sugar industry and others of that type?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did not issue a statement. The subject matter that my honourable friend is pursuing has to do with an interview with the media wherein they speculate as to what could come out of the Legislative Committee study of that report. And that was one question put, is that a possibility, and I said everything is theoretically possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the Minister concerned that the drug substitution program in Manitoba will lead to less research by major drug companies? Drug discoveries are rare and is the Minister concerned that the products of innovators will be replaced by those of imitators?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the member is quoting verbatim from a newspaper report of this morning. I do not share his concern. The firm, the gentleman referred to in the newspaper report, one of the major firms, internationally a Swiss firm which also is active in Canada. I have no doubt that being of international nature they will continue, because that's their business, in the field of both research and the producing of drugs. And I would like to remind the member who asked the question if he would look back on some of the debates or the studies made by the Federal Government as to the profits made by drug companies, I frankly don't share his concern because Manitoba has the program it has, that suddenly a firm such as this one will suddenly stop their research programs. They are in the business to make money it's true and I think they'll continue to make money as they have in the past.

MR. BROWN: A further question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will there be a chance by the Legislature to debate the expenditures of the Mincome plan?

MR. MILLER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last few words. What plan is it?

MR. BROWN: The Mincome plan.

MR. MILLER: You mean the plan that was announced together with the Federal Government? I suppose during the course of my Estimates it could be brought up, yes.

MR. BROWN: My last question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Will dentists be consulted before a decision is made on the dental care program?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that there's a study been made of which the Manitoba Dental Association were members of that study. A report I believe was tabled - I believe a report was tabled. That was the first of two reports that will be made, so the Manitoba Dental Association has been part of that study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is either to the Minister of Labour or the Attorney-General or the Acting Premier, although I'm not sure . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: It involves the potential of a police strike in the City of Winnipeg and I

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . wonder whether the government or the Minister can inform the House whether there have been any discussions with the City of Winnipeg for an alternative plan in the event the police do go on strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I think I can answer that, Mr. Chairman. In its usual competent manner, the government of the Province of Manitoba considers possible alternatives to situations that prevail.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question if I may to the Minister then if he's going to answer it. Have the City of Winnipeg discussed with the government a potential or an alternative plan in the event the policemen go on strike in the city?

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to that is, yes, Mr. Speaker, but the City of Winnipeg realized, as apparently the Leader of the Opposition does not realize, there is no strike at the present time.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then, I'll put it another way. Is it not a fact that the City of Winnipeg have discussed with the government an alternative plan?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question, although - I'm sure the honourable member knows that's out of order the way he stated it. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: May I ask then to the Minister of Labour, that in the event that the strike does take place will it require . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's hypothetical.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that it's so hypothetical to suggest that a strike may . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is hypothetical, cause it hasn't taken place yet.

MR. SPIVAK: In the event that the authority for the strike authorized by the City of Winnipeg policemen does come about . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That's still hypothetical, I'm sorry.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I must suggest to you on a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will not debate the issue; something that hasn't taken place, that may or may not take place is hypothetical. The honourable member wish to have another question?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must suggest that in this matter which I consider of vital interest to the people of the City of Winnipeg, that I think the rules that are capable of being bent in so many different ways in this House, are capable of being bent in this respect so that we on this side and the people are in a position to know exactly who is going to take responsibility . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . in the event of a strike . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair has no prerogative in allowing rules to be bent. It may be remiss in not being able to detect all the bends that may take place, but if the honourable member wishes to ask a question, he's at liberty. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Following the bankruptcy or receivership of St. Jean Sportswear, after the government had invested in it, did the government or the Manitoba Development Corporation sell the equipment, the production equipment of that company in order to help realize its investment, for approximately \$20,000 or thereabouts?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's possible. I'm not able to confirm or deny the particulars which my honourable friend puts in question.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can rephrase it. Can the Minister confirm that the equipment has been sold at a figure considerably below the amount against which it was mortgaged?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would guess that that is correct, because that is my knowledge as to what happens when an asset is received upon in circumstances of those kind, but I cannot answer specifically. I would indicate that Mr. Parsons, the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation will appear before committee and will be able to answer these questions specifically. Unless there is a particular urgency which I am not aware of

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . as to why the answer need be given in the House at the present time, I think that that should be satisfactory.

MR. ASPER: I wish to put another question, but on a point of order, I don't think the urgency is a matter that the Minister should judge or should even comment upon. He may decide not to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, that is not a point of order. Would the honourable member place his question?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer of the Minister to the proceeding question, can he confirm that the Manitoba Development Corporation received and rejected last year an agreement which would have given the Manitoba Development Corporation the total amount of its loan of \$184,000 and would have kept the doors of St. Jean's Sportswear open and the plant operating?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that there were proposals made to the Manitoba Development Corporation some time ago which were not concluded. The particulars as to what they were and why they were not concluded would have to be questions put to the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I'll repeat so that there is no misunderstanding. It's not my function, as I see it, to answer the day to day questions of a commercial organization on the floor of the House. It's not that this information will be hidden, but it will be answered by the Chairman of the Development Corporation when he appears before committee. On the other hand, if some question of great urgency, not as a foundation for debate, but of great urgency in terms of the implications for the ongoing activities of the economy of the province is asked, I will try to answer it as I did to the Member for St. James.

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

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would undertake in view of the fact that the committee has not been called and we have no idea when or if it'll be called, I wonder if he would undertake to ascertain that information and answer again in the House the question.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will undertake that the committee will be called and that the chairman will be there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in sequence of the question that was raised by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Has the Province of Ontario joined the efforts of the western provinces and the Federal Government in opposing the formation of this World Football League?

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I myself have not approached my counterpart in Ontario like I have my counterparts in the western provinces, and I'm not aware exactly of the stand taken by the minister responsible for sports in Ontario. The Premier to my knowledge has made certain statements, but I'm not in a position to indicate to the House exactly, you know, what has been said precisely by the minister responsible or the Premier of Ontario; but there has been a common approach by the western provinces taken by the three ministers concerned.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Honourable Minister. I wonder can the Minister advise the House if the Province of Manitoba intends to purchase, take over and operate the Assiniboia Downs Racing complex.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the thoughts or desires of the Minister in question is not to be considered in this House and that would definitely be a decision of government, and I can't indicate at this stage what the government will decide. But there has to be certain things happening at the Assiniboia Downs and hopefully by means of the Horse Racing Commission that certain recommendations can be made to government through the Minister responsible. And as the honourable member is quite aware now there has been an addition to the Horse Racing Commission made this morning.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the takeover being considered by the government?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to indicate if it's being considered or

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . if it's being contemplated or if, I'm negative at this stage, I cannot speak as an individual in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the Minister or officials of his department received a specific request from the Manitoba Medical Students Association for a meeting in order to negotiate improved remuneration for medical clerks and medical students in the Province of Manitoba? And if so could he tell us when such negotiations may take place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my office has received such a request. I don't recall seeing such a request.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, in light of the lack of information, would the Minister in the meantime undertake to make an assessment of the present scale of remuneration paid to medical students and medical clerks in other provinces and report such information to this House?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that information is known, is public knowledge across Canada and I'm sure the member can get that information. That information is known as to what is occurring in other provinces.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister does receive the request will he . . . with those students.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. Question's hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can he tell the House who assumes the responsibility for the security of the City of Winnipeg when the City Police are not able to shoulder it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if in the unlikely and hypothetical possibility of a withdrawal of services . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Order, please. Order, please. Order please. Again the Chair is remiss and the question was hypothetical. I can't catch them all. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: . . . to the question being put in that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister have that responsibility, is it his ministry that has that responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is the responsibility of the Minister of Labour and in this particular case possibly in joint consultation with my colleague the Attorney-General to see that there are provisions so that the normal process of government, be it the municipal level, industrial level, continues to the benefit of all of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the army being alerted to serve in that instance?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no riot contemplated except in the minds of my honourable friends opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Has the Minister's department considered the design of a small patch or an insignia that teams travelling out of Manitoba of any type can carry with them and present to the opposing teams that they are playing against, when they leave Manitoba in different tournaments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are, you know, certain items that can be given to teams that travel say out of province or out of the country. In regards to having say a coat-of-arms you know, that can be either glued or stuck to a lapel, that is equally something that could certainly be made available either directly through the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs or through the Department of Industry and Commerce. But such

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . items do exist and can be made available. Not necessarily free of charge in large quantities but they are available.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister's department considered the fact that the teams travelling in many different areas such as teams from different states and different cities are supplied by their state or city with a patch which is interchangeable at these different tournaments, and would he consider it would be a nice thing for the Manitoba teams to carry?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to accept the suggestion made by the honourable member and we'll take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister in charge of Autopac. Would the Minister confirm that cars owned by the Manitoba doctors have been reclassified by Autopac to adhere to this business category?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the doctors use their vehicles in their business practice they would take the business use as . . .

MR. BANMAN: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then also inform this House if a clergyman who uses his car to visit shut-ins or hospital patients is also then supposed to register his car under the business category?

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation relates to the answers he gave a few moments ago on the St. Jean's Sportswear question. Has he personally seen or had brought to his attention an agreement that was submitted by Earl Shibou Jeans Limited whereby that company offered to take over, operate, St. Jean Sportswear, keep the jobs going and pay off the MDC in full?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when I rose earlier I said that I was aware of certain proposals relative to St. Jean's Sportswear, that the Chairman will be before the committee and will answer questions relating thereto. I might say, Mr. Speaker, in questions of this kind hindsight, - and I'm not suggesting that this is the situation which prevails here - that hindsight is sometimes better than immediate judgment. For instance, Mr. Speaker, if the government would have had its way in giving instructions when it did it would now be the owner of 25 percent of the stock of Versatile Manufacturing which has gone up a great deal, but on the advice of our solicitor at that time we entered into an agreement which did not give us 25 percent of the stock and it was probably a bad deal. The solicitor was the Leader of the Liberal Party. But I wouldn't blame him for that, Mr. Speaker, it just works out that way that's one of the . . . Mr. Speaker, I say there's nothing wrong with that, it is just a change in judgment at the time as to what you are going to do.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, this point of privilege was raised two years ago in this House on the same point, and I ask you to listen carefully to the point of privilege because it's a matter of very serious privilege which the Attorney-General and the Honourable Mines Minister will know. A solicitor is not permitted to disclose the affairs of his client. But, Mr. Speaker, when the client . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege first?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the rule being, and I'm putting it to the Attorney-General to confirm to you, Sir, that when the client discloses those affairs the solicitor may make a disclosure?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again that may be law but it is not a procedure or a point of order or a matter of privilege of this House. The honourable member wish to ask a question?

