

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 10, 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 21 students Grade 11 standing of Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jolly. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Health and Social Development.

We also have 30 students Grade 11 and 12 standing of the Miami Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Miss Turner, Mr. George Hegan and Mr. Docking. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

And we have 17 students Grade 11 standing of the Sisler School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kennedy. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.

I should also like to mention that one of our members is celebrating an anniversary today of the day he was born. I won't say how many years it is but anyways we wish him well. The Member for Swan River.

Presenting Petitions--the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, for once I'm speechless. Thank you very much for your kind sentiments.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): I'm distributing for members a spring runoff outlook. This is in the form of a memorandum from my Deputy Minister to myself. Ordinarily I would do it in answer to a question but it's fairly lengthy so if I just distribute it the honourable members will have it. The situation has not changed a great deal from the last time that I gave a report.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable First Minister.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier and Minister of Urban Affairs) (Rossmere) introduced Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act (2).

MR. SPEAKER: Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. He has just returned from his journey to the east. I wonder if he's in a position to indicate whether Winnipeg and Manitoba will have an expansion of the Air Canada overhaul facility, or a new facility, or additional work for Canadian Aviation Electronics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition can appreciate, it is not really within my purview to make any kind of definitive statement in that respect. I can only say to him that the discussions that were held pursuant to communications and letters, telegrams in recent weeks and months the discussions yesterday were definitely worthwhile and there is reason to be optimistic. But in any case, Sir, I cannot make a definitive statement as to what will transpire some time in the near future.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to make any statement with respect to the request for Saunders Aircraft.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, there, too, Mr. Speaker, the discussions were definitely worthwhile. There is a need to carry out some very specific and detailed analysis and further

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . exchange of information and that has been arranged for and will be taking place in the course of the next month or so.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to inform the House as a result of the discussions in Ottawa as to the nature of change or the manner in which equalization payments with respect to the new revenues to be realized by the provinces and by the Federal Government would apply insofar as Manitoba is concerned.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba has indicated its concern with respect to the announced Federal Government change with respect to the equalization formula and we have communicated that both through the office of the Minister of Finance and through my own office