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Does he permit and will he permit the solicitor who acted for the government in that case referred to to make a public disclosure of the advice given and the whole circumstances surrounding the transaction?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that with respect to Versatile Manufacturing Corporation the members in the House, we have no objection to him discussing it, and we will discuss it on the same terms.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer and the freedom he has now given me and I shall take advantage of it. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place another question, I wish to place another question relative to the St. Jean Sportswear. Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has it been brought to his attention or has he been informed that the Manitoba Development Corporation refused the offer I referred to by Earl Shibou Jeans Limited and that that company then went across the street, opened a plant and is currently operating in St. Jean while the Manitoba owned plant, the government owned plant . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I answered the questions that have been posed by the honourable member.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for MDC. Can he advise the House that if housing, Misawa Homes in Gimli, is it still closed or is it in operation today, a plant which the government has 50 percent interest in?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, every time this question has been asked I've had to object to the prefix that "is it still closed". The condition of the Misawa Homes is the same as it was when this question was first asked.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is that condition? Can the Minister advise the House and the people of Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member can refer to the answer to the question when he first asked it.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. I would like to know if the Minister can advise the people and the members of this House when will this plant open, because, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member wishes to debate the question now. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer the question. The question as to what the future of Misawa Homes will be I hope will be determined very shortly, but I don't wish to deal with the question in the terms of which the honourable member has put it. But I have answered that question for the honourable member and for the people of Manitoba on a previous occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact when the plant was manufacturing the Minister was releasing news releases, when there's difficulty, the Minister denies to give any answers to this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Question? Question? Order, please That was not a question, that was a statement; was totally out of order. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. Has the Minister instructed or asked the Environment Protection Branch of his department to undertake specific studies on the environmental impact of the proposed development of new campsites by the Provincial Government in the Whiteshell? And if so will he table those reports in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the answer to that question was made yesterday by the Minister of Tourism who said that they are the ones dealing with the questions of campsites in those provincial parks and that they maintain a liaison with the Department of Environmental Management. That's the way I heard it. I may not have recalled it.

MR. AXWORTHY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I asked specifically has the Environmental Protection branch undertaken those studies and will he table those in the House?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did not suggest that studies were made. I suggested that the answer to my honourable friend's question with regard to the responsibility for environmental assessment of campsite development was done by the Minister of Tourism and

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . Recreation and that they maintain a liaison with my department, and therefore there are no studies for tabling that I referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge have another supplementary?

MR. AXWORTHY: Can the Minister inform this House whether he or his department or the branch of his department have any plans to maintain a constant monitoring of the environmental damage encountered by those campsites in terms of pollution of water and litter in the parksite area?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Tourism and Recreation which deals with the question of campsite development in the parks, I have every confidence that they are paying attention to such assessments as they need it pay attention to including environmental problems which they have indicated they maintain a close liaison with our department for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to ask a question, I don't want to present a ministerial statement for rebuttal, but I do want to make an observation if I may be permitted. That for the first time in the history of Manitoba the Chief Electoral Officer has undertaken the responsibility or his duty in presenting to members of the Assembly a documentation entitled, "Statement of Votes for the Thirtieth General Election and Bi-Election Since 1969". This represents the first official report on elections ever published by the Chief Electoral Officer of Manitoba. It has been compiled with a view of providing as much information for the elected member and for the student as reasonably can be expected and represents, so I am told, a political scientist's dream. Members have been supplied with the document, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that they will be available to interested parties other than members at a cost of approximately \$4.00 per book in order that those interested may obtain this concise information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to on a rare occasion agree with the Minister of Labour in his complimenting the Chief Electoral Officer for the compilation of this report. I hope now that the government will recognize the value of a permanent electoral officer and sufficient staff to carry on the responsibility of that office, and that amendments will be made to the Election Act to ensure that there is sufficient staff to do the job that is so important.

I want to also say, Sir, that I hope that the compilation of this report will result in the many thousands of students across this country desisting and ceasing the sending of questionnaires to members of the Legislature, because, Sir, that would if they were to be all filled out occupy about one-half the time of a member of the Legislature. I want to congratulate the Electoral Officer for this report and hope that it will serve the purpose for which it was intended.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if I may offer our congratulations to not only an official person in this House but I'm sure he's a good friend to all members of the House. He never hesitates to assist where possible, when a member goes to Mr. Reeves for advice, and it gives me double pleasure to publicly congratulate him on doing his best during the last election and in publishing the type of report that we have now. I think it would be an idea to consider by the House, I don't know quite how it would be done, but to advise every high school, every high school in the province that this sort of report is available to them on the cost mentioned by the Minister of Labour, because I think in the increased interest that the teachers are offering to their students about the parliamentary and legislative proceedings of our country that this book would be of interest to high schools.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Can the Minister advise this House if there are further sales of unused schools being contemplated by the Department of Education in the rural areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the matter of selling any surplus buildings that a school division has is a matter within the jurisdiction of the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . school division; that is the one that makes initiative to do so. So therefore at the moment I cannot answer the honourable member what buildings are for sale or contemplated to be for sale at future times.

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

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I related this question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture the other day but I want to give the same question to the Minister of Health. In regards to stilbestrol in beef cattle which may be brought in from the United States to Manitoba, which is within the limits of the Food and Drug Act of Canada, has the Minister of Health had any correspondence in regard to this subject matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, no, I believe it's under the Canada Food and Drug Act that this control is exercised.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the Minister of Education. Could he advise the House whether he has yet initiated a program of student travel as we raised last year in his Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, a supplementary. Would he table information to avoid having to ask questions - some sort of report to the House on the extent, the number of students travelling, where they're travelling to and the cost of the program.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, according to the Orders of the Day I believe there will be ample opportunity - there's still some 70-odd hours left for estimates. Any portion of that can be taken up with the debate of the estimates of my department .

. . . continued on next page

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call the Bills on second reading on the Order Paper.

BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 7, the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with this Bill No. 7, Mr. Speaker, an Act to amend the Civil Service Act, I have read the Honourable Minister's statement and tried to study the Bill and I find it very, very interesting and one that has great repercussions to the great Civil Service that we have enjoyed in the Province of Manitoba. I'm quite in agreement with the housekeeping tidying up matters that are suggested by the honourable the minister but on the other hand I would say, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important, if not the most important bill in my opinion that has come across our desks since the Legislature opened this session, and it's therefore also one, Mr. Speaker, that we should not treat lightly in this House because there are some very important suggestions that are offered here by the Minister as he lays this Bill on our desks.

The two objects of the bill in my opinion are first of all the foremost is to allow civil servants to run for office and the second objective of the document is allowing civil servants to become active politically in our province, Mr. Speaker, we find a new approach to the Civil Service Commission defined in this bill. In the past the Civil Service Commission had the total responsibility of employing people on behalf of our province and of sort of policing their work as servants of the Crown. They decided who was to be hired and who couldn't be hired, etc. etc. and they pretty well ran their own show. But in recent years, Mr. Speaker, especially since this government came into office, we have seen the Civil Service Commission by-passed on many occasions, legally or not legally I'm not sure. I have heard it described and explained to me sometimes that it is legal and others, but there's apparently a way that they can by-pass the Civil Service in our province and hire people, and as I read this bill, the Minister in his efforts is trying to make that procedure that has already taken place, he's trying to make it legal.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any minister or any department under this bill can also declare a position temporary and then go out and hire their own people outside of the Civil Service Commission. So we are going to see, Mr. Speaker, if this legislation gets the approval of the House, we are going to see our civil servants appointed outside the Civil Service Commission, and maybe the reasons, Mr. Speaker, are justifiable ones but maybe another way of looking at it, they are for political reasons, and that's the ones that concern me and many of the people in Roblin Constituency.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is not the way that I as a member for Roblin Constituency would like to see the Civil Service Commission disappear in this great province. Their history is on the record, some of the key men of the last 50, 60 years their names are well-known all across our great Dominion and in the United States and in jurisdictions abroad; people that have come up through the Civil Service here have been able to provide the type of service for a government that's required, and that's to be neutral, to carry out the administration, carry out the policies and stay clear of politics.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer that we continued to respect that Civil Service Commission that have done so many things in the past in Manitoba, in this Act as well. We see that this can only be accomplished if the position is described as temporary. Now how easy it's going to be, Mr. Speaker, for ministers or departments now to design any job that they want and class it as temporary - temporary until one job is finished and then when that job is finished, they'll move on to another job and under a temporary classification they can move on and thus avoid the guidelines which have been established for years and years by the Civil Service Act of our province, I think, Mr. Speaker, that our Civil Service has been a first class one; it's served the people well, and now under this "temporary category" I just wonder what the end results or what results we can expect from civil servants, temporary civil servants who will be able to by-pass the Act.

I notice also, Mr. Speaker, in the case of the rights to appeal whereby a civil servant who was unhappy because he was not promoted can go to the Minister or go to somebody who is appointed by the Minister and have his case heard. I think, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that

BILL 7

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) that responsibility should be with the Civil Service Commission and not with the Minister or not with one who is appointed by the Minister. I think many embarrassing situations, Mr. Speaker, could be the end result of that type of law in Manitoba.

Let's suppose a civil servant, Mr. Speaker, has taken part in an election, or let's suppose he hasn't taken part in an election but his promotion comes up in a week or ten days or six weeks or 90 days after the election. The Minister can deal with the promotion or he can appoint somebody else to deal with it. Now, Mr. Speaker, there's a great temptation left and a great deal of discretion at stake when that promotion or demotion comes up, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, who would gain the promotion in this particular Minister's case - the one that he favors politically or the one that he favors for his background as a top civil servant? I think it's very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for that type of legislation to be written into our records and I think it's very difficult type of legislation that we're trying to force on our Civil Service and put them into that very difficult position.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation, the section that allows civil servants to become active in political elections. I certainly can support the Minister's comments where he said that it was very desirable from a human rights point of view, and I don't think there's any member of this Legislature that wants to deny our civil servants equal human rights. I'd be the last one to try by legislation or otherwise to deny a civil servant all the rights that's entitled to him. But let's be realistic in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and look at the consequences that's possible with this type of a document.

We must remember that the bill does not only allow civil servants to become candidates in an election. It allows them to take leave of absence and then to support a particular candidate. It allows them to write speeches and it allows them to collect money, etc. etc., and actively campaign for the candidate of their choice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion we could have dozens of civil servants the day that the Writ is issued taking a leave of absence, to leave this Civil Service of this great province and take part in an election campaign; and of course, Mr. Speaker, with the legislation we could fill that gap with the temporary type of Civil Service but can you imagine just how political our Civil Service would become under such legislation.

Civil servants running around making speeches, collecting money, actively standing up on soap boxes supporting certain ministers, criticising other ministers. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's bad enough under our present legislation some of the things that have taken by . . . because I had an experience where the Premier went into the Minister of Health's office, took out a personal letter of mine, and took it out and used it against me politically in the Town of Grandview. That happened last year. Now imagine what would happen if the Civil Service who are political, like the Premier, started going back and through the files in the various departments and taking documents out to use them politically. And that's possible, Mr. Speaker, under this legislation. Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, how this bill would allow key Civil Service, who have access to our private letters, to all the members of this Chamber, the right to go around this province and to spread information for or against the political party of their choice, and to be given that right by legislation. We have seen examples, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Member for Swan River, where a civil servant - I suspect Mr. Hofford was a civil servant - where he went to a certain meeting in Swan River with 10 or 15 letters from a certain department which he said part of them were mine and part of them belonged to the Honourable Member from Swan River, but he took those letters to a political meeting and used them for political advantage.

Now this Bill that we have before us in my opinion is not the right type of Civil Service that we should have in this province. Under this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that's now going to become legal. --(Interjection)-- Well, when I finish I will.

Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, let's say the liquor inspectors of the province going around checking out the liquor outlets, they're bagging money, they're working politically, who would get the liquor outlets, or who would not get the liquor outlets in this province if we have those kinds of civil servants. What about the road inspectors, the men that are making the judgments on road contracts - civil servants, key civil servants that are involved in the decision-making process of which contractor is going to get a certain bid on a highway --(Interjection)-- the one with the biggest kickback is right. The guy that put the most money

BILL 7

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) in the bag would naturally be the guy that would be going to get the job.

Can you imagine tax inspectors, the various inspectors that prowl around this province enforcing the laws in this province, becoming political bagmen and doing justice to the people of Manitoba as civil servants and at the same time trying to do justice as politicians?

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that it won't work. I suspect it won't work, Mr. Speaker. I become very uptight about that type of legislation and the fact that we are asked to pass it in this session. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our Civil Service and our civil servants should be recognized as a special class of employees, who under oath can carry out the duties and the responsibilities that are assigned to them to the best of their ability, and whether they agree with the political process or whether they do not agree with the policies of the government of the day, it's their duty which they take under oath to carry out the responsibility without political interest in any shape or form.

Mr. Speaker, that is the type of Civil Service that we have had in this province for many, many years and it has worked well and I can't understand why the Minister wants to change it. Sure, the civil servants can accept a job under the guidelines that's laid down under our present Act and there's no problems. So I say, Mr. Speaker, under this legislation there's going to be bias, there's going to be political harangue, there's going to be problems that we can't even judge as we debate it here. Can you imagine the quarrel in one department of civil servants where there's maybe four key people for four different political parties standing around at coffee break and there's an election on, the mayhem that would go on in that department. It just wouldn't function, absolutely couldn't function.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest in this legislation regardless of how many promotions or demotions take place in our Civil Service, or how we handle this political thing and allow them to become bagmen, get involved in politics, collect money, drive cars, write speeches, the rumblings and the accusations in the various departments are bound to flow out across this province. They're bound no doubt to flow into the halls of this Chamber, stating that a certain civil servant received his promotion because he was political or another civil servant got his promotion because he collected more money than the other civil servant for a certain political party. The haranguing that's going on I think in that type of an ally, Mr. Speaker, doesn't deserve to be put on the mantle of our Civil Service.

Senior administrative people, the Minister, apparently in the legislation, deputy ministers and that are going to be exempt, that possibly that is part of the Minister's recognition of the problems that he is going to face with this legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, how can a system such as developed in that bill serve the needs of the people in Manitoba? I'd like the Minister when he does close the debate on it, stand up and tell me how any civil servant can satisfy the needs of a political party on the one hand and satisfy the needs of a Civil Service to look after the needs of the people of Manitoba on the other hand. Mr. Speaker, it just won't work. It just won't work. It's not possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he call a referendum from the civil servants of this province at the earliest possible date. The cost will not be very much I assure him and I think I would like to hear what the civil servants themselves say about this legislation that we are dealing with. I don't think as I said, it would be too costly, but I would sure like to see the civil servants of this province who I'm so proud of and who have done so well over the years, I would like to have them involved in this and I would like them to be spelling out, do they want to get into politics and try and be a civil servant at the same time? Do they want to be political bagmen and be civil servants at the same time? I think, Mr. Speaker, our civil servants will consider a referendum very seriously and the results of that referendum will tell us loud and clear if they have the right to be privileged and that are spelled out in the Minister's document.

I would also like to be able, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, be able to support the bill on a human rights level, because I think all our people should be able to take part in the political process. And I think that has happened in Manitoba. I don't think under our present legislation anybody has been denied to get into politics. If I'm a storekeeper and I want to get into politics, I have to give up my position as a storekeeper and actively go and campaign in politics; there's nothing wrong with the present legislation that if a civil servant wants to get into politics he can get in. He can resign his position and go and get in the same as the

BILL 7

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) rest of us, but why put him in a special class, in a special slot whereby they have special rights to run for certain political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the bill until the Minister will assure me that he will take a referendum from the civil servants of this province and then after we have seen the results of that referendum, then I will be most serious in trying to support the legislation. But until that time comes along, Mr. Speaker, I cannot - I cannot, no way stand up and see a Minister politicizing or trying to politicize our civil servants; I cannot see a Minister of this Crown granting the Executive Council some of the rights in that one section, that's one of the latter sections here, granting the Executive Council exclusive rights over all the Civil Servants in this province. It's just unbelievable what's in that one section and I'm sure the Minister will explain that at some later date in the debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words, there's no way that I, as a minister from Roblin, can skirt around and hide behind this bill. I look . . . be on the line, I want a referendum, I want to hear what the Civil Service have to say, and I can't support the bill and give the Executive Council all the powers that's vested in that document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I asked my honourable friend whether he would permit a question and he said when he stopped his speech he would - I'm more polite I believe than some would describe to my honourable friend. He made reference to the chairman of the Hog Marketing Board; my question to him is: is the chairman of the Hog Marketing Board a civil servant?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, he's not a civil servant at the present time, but under this legislation he would be.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, then I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: He could be classed as a temporary . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and I have a further question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend now states that he is not a civil servant, will he withdraw the allegation that the chairman of the Marketing Board in his speech which he said, will he withdraw reference to that particular person being a civil servant?

MR. McKENZIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my intent was that under this legislation those kind of people could come under the temporary slot, but if I made the allegation I do withdraw that portion of it that Mr. Hofford is not a civil servant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): The member indicated that it was necessary for him to sell his store to become involved in politics, is that so? Could he comment on that?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say - I said I had to have other help come in, or vacate myself from the job as manager.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a few moments to deal with this bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in this Chamber would concur that we ought to attempt to place as few limitations as is possible for a citizen within a given jurisdiction to participate in the political process in the opportunity to have the choice, and the opportunity to elect a party or a candidate of his or her choice. And I think therefore that we would want to be very cautious and careful in any efforts at all by legislation, and other means, to impose limitations on that freedom of the individual within a democratic society to participate in political activity.

Now insofar as the legislation that is before us, I see this legislation basically as establishing in practice in law that which really has been in practice for many many years in the Province of Manitoba. I think, Mr. Speaker, that - and I'm rather surprised at honourable members opposite - that this legislation in effect gives opportunity to the civil servant that disagrees with the party that is in power at any particular time to participate in an election campaign, supporting a candidate which is in opposition to the particular party in power. A civil servant whose political views are coincidental with that of the party in power has less need for concern, less desire for legal protection, than the civi

BILL 7

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) servant who has political views in opposition to the political Party that is in power. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: And let me make it very clear, that I have never for a moment disagreed with a civil servant in a non-policy role participating in political activity. In my own riding I looked with favour upon several civil servants that participated in an election campaign, working against myself in the political process. And I admired their courage and their willingness to express themselves within that political campaign; and I think it is only reasonable that we would want to translate into legislation, safeguard, so that political servant, that civil servant would have the opportunity to express his or herself, and to participate in an election campaign, even against the party that is in power. So, in summary then, this legislation to me gives to the civil servant the freedom to participate even against the political party that happens to be in power at any given time.

I think the best example of where the old-fashioned type of attitude that is expressed by the honourable members opposite, that there should be maximum strictures imposed, is in the example of British Columbia where the present Premier of British Columbia back in 1950-51 accepted a nomination to run for the party which was in opposition at that time, the CCF of the day, and he immediately received a dismissal from service in the Civil Service of British Columbia. That is the type of arrogant, and type of approach, that I think we would want to resist. I can think of another example in Manitoba where a civil servant, an employee of a public utility whose only job was to be involved at the very administrative level, in fact climbing hydro poles, was discharged because he had the nerve to oppose the party which was in power at that time. I don't think honourable members in this House for a moment want to see the type of conduct that I have referred to in British Columbia, or historically in this province, ever repeated ever again in the future.

We want to encourage public servants regardless of their political stripe, to participate in the political process, and to - insofar as the policy matters are concerned, policy decision making civil servants, then I am satisfied that this legislation will prevent them from participating, and I think that's the way it ought to be because those that are involved in decision-making cannot really in trust of their responsibilities participate in a campaign if they are involved in developing the policy of the party which is in power. But at the levels that the Minister of Labour has proposed in his bill, administrative levels, a clerk, an employee of the administrative level, no one should attempt to prevent that person from engaging in the democratic process, because if you carry this too far you will find that very few in our society will be able to participate in the political process, except for those of independent financial and social means; and that is I think in opposition to the direction that we would want to see democratic society move in. Democratic society we wish to maximize the number of people who have the social and financial freedom to participate in the political process regardless of their political views.

But what honourable members across the way are doing is wanting to uphold, to sustain a system that is limited. Those that have been able to participate in the political process, and in some respects because of the very nature of society to those that are not a majority in society, business people for instance often feel that they cannot participate; they're afraid of losing customers. People of farm organizations often take the view that they cannot participate in political activity because they're members of a farm organization. We can go on and on to recount many different groups within our society that people feel strictures upon their involvement.

And I want to commend, to take this opportunity to commend the Minister of Labour for introducing this legislation, and I think in the years to come that the Province of Manitoba will pay tribute to a Minister of Labour that has had the courage and the foresight and the initiative to introduce this type of progressive legislation to this House.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 18

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, an act to amend The Highways Department Act. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I adjourn this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I was fully prepared to go ahead, but in the absence of the Minister of Highways, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand? (Agreed)

A MEMBER: Hear hear. That's fair game.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

POINT OF ORDER

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that if the honourable member wishes to delay speaking, then we would not object; but if he wished to indicate that he will only speak during the time when a person on this side is present, then he cannot make that kind of stipulation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's in order for us to let this matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member from Virden. It'll be called the next time it comes around, and he may or may not speak, at which time somebody else may or may not speak. Eventually this matter will come to a vote, whether or not the member speaks, I should think.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the same point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, let the record be very clear. The Honourable Member for Virden was not laying any condition about whether or not he spoke, whether or not a member was in his seat or not; it was a bill introduced by the Minister of Highways that the Honourable Member for Virden was going to address a few comments to. The Honourable Minister of Highways did not have the courtesy to be in his seat, to listen to his bill being discussed in this Chamber, and for that reason the Honourable Member for Virden was quite in order for suggesting the course of action that he chose.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . I would suggest that if there's a repetition of the kind of comments that were made in regard to the absence of a member, then we could have asked, and I was aware of it but didn't, we could have asked you, Mr. Speaker, to consider that the Honourable Member for Virden had already spoken in that he did more than just ask to let the matter stand; and I could have asked your ruling, and I think would have succeeded in obtaining your ruling, probably with the support of the Member of Morris, to the effect that the Honourable Member for Virden has already spoken today, but I wouldn't push that any further.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Swan River on the same point of order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I believe that the Honourable Member for Virden asked for the standing of this bill. His last words were that. The few words he made prior to that have no consequence whatsoever in his appeal to the House to have this matter stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order, if we observe the rules of the House, we will note that the Honourable Member for Swan River who had the adjournment of the debate, exercised his right to speak in this debate, and indicated that this adjournment was in favour of the Honourable Member for Virden and thereby the Honourable Member for Swan River overcame his right to further participation in this debate. When the Honourable Member for Virden stood up and did more than just simply say "May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand," properly speaking, he exhausted his right for further participation. However, we are prepared, as indicated by my colleague, the Deputy Premier, and myself as Deputy House Leader at the present time, to forego the

POINT OF ORDER

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) rigidity in this particular time, but I respectfully suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that members of the House take note of what has occurred at this time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House that this debate stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 19

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 19, an act to amend the Crop Insurance Act. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister is in his seat so I don't think we have any problems to deal with this bill --(Interjection)-- Mr. Deputy Speaker, no, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Speaker, I think that the comments I have to make here are not such that I will want to see this adjourned.

The Minister, Mr. Speaker, has proposed two amendments in the Crop Insurance Act, and before commenting on those two amendments, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the Minister on so many many occasions has tried to remind those of us on this side of the House, and talked about the wonderful legislation that he has been responsible for for the time that he has been in office, and I, Sir, would just like to remind him that this is one piece of legislation that I, and our Party, had the pleasure of bringing into this House, which I think has been the best piece of legislation that has served well in the way of protecting farmers in their crop losses.

The first amendment, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation is whereby the Minister has indicated that rather than have to go to changing or amending of the Act whenever an addition to any crops to be insured is to be brought about, the amendment, as he explains to us, that we're going to do away with all this formality and rather just do it through regulation. Mr. Speaker, I think that those of us on this side of the House can accept his explanation and trust that this will certainly improve the legislation and work for the best interests of all farmers concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second amendment that the Minister is bringing in in regards to farmers who may have problems in disputes in the way of settlements of their crop losses as it pertains to the Act as it is written, and the Minister is indicating - and I would like to read, Mr. Speaker, as he states, and I quote, "the second one has to do with changing the way in which we handle the appeals, the crop insurance appeal tribunals. In the present system under the existing legislation a tribunal is responsible to the Crop Insurance Corporation for its funding and organization, and we feel there could be a conflict of interests, Mr. Speaker, in having people to appeal to a tribunal who is responsible to the corporation against which an appeal is launched." So what he is saying, the change here is to provide for the Department of Agriculture to be responsible for the appeal tribunal and to fund that organization so that there would be no possibility of conflict of interest in the appeal to the Crop Insurance Corporation's rulings.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering when the Minister is suggesting that he makes the change the appeal of a tribunal instead of going directly to the Crop Insurance Corporation Board, he is transferring that authority into the hands of the department itself. Now, I'm wondering, have there been many cases, Mr. Speaker, where farmers have made their appeals and there's been difficulties - I would like to hear from the Minister if he'd like to explain some of the examples whereby this is necessary.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but feel, and I bring it to the attention of the Minister, and if he could give me satisfactory evidence that this is justified, because the other point that I want to make is that I'm wondering if he is just making this transfer of authority for the purpose of establishing another board for some of his friends and even maybe relatives, and providing funds for that purpose, that I want to be assured, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case. Otherwise, and I agree with the Minister on the first item, the amending of this act, but the second one I would like to hear an explanation from the Minister as to give us a little further detail as to what he means and why he is transferring that authority from the Crop Insurance Corporation to the Department of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by

BILL 19

(MR. GEORGE HENDERSON cont'd) the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 9. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 20. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15, also.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand?

MR. SPEAKER: 16.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand?

MR. SPEAKER: 17.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, 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.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might be advised as to how much time I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has 13 minutes.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering whether it might be appropriate for me to provide for the House a very important announcement, one which indeed I should be proud to present to the members of the House, and it has to do with the development of a new rapeseed known as Tower rapeseed. This variety was just licensed by the Canada Department of Agriculture. It was developed by Dr. B. Stefansson, Plant Science Department, University of Manitoba. The main features of this variety, other than its excellent agronomic characteristics, is the fact that it is a low erucic acid and low glucosinolate type. This is the first time that these two factors have been removed in a single variety and represents a major step forward. The erucic acid was reported to cause a build-up of fatty tissue in the heart. This factor causes goitergenic problems in livestock meals with the result that there was some reluctance on the part of feed formulators to use rapeseed meal. The development of this variety should enhance the use of rapeseed meal in livestock rations. This variety will be increased in 1974 and sufficient seed will be available for planting needs in 1975. The variety is higher in yield than Target, the oil content is slightly lower, but the protein of the meal is higher than any previous variety. The plant is slightly shorter than Target and a day earlier.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure for me to make that announcement because the Department does contribute very substantially to the research arm at the University of Manitoba. Members will recall that for many years we have been making direct research grants to the agricultural faculty and the research arm of that faculty in the development of new varieties, and this certainly is an example of a good success story and which has, I would say, world prominence on this day, Mr. Chairman. It's a major achievement in the new varieties that have been established. So I simply relate that to the members so that they may have the information, and indeed in recognition of the good work that has been done by our University.

Mr. Chairman, the other day, or yesterday, I believe the hour of 9:00 arose before I was able to complete my remarks, and I was in the midst of completing a report on the allegations, or the report of the Manitoba Marketing Board on the allegations of one Mr. Don Cameron. And I should like to continue that for the record, Mr. Chairman, and it has to do with the Japanese pork contract. I'm now going to quote from the report, Mr. Chairman.

"A major problem affecting the Producer Board's operations revolved around the

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . contract signed by C. Itho for the export of hogs to Japan. This contract has not been tabled at a board meeting for the information of board members. At the time the contract was negotiated there was an understanding among board members, with one exception, that the specific terms of the contract should not be revealed to the board members. This position did not change with the election of the new members of the board. A motion to have the contract tabled for the information of the board members has never been made at a board meeting, therefore formal request for the information has not been denied to any board member.

"The reason for maintaining the confidentiality of the contract terms to the general public are: 1) It is poor business ethics to publicly divulge the terms of a business contract. 2) It would jeopardize further contracts with C. Itho. 3) It would jeopardize contracts under negotiations with other Japanese firms.

"Release of the contract to board members was considered by a majority of the board to be tantamount to making the contracts public and for this reason the contract had not been tabled.

"The Export Canada West Agreement was being treated as a confidential document by the board. This confidentiality was broken when Mr. Cameron disclosed details of the agreement at a public meeting on November 28, 1973. This incident underscores the need for a commitment from board members that some matters must be kept confidential as a condition of releasing information to board members. The need for confidentiality of certain information must be balanced with the need of board members to have the information in order to fulfill their responsibilities as board members."

The Manitoba Marketing Board recommends: 1) That members of the Producer Board swear to maintain the confidentiality of the contract with C. Itho and that the contract be released to them on this condition; 2) That matters requiring confidentiality in the future be determined by a majority vote of the board and that board members swear to maintain this confidentiality as a condition of receiving the information. That is considered normal practice on any board of directors of any private company and likewise has always been considered to be such with respect to the board functions of all of our marketing boards in this province, and it is only because of the deviation from the traditional norms of behaviour on these boards that we find ourselves in some difficulty at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I should now like to respond to the Member for Portage. Last night he took issue with the government, and in particular with myself, over the role that the government played in the recent rapeseed referendum, and I take with a good deal of sincerity the comments of my honourable friend because I do not consider him to be one of a negative type of individuals who would want to only cast in a negative fashion on the integrity of people and I'm sure that he was sincere in his concern for that reason, Mr. Chairman. But I want to put in context the reasons why the government chose to participate as we did in that particular plebiscite.

I should like to remind members opposite that the Government of Manitoba considers that the operating of a marketing plan to the Canadian Wheat Board of all grains on the prairies is to the economic advantage of the producers and indeed of the provinces in question, a definite monetary financial gain to those involved. The Government of Manitoba believes in stabilizing agriculture and that every building block that can be put in place to give that stability should be provided, and the Canadian Wheat Board system is one major building block, Mr. Chairman. A need for leadership arises from time to time, Mr. Chairman, and we took the position that this was a time for leadership and therefore that it was money spent in the best public interest of Manitoba and, in particular, the farmers of this province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my only apology on that question to the members opposite and to the people of Manitoba is that we were a few percentage points short in the amount of spending required. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the result of the vote was almost a tie, 46 to 52, and perhaps one more ad would have done the trick and it would have been to the advantage of the people of Manitoba.

Now the most important reason, Mr. Chairman, why we took issue in the way we did was the fact that that referendum did represent, if it was negative, some threat to the Canadian Wheat Board continuing in the other fields that it has traditionally been in, and the evidence that I would present to members opposite, and I don't have it here on paper, Mr. Chairman,

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) but I'm sure members opposite have read since the results were known to us, many editorial people alluding that that particular referendum reflected badly on the Canadian Wheat Board and that really we should be moving towards wiping out the Canadian Wheat Board - and I think you would find that in the Country Guide and other weeklies or monthly publications. I think this is really, Mr. Chairman, the main reason why the Government of Manitoba chose to provide a degree of leadership on that issue.

Now the other important reason - there were two main important reasons, that was one - the second one was the way in which the voting procedures were carried out, and I would challenge the Member for Portage la Prairie to tell me that he personally, Mr. Chairman, would want to be elected under the rules of that particular referendum wherein it was required that 60 percent of those voting had to vote in favour, and wherein the undecided ballot, Mr. Chairman, was a vote against. Imagine to assume, Mr. Chairman, that when one is undecided that you must count that as a no vote. I could allege, Mr. Chairman, very easily that if one is undecided that that one could be persuaded to vote yes as well, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, there was a need for an outcry and a need for leadership on that question. --(Interjection)-- And that was money well spent in the public interest of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- I don't recall but I could provide the figure for my honourable friend. And I think that I should say to my honourable friend from Portage that we did it most sincerely. We believed in what we were doing and that it was indeed in the best interest of the people of Manitoba.

On the issue of feed grains, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to draw the attention of the Member for Portage to an important omission in his comments of yesterday. He alluded to the present situation wherein in my speech I alluded to what is going to happen on August 1st next, and hence his comments were not appropriate for the points that I made earlier - in fact completely off the mark. But let me take him up on his comments, Mr. Chairman, because even the interim policy, as we now witness it, is a disaster for the prairie farmer because what the interim policy is doing, Mr. Chairman, is forcing the prairie producers of feed grain to receive less money for their product than they would have, had that policy not been established. They are losing money every day now because of the interim feed grain policy. The idea, the idea, Mr. Chairman -- the idea, Mr. Chairman, that the Orderly Marketing System, which is the Canadian Wheat Board, should use as its criteria the unorderly market to establish a price, is an insult to the concept of orderly marketing. Here we have a situation where the Government of Canada said to the Canadian Wheat Board, "Despite the fact that you've been set up to bring order into the marketplace, we want you to set a price based on the amount of trade that bypasses your board, which may represent a very small fraction of the total volume of sales." Imagine placing your criteria pricing on one or two or three percent of the transactions and using that as the important bench mark. That is the insult, Mr. Speaker, that we should not be prepared to live with.

So, Mr. Chairman, you know, it is not -- and I should like to draw to the attention of the Member for Portage la Prairie that when he raises the point that I have been attacking the Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board for the last two years without any information or a basis in which to attack, I want to remind him, Mr. Chairman, that I had many allies in that attack, that the three prairie wheatpools are not happy with the proposals coming from Ottawa; that there are only two organizations that are saying, "Yes, go, Mr. Lang" and that is the United Grain Growers and the Palliser Wheat Triangle. Only the two. But the prairie governments are not and the three pool elevator associations are not at all happy with the proposals that have been made; and the position -- and I will end my comments on this note, Mr. Chairman -- the position is that after two years of discussions the Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board hasn't changed one word in its proposals despite all the discussions and dialogue that took place with all interested parties. And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that his motives are beyond the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board and are political.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We listened with great interest to the Minister of Agriculture up to this point. He has stressed his point of the Orderly Marketing System to a great degree. Also, during the month of June I should have got to know the Minister very well; he spent many visits to my constituency, and I would like to thank him very much for the effort that he did on my behalf.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. FERGUSON Cont'd)

Getting back to the marketing system that the Minister is pushing so hard, I would like to ask him, where has the market all of a sudden appeared from? I'm under the impression that the big buyers of our grain are China and Russia, both good supply-management countries, and I would imagine that with the system that they have which is being pushed by our present Minister of Agriculture, that there should be no reason why there would be any shortage of anything in those countries because, according to our Minister, all you have to do is manage a thing enough and it will take care of itself, and I think that circumstances have proven that this is not a case. When you cut out all the incentive and start exercising complete government control through bureaucracies, etc. I think that it has shown all throughout the whole world that this is certainly not a system that is going to work.

Getting back to marketing of feed grains, Mr. Chairman, I think that possibly in my own personal experience I've sold more feed grain than the entire caucus across the way, and I would like to know where they all become experts. And I can tell you right now, Mr. Chairman, at no time did I ever receive more money than I did under the free market system. I agree that in 1951 there was a vote taken, and I think the majority the Minister quoted yesterday I believe was 86 percent in favour of the Wheat Board. I would like to ask him, had a vote been taken in 1971, what would the results have been then? In my constituency barley was selling for 3 bushels for a dollar, oats was selling for 25 cents a bushel, and there was no quota. Now where is your Orderly Marketing there, Mr. Minister? American corn was pouring into the eastern feeders and we weren't selling a bushel of grain; and you can stand up in this House and tell us that this so-called Orderly Marketing System of yours is the answer to everything in the province of Manitoba, which is a bunch of rubbish.

Mr. Speaker, the actions of the Minister of Agriculture reminds me of the days of the insurance debate when the Minister for St. Boniface sat over there and he called some of the honourable members across the way a bunch of frantic fanatics, and Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture is so hung up on supply-management between he and his staff that he is blind to all the circumstances that are being used in agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. The stay option was a catch phrase that was brought out to win a few of the rural seats in Manitoba. It won none. The Minister certainly lost a whole bunch of credibility. The fact that he went out and preached this -- the farmers are not stupid any more. They want to do some of their own business and they certainly are going to continue to do it, and I think that the rural vote showed to the Minister of Agriculture that his policies are not being accepted and it's time that he woke up to the fact that he'd better put some incentive back into agriculture instead of trying to manage every phase of it. --(Interjection)-- The land lease program, certainly. It's one of his programs that I believe is a good thing. By the same token, here again we have the government hung up on one specific instance. I don't really believe that he is so anxious to promote the young farmer as he is to gain control of the agricultural land of rural Manitoba. If this present government was so anxious to keep young farmers on the land, why do they not give them a tax incentive whereby if they make a dollar they don't take 35 to 40 cents of it instead of trying to give them interest-free loans and taking it out of the public treasury to do it? If you want to give them some incentive give them a tax break, not grants and all this sort of thing.

Getting back to the hog deal, I'm not going to dwell on this. It's something that's been beaten around and I certainly don't want to go into it too much further, but again, in Roblin the Minister said that when the Hog Board comes into effect that there will not be a differential between the Toronto market and the market in Winnipeg. I would like to ask him today what the differential is there. Has it been removed?

A MEMBER: No, it hasn't.

MR. FERGUSON: Again. Another thing, getting back again to the stay option, is the AI technician. In the speech from the Throne I mentioned the fact that there was a meeting in Portage of about 300 basically very alarmed people that are involved in the cattle business of Manitoba, and quoting a letter -- I'll read you one line of it, I'm not going to bore you with the thing, but -- "No doubt some of you may be encouraged to hurt Manitoba Animal Breeders Co-Op, but if you fall into this category, be prepared for the inevitable consequences." Signed by Mr. John Lee under the -- Mr. John Lee didn't write the letter, it was written by Dr. Keith Robson. Who it was dictated I don't know, but this is the kind of thing that this

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) Minister is perpetrating on the farmers of Manitoba and then he expects them to trust him and expects them to believe in his policy. They won't buy it. And the Minister was not present at the meeting. The new Deputy Minister, where he might have had a chance to go out and meet the farmers, where was he? He didn't even give an excuse for not showing up.

I would like to thank the Minister for his announcement of the new rapeseed, . . . low erucic, high yielder. It's something that we're definitely going to have to have if we're going to -- under the present setup I'm sure that the farmers of Manitoba are going to be more interested in growing wheat than they are going to be in special crops. I think we all realize that this is a very temporary sort of thing, this strong wheat market. As a matter of fact last night's paper is already showing that they are predicting a surplus for 1975 in some areas. But I would like to ask him, is this rapeseed, are we going to have another plebiscite to see whether this is going to be marketed by a board, as it's a new variety, or will the present vote still hold?

Now again, getting back to the fertilizer investigation, I was looking at the leaf in the report and it's dated May 31 of 1973; we received it on Feb. 26, 1974. I would like to ask the Minister what the delay was in getting this back out to us, so we might have had a chance to look at it and study it a little bit and see what is going on.

I would also like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to bring up the fact that was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, and he got up the other day and made the statement that organized labour should be on a 32-hour week, they should have the same take-home pay. I would like to ask him how he feels that the beef of the Province of Manitoba could be produced on a 32-hour week. I'm kind of under the impression that my boys at home are working a 7-day week, possibly a 5- or 6-hour day or maybe a little better, and I wonder what happened last summer when the price of meat took a little move. The Peter Warren show, all our friends across the way -- the Minister of Public Works isn't there but he is always one of the big proponents of the fact that if anything goes up in the country, why it certainly should be brought down quickly -- and I would like to ask you fellows across the way, especially the Member for Crescentwood, what are you prepared to pay for your beef? Do you want us to raise it on a 32-hour week? Do you think that we can do this? Do you think that we are people that should be operating under different circumstances than what you people are as labourers? There's no way that the young farmers are going to stay on the farm and work 7 days a week, and you tell us to hire labour. We can't do it. And if we do raise the price of the beef what happens? Well give me an answer to that, you fellows over yonder.

A MEMBER: State farms.

MR. FERGUSON: State farms would certainly be the answer, there's no doubt about that. You'd be importing beef from Australia in six months.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that's the crux of my remarks at this time. I hope to take up a few more matters with the Minister as we go along, but thank you for your indulgence.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This time I'd like to make a few remarks regarding the Department of Agriculture, its operations, and the way things have been going in the last three or four years, Mr. Chairman; but before I do, at this time I would like to pay tribute to those people in the Province of Manitoba who have contributed much to the promotion of agriculture while working for the Government of Manitoba and have left the department. I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the Deputy Minister, a man who was well-respected in the Province of Manitoba, who also, incidentally, came originally from the constituency of Birtle-Russell. I would also like to pay tribute to the service that was rendered by the manager of the Agricultural Credit Corporation, Mr. Lorne Leggat, who was very well respected in agricultural circles. He also, Mr. Chairman, came from the constituency of Birtle-Russell. And I do this, Mr. Chairman, to point out to the Minister of Agriculture that the constituency of Birtle-Russell has contributed much to the field of agriculture over the years.

There were others, Mr. Chairman, who served well and in the past year have left the Department, men like Ron McLaren, Bob Breska, Brian Hodge, Doug Stevenson, and I'm sure there are others too; and at this time I would like the House to recognize the service that they

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) have contributed to agriculture in Manitoba.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to turn my attention to the affairs of agriculture as they have progressed under the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture over the past few years. We have seen the establishment, Mr. Chairman, of a feed grain marketing commission in the Province of Manitoba, a commission which really doesn't buy any grain, doesn't sell any grain, but in the meantime it takes a rip-off. Mr. Chairman, at the time that this board was set up I think that there was probably a field where many farmers were a little dissatisfied with the situation that existed, and there was an excellent opportunity for the Minister to make a positive contribution, where he could do something to help the farmers, but Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the results that have been achieved really helped the farmer. You blew it, Sam. You had the opportunity to really help them but in my estimation you blew it.

Mr. Chairman, at the same time, he changed the Hog Marketing Commission to the Hog Marketing Board and he appointed the members to hold office for quite a considerable length of time when they had been promised an elected board, and the operations at that time left a little bit to be desired, I think, and again we find that at the present time the hog producers in Manitoba are questioning the direction that this government is leading us in the marketing of hogs.

When you find that the price of hogs is at almost its peak in history, when the price of hogs has really never been higher, we find people are going out of the hog business, and you have to ask yourself why. Why are they going out of the business? And again I say that the Minister had a chance to show leadership but he blew it. Mr. Chairman, there have been many, many cases where the Minister has had the opportunity. He brought forward his Samcan program, where he's going to assist the farmer with installation of sewer and water and other facilities on the farm, with government assistance too, I might add, but the end result was that the number of regulations that were laid down, in the end the farmer even though he was assisted by government ended up paying more - the project cost him more than what it would have cost him if he hadn't had government assistance. Again I say, the Minister blew it. He had the opportunity but he blew it.

Mr. Chairman, again, in another field, I want to refer now to the operation of the various agricultural offices throughout the province. We had an ag rep system set up in this province that has served the community excellently in the past for many, many years, but we find that today the ag rep offices are probably the greatest propaganda machines disseminating information that we have ever seen in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, has directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS HOUR - RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Private Members' Resolution No. 3. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood, has five minutes.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): At the conclusion of my remarks the other . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATTERSON: . . . spiritual encouragement. At the conclusion of my remarks the other day Mr. Speaker, I caught a brief remark something about the price of meat, and I was glad that the Honourable Member for Gladstone signified that it was him that was concerned about the price of meat and all of the ramifications around that particular problem. But I would just like to note in the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, in his resolution in the RESOLVED, he states "any employee". Now in that RESOLVED I don't think that in his mind he was excluding the farm worker, and if he was then he's using the wrong terminology in his resolution.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the honourable member on a point of order. There was a question of privilege which arose yesterday and the Member for St. Matthews has to leave, and I wonder if it could be noted that he may leave and that the matter of privilege will be raised at the first moment when both members involved are present, because the Leader of the Liberal Party is not present at the moment, so I just wonder if the Member for St. Matthews can leave and not be considered not to have been here if the Leader of the Liberal Party happens to re-arrive.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: The Honourable Member for Gladstone was mentioning something about hard work and long hours - well let me assure the Member from Gladstone that I have worked just as long and just as hard on a farm as what the honourable member has, and maybe --(Interjection)--maybe some reason--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATTERSON: And I would suggest to him that probably I could still take him on in a 16, 7-hour day and will probably still be able to play hockey at the end of the game, you know, this is no problem, you know, once upon a farmer, always a farmer, and I'm sure the Member from Gladstone realizes that.

Now - but let's get down to the price of meat, what he's concerned about, and I don't think that you can equate the price of meat with the wages that you pay to the particular workmen that you employ. If we take that type of a situation then you could argue that we should always pay a very low minimum wage in our society in order to keep the cost of goods low. I can suggest to the honourable member, if he wishes to look around the country, where high wages are paid you have a good standard of living. You have people rising up from the bottom of our society into the middle class of society where they can buy better clothes, better housing, better transportation, better education, those type of things. But if you go to other areas where the wages are low, you will find depressed conditions, you will find poor housing, you will find poor education, and the people just can't afford to bring themselves from that standard of society. And I'm not suggesting for one minute that the price of meat that we now experience in Canada was caused by the farmer. I'm saying right today that the farmer is not getting too much money for the product that he is producing. I don't blame the farmer one bit. I say there was manipulation of the supply of meat in North America that created the prices that we have today.

But I would suggest to the honourable member that if we take that type of thinking that we can't afford to pay time and a half after 40 hours or after 32 hours - and this is what the resolution is driving at - the time and a half feature after X number of hours, whatever that number of hours should be. Then I would suggest that we will never advance in society.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker . . . submit to a question.

MR. PATTERSON: Well . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute left.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

MR. PATTERSON: Yeah. Okay. Honourable Member from Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: What would you be prepared to pay for your beef per pound; and can you buy as much beef now as you could five years on your wages?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Gladstone realizes that the railway workers are one of the lowest paid in our general industry, and we've never been able to afford to buy blue ribbon or red ribbon steaks. We were always the stew and hamburger type of people, and I think that we're still in that category, but we're hopeful of getting our wages up in the not too distant future.

And just talking about wages, Mr. Chairman, I still can't afford that type of meat, you know, and I'm hopeful that the members opposite are going to help us get an increase as an MLA salary in order that we can start affording some of the type of meat that they're producing on their farms. And I also suggest to the members of this House it's time maybe we started to look at the provision of time and a half for the members sitting in this Assembly in order to keep tune with other things that are happening in society. We should have a shift differential here; there's all kinds of things in this place that I see wrong with the working systems here, and we've had them in the labour movement. But anyway, just in the closing remarks, Mr. Chairman - I wish I had another 20 minutes on this resolution - I think that the resolution is in the right direction; I support the principle of the resolution, and I'm confident that the Minister of Labour is cognizant of the facts, and we can see some progress on this type of resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make several observations and express a certain amount of apprehension about this resolution. The Member from Fort Rouge this weekend stated that the Conservative Party was one believing in the sanctity of small business. And as I consider most farmers today business people, I would like to say that he possibly hit the nail on the head as far as I'm concerned.

This resolution is of concern particularly once again to, No. 1, small rural businessmen in the field of the service industry. These people are presently faced with escalating costs, such as we have never seen before. Take for example the corner store, general retail merchants--(Interjection)--and automobile dealers. The problem created by dropping hours of course is not a new one. The Manitoba government, especially the Highways Department is faced with this very same problem right now. They went down from a 50-hour week to a 44-hour week, and this is causing problems among the employees, because as a result of this the employees are going home with very much the same pay as they were receiving before, even after the pay increase.

We all know that when a person's hours of work, weekly hours are reduced, you cannot very well decrease his pay. At today's rising inflationary trend and high cost of living no one can afford to go ahead and take a cut in pay, especially leaving him with some extra leisure time. For example, let's just take the example of the auto body shop in which Autopac is affected. Under the present Autopac structure, Autopac is paying to the body shops \$9.50 an hour in the metropolitan area, and \$8.50 in the rural areas for every hour of work done. These people are presently in the rural area operating on a 44-hour week. Simple calculation shows that if this businessman has to go down from a 44-hour week to a 40-hour week in order to maintain the exact same rate of fee structure, he will then have to charge \$10.45 an hour, from 9.50 to 10.45, an increase of a dollar, and of course this is then passed on to the consumer, or in this case Autopac, who seem to be having enough difficulty without something like this.

Another problem facing the service industry, unlike the Honourable Member from Crescentwood stated, is that we are in the age of technology. In industry very often technology can be used to either reduce the manual labour to be done by an employee, and also shorten his working hours and increase his productivity. However, in the service industry, we are faced with the reverse of that problem. As machines become more complicated, as appliances become more complicated, as people demand more from the distributors, from the retailers, the time required to repair these items is substantially more.

Consumer legislation has complicated small business, and especially the service industry. I agree with the Member from Crescentwood, I would really think that if we could arrive at a 32-hour week without causing all kinds of ramifications, I think this would be a real fantastic thing. But to project that even a little further, you go down from a 44-hour week to a 32-hour week, again in the service industry, we're looking at an equal rate of \$13.50 an hour for repairs done on automobiles.

RESOLUTION NO. 3

(MR. BANMAN cont'd)

Now I don't have to point out what the ramifications of something like this is with regards to the inflationary trend. We all realize that as this would again put extra dollars, tax dollars in the government coffers, because when you add five percent on 9.50 or 13.50 there's quite a difference.

The Minister of Labour has in the past granted variations to the existing 44-hour week, and I feel the passing of this resolution would set the format for many briefs being submitted, by especially rural areas, requesting various variations of this type of legislation.

The problem is not a simple one. I should just point out another thing that being a rural member probably one advantage that we have over urban people is the fact that it only takes us maybe five or ten minutes to get to work, whereas if you're driving across Winnipeg you're spending an hour in your car. It's a small point, but this is the concern of the people providing services to people in the smaller communities, and especially to the service industry. So I would ask the members here before they vote for a resolution of this nature that they have a close look to see what the different ramifications of a resolution like this are.

MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 20. Just a minute. 20. The Honourable Member for Pembina. Absent. Resolution 4. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

RESOLUTION NO. 4

MR. MARION: Where's the resolution, so I can read it? Let's be patient. Thank you.

WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg Act is presently worded to provide that the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg is to be elected by the Council of the City of Winnipeg in the next civic elections rather than the public at large; and

WHEREAS civic elections in Winnipeg are required to be held in 1974; and

WHEREAS the tradition of the office of Mayor in Winnipeg requires that it should be filled by a person elected by the City at large rather than by the Council of the City; and

WHEREAS it is in the best interest of a good government of the City of Winnipeg that the powers, responsibility, duties and authorities of the Mayor be strengthened and more clearly defined;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of introducing legislation at this session of the House to amend the City of Winnipeg Act by:

(a) providing that the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg shall be elected by the electors of the entire city rather than by the councillors for the said City, and;

(b) that the powers, authorities, responsibilities and duties of the office of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg be increased in order to make the office more effective and that such increased authority be set out in the legislation creating and governing the City of Winnipeg.

And that's moved by myself, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. I find that this resolution is anticipatory as it has been stated in the Throne Speech that there will be certain amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act.

Resolution No. - the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, on a point of order, the actual phrase calling for the election of the Mayor was not alluded to in the Throne Speech, I don't believe. Government can make mention if they're going to amend a certain Act, so this would then preclude any mention of a municipal matter, in this case the City of Winnipeg Act, so I don't see that the motion can be ruled out on grounds of anticipation because we have had no indication from the government that they're going to do such a thing. They had the chance last year; they did not put it in the Act. Your ruling would suggest then that no one can mention anything at all about the City of Winnipeg Act, and I don't think that's the intent of a ruling that says in effect that a motion is anticipatory.

MR. SPEAKER: The rule I refer to is the one in anticipation; and secondly, the one in respect to debate being repetitive; and since there will be an opportunity to discuss the total Winnipeg Act when the Winnipeg Act is being amended, that necessarily includes Mayor or any other particulars - and the reference I am making to where it is indicated is stated in this manner. You will be asked to approve certain amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act, which will make its government and its administration even more efficient, and I think that encompasses the Mayor or any other particular amendments.

RESOLUTION NO. 5

MR. SPEAKER: Next resolution. Resolution 5. Proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The resolution is open. If we do not proceed with it - the resolution is open. If we do not proceed with it, then I must call it to a vote. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I at this time do wish to make a few comments in respect to the resolution. I listened quite carefully to the speakers the other day, and I think that the resolution does have certain merit, Mr. Speaker, because not only that I am concerned about recreation land, and I cannot talk for the farm land, I'm really concerned about the recreation land, Mr. Speaker, and this is what I would like to concern myself with. I know that members on my right had very strong reservations about the resolution and could not agree with it, but Mr. Speaker, can I bring to your attention that the government in the Province of Alberta under the leadership of Peter Lougheed has brought such legislation in the Province of Alberta, and only a couple of years ago the Premier in Ontario, Premier Davis, has brought in legislation where you can not now buy recreation land - they've changed their policy completely. --(Interjection)--Yes it does. Now surely, surely, Mr. Speaker - I don't think it's got anything to do with state ownership or socialization but what has happened in the Scandinavian countries. You have three Scandinavian countries which have laws that you cannot buy any recreational land. You have the same kind of legislation in the United States, in most of the states in the United States, that no one except a citizen, and in our resolution it says "any landed immigrant," any person that's living - doesn't have to be a citizen, as long as he's living in the Province of Manitoba, he has an opportunity to purchase recreation land, and that's all that this resolution is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Now I would like to, you know, ask the members would they not be concerned, would they not be concerned - for instance in one area of this province where you had lakeshore property of some 16 miles, which was owned by not a Manitoban or not a Canadian, which you had the greatest fly or flyway of geese in the North American continent, which is Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the greatest flight occurs through the Delta area in Manitoba, and the people of Manitoba, the citizens of Manitoba, do not have, or have not had the opportunity to enjoy the amenities to be able to go and hunt in that area because it was privately owned.

Now if the government's prepared to expropriate some of this property this would be a solution in some small measure, but surely we have to look at some of the legislation that has been brought in now in Ontario, in Alberta, the Maritimes provinces, where they have lost most of their recreation lakeshore properties, have been taking action and studying, and I know that there has been quite an extensive research done into this problem by many associations, Mr. Speaker, in Canada which does concern many people. For instance, in one city in Ontario, in Sault Ste. Marie, where over 60 percent of the lakeshore property along Lake Superior is not owned by the local citizens, and these people not only that they were concerned but they were angry to the extent that they have been doing some damages to lakeshore properties that were not their properties, they are saying, well live here - the people that enjoy the lakeshore properties not only live close by or across the bridge, but live thousands of miles away and why should they enjoy the amenities in this country who do not pay the same kind of tax, who do not put up with the temperatures, that the residents have to do, the citizens have to do, and still have not the opportunity to enjoy the amenities Mr. Speaker.

So this isn't something that's new. I know that the Saskatchewan, or the Government of Saskatchewan did get into a predicament because they brought in a similar type of legislation, but not only that, they prohibited that no Canadian can own any land, farm land or recreation land except a resident of Saskatchewan, which I think it's--(Interjection)-- well I couldn't accept that type of legislation under no circumstances. Just because . . .

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. PATRICK: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Relative to the land that he referred to on Lake Superior, which he said that the local residents should own, would he agree that they would be in the same predicament if it was all owned from people in British Columbia, in Quebec, and Alberta.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't happen that way, it just doesn't happen, but at least the people would be Canadian citizens that would own that land. Is the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources trying to tell the House that the whole Whiteshell - if the lakeshore properties of the whole Whiteshell, if all the lakes would be owned by non-Canadians, he'd have no

RESOLUTION NO. 5

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) concern at all and he'd approve that. That's what he's indicating to this House. That's my thinking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege?

MR. GREEN: Yes, and the type of privilege that was raised last night. I indicated very clearly that I believe that all of that land should be owned by the public.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the member had no point of privilege. I said in my opinion this is the way I interpret what he said to the House, and I have the right to do that, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, you know, he gives us many stories in the House the way that would suit him. He likes to make big news releases when any of his industries are doing well, but when they're in difficulty he is not prepared to give any information to this House, Mr. Speaker, because then it's not favourable to him.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have never issued a news release with regard to a business owned by the Manitoba Development Corporation, or any other business which I have been involved with. The honourable member says that I like to issue news releases when businesses are doing well. Mr. Speaker, I have not issued a news release on any business over which I have had jurisdictional control.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, again the Minister has no point of privilege because reads the government Information Services that come to all the members in this House, when we are put on the mailing list - it tells about any new industry when it opens and how much money has been put in, and if it's the plant in Carberry, the bicycle, or if it's Misawa Homes in Gimli . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member said that I liked to issue news releases when any of the businesses which I am involved with are doing well, and I indicated to the honourable member I issued no such news releases.

MR. PATRICK: Well perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase. The government issues news releases and when it's to their advantage we get fancy news releases, big releases, but when we ask the ministers a question in this House in respect to what's going on when there are difficulties, what is the Minister's attitude - the public be damned. I'll tell them what I want to tell them and I won't tell them what I don't want to tell them. That's his reaction. That's the kind of Minister we have in this House, Mr. Speaker - and if he doesn't want to believe it, let him read his own news report to the press. So Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I have never made a remark in any way resembling the remark that has just been made by the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder who it was that said to the press: "Mr. Green's reply was that it would do no good whatsoever for the public to know why Mr. Ault left the firm." That's what he said, so okay, what you're saying that everything the public can get value from knowing I will tell them - the Minister is reported as saying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of order.

MR. ENNS: As one who is still trying to resolve in his mind as to how to vote on the particular resolution before the House, I'm having a great deal of difficulty in understanding what the current debate is about. We are not dealing with an MDC resolution, or a resolution dealing with the development of industry in this province, or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' actions nor his attitude toward a particular segment of this society, or his problems with the Liberal Party. We are dealing with the resolution calling for whether or not we should prevent the sale of land to foreigners, non-Canadian residents.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member - the point is very well taken. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has interrupted me at least half a dozen times on some presupposed point of privilege which he never had any point of privilege, but I will continue with what I started to say. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Provincial Government to regulate property rights, you know, within the province, and I think

RESOLUTION NO. 5

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . it's their obligation to see that our resources are protected. Now it may be difficult to implement what we are asking in the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I'm not saying that it will not be difficult, but at the same time we have to appreciate that the other provinces are taking some action, and have taken some action. The Province of Alberta has taken action. The province of Ontario has taken some action. Prince Edward Island has taken some action, so this is not something that it's completely foreign to the Minister or to the members of the House that we should not get ourselves involved. I think that we should be concerned in the amount of land that is being sold to people that are not residents, or have no interest at all in Manitoba.

I am concerned about lakeshore properties in the province - perhaps you know some other members are not and perhaps the Minister is not - but I am concerned and I think that the resolution has some merit, perhaps it's just not framed in such a way to the Member's liking but if it's not, he can probably amend it and we can debate it again, but I believe that the debate is worthwhile in this House, and it's worthwhile to debate this resolution because the other provinces have been confronted with this legislation.

I know that we are fortunate in this province, Mr. Speaker - we are fortunate that we have established a provincial parks system, and we have protected many of our lakes, particularly the Whiteshell, and what has happened in some of the other provinces - this has not taken place and they are experiencing difficulties at the present time. For that reason, not only that they have brought in legislation but it's pretty expensive to buy back some of the properties now, and this is the reason I am trying to point out to the Minister that I think that we should be careful to the amount of land and what kind of land, if it's recreational land, if it's sold for speculation purposes, and who it's sold to, so we should be concerned. Well I--(Interjection)-- The Minister says he's not going to sell any land, he's going to lease it, and I appreciate to hear that. I'm glad if that's - I will accept that.

But I do feel that there is still recreation land and there's lakeshore properties that have been purchased by - not in one lot, has been purchased in large amounts - it could have been purchased privately or in the case that I've just indicated to you, Mr. Speaker, what happened at Delta, and I don't think it was fair. Now the land was owned by the same party for many, many years and still it denied the local people, it denied the local residents, it denied the citizens of this Province of Manitoba, to be able to enjoy the amenities that we have given to somebody else - and let me repeat to you, Mr. Speaker, what I'm talking about is not just an ordinary natural lakeshore property, what I'm talking to you is the greatest flightway, or the greatest area where the migration of geese takes place in this - not in this province but in this country, in the North American country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: . . . ask a question. The question is simply: would it be more accessible to the local people, which you are concerned with and which I am concerned with, if it was owned by one of them, to the exclusion of the others?

MR. PATRICK: No it wouldn't. I agree with the Minister it wouldn't. But again, I know he's posing it in such a way that he's trying to develop his case, that it doesn't matter who owns the property, and I agree if anybody from Winnipeg or Plum Coulee, it doesn't matter where, owned that 16 mile stretch, or whatever it is, it wouldn't make no difference. Perhaps it would be posted as private land - and private land to me is sacred, that the man has rights. It can be posted and nobody should be allowed on it. I agree with that, completely. I agree with that but would the Minister also - what he's trying to pose to me, that he feels if non-Canadians, non-Canadians owned all the lakeshore properties in the whole Whiteshell on all the lakes there, it still wouldn't make any difference to him. He'd say, he wouldn't care --(Interjection)--well then--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's the solution.

I still feel that the people in Manitoba, the Canadian citizens, the Manitoba citizens, surely should have at least a first option, should have an opportunity to own this property, to own lakeshore property, recreation land, if it's lakeshore or not, recreation land, instead of somebody owning it that's 2,000 miles away, or 3,000 miles away, and comes and spends here say six weeks a year, or a month or two months a year. Now I know the member will say, well what if it's my son but he's living in Florida and he's got a property on Lake Winnipeg and shouldn't he own that? Well I'd say, sure he should own it. He owned it at one time; he's a Canadian citizen, why shouldn't he own it. But the thing is what I'm saying, it's not

RESOLUTION NO. 5

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) anti-American, not one bit. Look what the other provinces are doing. Look what the states in the union are doing. The states in the union are doing the same thing with the exception of the State of Washington and a few other states, but most of the states have already brought in law that you cannot own recreation land if you're not a citizen. But what you're saying--(Interjection)--if you're not a citizen of that country--(Interjection)--most of the states in the union have brought in legislation that you cannot buy lakeshore or recreation property, that's what I'm saying. --(Interjection)--

Well then - but what you're saying that anyone else should have the right to own it in Canada or Manitoba irrespective of whether they're Canadian citizens or not. That's the kind of message I'm getting from the Minister. What I'm saying - what we're doing here, it's not new. The other provinces have done it; many of the states in the union have done the same legislation, so it's not new, and perhaps the resolution may be too restrictive, I don't know, but I think it's worthwhile to discuss this; it's worthwhile to debate because there is concern. If the member feels that there is no concern, I'll invite him to a meeting, any meeting, and let him raise this point with a group of people, and they're all concerned, it doesn't matter what public platform you have, or an opportunity, and you ask the people, are you concerned about foreign ownership of recreation properties and land? They'll tell you they are really concerned and they'll say, if you're trying to do something about it, you're our guy. We're really interested to see what the government or the Minister is trying to do.

So I did not intend to speak Mr. Speaker. In fact, I wasn't prepared or ready - I was trying to get some more information, and I didn't expect the Resolution would be up today, but I had to get up, and listening to the Minister speak last time, I recollected what he said and I wanted to put some of these points on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member agreed that I could ask a question of him. And I'd like to ask, short of expropriation, that is buying out all the land, how much is the member prepared to pay for expropriating from the present owners their right to sell the land on a free market. Surely their opportunities for sale would be restricted by the resolution. How much is the honourable member prepared to pay for that kind of expropriation?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I did not indicate that all land, or all recreational land should be expropriated, because I don't think I will accept and I agree that all recreational land should be owned by the government - I would accept the fact that no one should own large tracts of land. I think it should be subdivided in a matter of 50-foot lots or 100-foot lots, and that people should have the opportunity to own a lot; if not, they should have the opportunity to lease that property - what has been in effect now in Manitoba for quite some years. For instance, in Falcon, and what's happening in the Whiteshell, this should be the practice, but what price? I feel that when you're expropriating from anyone, I don't care who it is and where the person is, if he's a Canadian or an American or anyone, I think that expropriation should be most fair, and I would feel that the Crown should pay whatever the going price is, whatever the market can bear, and you can establish whatever the market is pretty quickly, because you're . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up.--(Interjection)-- Only by consent of the total assembly. The honourable member's time is up. (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I thank honourable members, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the Member for Assiniboia quite understood my point. My point was, that short of expropriation, assuming we're not going to expropriate, then this resolution would say to Farmer A, you may not sell your land, be it recreational or farm land, to a non-Canadian or landed immigrant. Well since you are taking away from him a right to sell, then I believe that you are limiting him only to sell to a Canadian, then you are . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then you are forcing him to pay, to accept less, should you not as a government pay for - pay him for that loss, the damage he suffers for the inability to sell at the highest price?

MR. PATRICK: I'm sure that the Minister has an answer; if he hasn't one, I'm sure he can arrive at one. I believe--(Interjection)--Okay. I believe that any farmer, he should be entitled to the highest possible price that has been offered to him, and it doesn't matter where it's coming. Now if the highest price came, let's assume, from a non-Canadian,

RESOLUTION NO. 5

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) non-Canadian, I believe that there should be some kind of a board, review board, that would look at the price, and if the government felt that they really needed that land and they didn't want it to go into foreign hands, then they should pay that price to that farmer and perhaps the government can buy it, but the farmer should still get that price. If they felt that they were not interested and it didn't play a big part as being recreational land and it wasn't that important, then I would agree that, you know, I wouldn't exclude every single transaction, but I think that the government should consider setting up some kind of a review board in respect to foreign ownership of land.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've listened carefully to the remarks of everybody on this resolution so far, and I'm quite frankly confused, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the member that has presented it, or the Liberal Party, has thoroughly researched the options that are available and what is really happening in as far as land in Manitoba for recreational purposes today is governed under. It may be popular to wave the national flag and say, go home Yank, or go home somebody, but I would hope that they haven't presented it on that basis because it's not one that we would really look to as being a very democratic way of having land looked at in this province.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the reference to farm land I could not buy, because if I own farm land and I want to sell my farm to anybody, that is my privilege, the same it is my - I wouldn't like somebody to tell me who I could sell my farm to any more than I would want somebody to say to me that you can't sell your house in Winnipeg to any one particular person or it must be sold to a Canadian - that's just not the way we want to be in the Province of Manitoba. From that point of the resolution, there's no way that that's agreeable.

Now let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what happens as far as recreational land is concerned. At the present time if this town or a municipality or a city designates, or in the case of the City of Winnipeg where we had Metro zoning before, we now have the City of Winnipeg zoning, if you zone something, if you zone an area, recreation or park, there is no way that if I own that land and it's designated recreation or park, that if I sell it to you, Sir, that you can use it for anything but recreation. Therefore, the regulations regarding zoning, or designation of recreational property can be laid down very closely.

If you're speaking of farm lands that border on lakes or beaches of some kind in the Whiteshell or around Lake Manitoba, the same thing definitely applies. Nobody as far as I know owns to the shoreline, Mr. Speaker. The shoreline is owned by the people of Manitoba, and it is never sold.

A MEMBER: Not all of it.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Well, I heard somebody say, not all of it, but I would research that. I would sincerely hope that in most cases, that 99 percent of the time the shoreline is not owned by the people that own the property. There's usually a stretch, and I'm not sure of the amount, Mr. Speaker, that is public domain.

Mr. Speaker, on that basis, on that basis, if the government decides to go into an area and designates it as a recreational area, whoever owns that land sells it, he sells it to a person on the basis that that land is going to be recreational area. Now, the Minister of Finance brings up a point that if we go ahead and zone his land recreational and he cannot sell it for as high a price, certainly I think that there has to be a system of looking at what that man may lose. But the province at the present time has the power to make sure there's enough recreational land available. The province at the present time is not selling recreational land, and when we get into an area of land that the province presently owns - as the Whiteshell was at one time - here we have a situation where it has been developed, and what do you do? You say there'll be so much public beach, there will be so much transient campers, there'll be so many permanent campers during the year; there'll be so many area lots open for people who want cottages - and that, Mr. Speaker, is perfectly logical thinking, and if somebody who comes in there and it's provincially owned recreational area that has been well planned for the people in that area, or well planned for the people of that province, what's all the excitement?

You know, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, at the present time the province has the power, has the power to make sure that there's going to be recreational land available for the people of Manitoba. I would only be very very concerned if the province was not studying the areas in Manitoba at the present time where parks should be developed in time. And supposing

RESOLUTION NO. 5

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) at the present time - let's take for example now that an American owns a piece of property on a frontage of lake, they may even decide it would be expedient, because we need a recreational area there right now, to deal with that man to see if we could move along or speed up another recreational area in the province. But to turn around and have a resolution that says, "you can't sell any farm lands, and you can't sell any property to anybody but a Canadian citizen" is something that is building a fence around this province that is not desirable for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I like anybody else want to see a lot of recreation land in Manitoba, so do the people, the members of our Party, but we do have the power at the present time - and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, once a piece of property is designated recreational, there is just about no way, no way that it can be sold to anybody except that it be put to use for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is, you know, it's fine, we want recreational land, but we have that power now. The only criticism that I could have is that if the government wasn't exercising their power to make sure there's recreational land. The other criticism is that I would not like to see the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources buy all the land - I'm not going to go along with that. But I think that on that basis I would have to draw the line somewhere because as I said, I want to see a planned area for recreation in different areas.

But the resolution is really redundant, we have that power now; and if we really want to be mean, we can go out and designate a piece of property or zone it, which would tie up that person that if he sold it, the person that bought it could only use it for recreation. I think that if you do that you have to deal with the person selling; you have to put rules and regulations in that he doesn't advertise it unless he tells the person that buys it what it's zoned as; but the power is there, and as far as saying whether I can sell my farm land, which to me is my home - instead, and whether I sell my house, which to me is my home, telling me who I'm going to sell it to, I certainly cannot, certainly cannot agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that I couldn't support the resolution on the basis that we have the powers now. The only thing that - I could support a resolution saying that the government study and make sure, consider the advisability of, looking at further recreational properties, that I could support. But I cannot support this resolution, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not really up tight about this resolution, I'm flexible on it, and the more debate I hear about it the more I'm going to form my opinion on it, and I haven't really got a solid opinion on it yet. I have much sympathy with what the Member from Sturgeon Creek stated, but coming from the Liberal Party, the type of resolution that it is sort of surprises me, because I sat in convention of our own Party and saw resolutions and heard debate on almost identical wording to this resolution that we're looking at today. What I'm finding is that the Liberal Party that we have in existence today is almost, if not already, on our side of the House, and they--(Interjections)--Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, you hear comments about the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party - you know, even through all his faults he still has some good qualities. You know, he's not all bad. He said . . .

A MEMBER: Name one.

MR. PATRICK: They want to name one. He's got unlimited amount of energy. He never gets tired, that fellow. He just keeps coming. You know, I'm surprised at the motivation he has, getting out of his chair so quickly as he does so many times a day. He just never tires.

A MEMBER: No, but does he say anything?

MR. PATTERSON: But getting back to the resolution and the philosophy behind the resolution - and by the way, Mr. Speaker, I found this in the election campaign also, the Liberal candidate that ran in Crescentwood is, you know, maybe more so than what the present members of the Liberal Party are, oriented toward the New Democratic way of thinking. And she is involved in many very progressive type of organizations and I know that her philosophy - this resolution is right down her alley. So maybe she had a hand in presenting it, I don't know.

But looking at the philosophy of the resolution, and in looking at the slogan that the Liberals had in the campaign of self-control, not state control, the two things don't jibe, so I'm just wondering where some of the brain thrusts are coming from within the Liberal Party, and it doesn't seem to me that they're coming from the members that are sitting in this House. There seems to be some back room strategy going on somewhere, and with that type of thinking

RESOLUTION NO. 5

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) I can't agree with that. But anyway that's just talking on the philosophy of the resolution.

Now, getting into the resolve of the resolution, there has to be some line drawn between the farm lands and the recreation land. I think there's a hang-up there because there seems to be two points of view coming across in the House concerning the recreational land and the farm land. But, you know, how can you restrict a sale of land that somebody already owns. That is going to be the point. And I know the Member from Lakeside, he certainly won't want us to put any restrictions on any sale of land because that just runs against the grain and his hair bristles and he gets a little perturbed when we talk about things like that, and I certainly don't want to get him perturbed because, you know, we got a hockey game coming up Saturday night, and if he gets mad he'll be in the penalty box all the time and we won't be able to afford that. So, I want to keep him in good humour at least until Saturday.

But talking about the recreational land. Now to me the crux in this resolution seems to be the beach front land, the property down where we all want to enjoy a little sunshine and a little swimming, and what have you. Now, the problem here is, do we take a position that this land must be Crown land? If we take that type of position, then we're going to have to look at some very definite limits when we sell land or when new land is being put up for sale, that type of thing is going to have to be. Then you run into the problem of, you know, self-control not state control, but, you know, the state has to say something in some of these things, and the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek indicated that we already have that type of power - whether we have or not, I don't know. But I'm rather confident, Mr. Speaker, that the government in this particular type of situation are going to do something in some way to eliminate some of the concern in this area, and probably in this session, so I would suggest that the honourable member from the Liberal Party not be too disheartened about the resolution because I think that he's going to see some advances.

Now, everybody that's in the real estate field knows that land is money, and today that is more true than ever before; and anybody that does own some land they're not going to give it up easily and they're not going to give it up cheaply. So if we're going to expropriate or buy, then we've got to be prepared to spend huge sums of money to get the type of thing that this resolution is driving at.

The economic base of Manitoba has hereditarily been an agricultural base, but that is changing. The agricultural base is not so strong in Manitoba as it has been. The last three or four years has seen that change. We're getting more of an industrial base and different types of things like that, so--(Interjection)--Well, the farmers are getting rich, they're already probably rich, so we don't have to worry about them in that sense. A lot of our farmers are, you know, --(Interjection)--No, they're not rich in the sense that they're multi-millionaires and that type, but they're not suffering that much either. With the type of policies that our present Minister of Agriculture has been putting into Manitoba the farmers have been profiting and progressing. You know, I hear a lot of criticism on the Minister's supply paper and to me it's just unrealistic that the types of criticism should be coming with all of the progressive things that he's done for Manitoba. And I don't say that he's 100 percent right in everything, but he's so close to being 100 percent right in many of his policies that you can't get much better than that. So--(Interjection)--Well I mentioned one when I spoke on the Throne Speech Debate, the stay option. I would probably be still out working with the Member from Gladstone 16, 17 hours a day and struggling to make a living, if the stay option had been in effect when I was a youngster, but it wasn't, so here I am in here working for the railroad at low wages. But hopefully we'll change that.

The last sentence in the resolution really gets to the crux of the problem when it says that it will only be owned by Canadian citizens or landed immigrants. Well that's being real restrictive and I doubt very much that even the New Democratic Party would adopt a policy like that, so I wouldn't think that we would be able to support that type of a statement in the resolution and, like I say, once again I'm rather surprised that it's coming from the Liberal Party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)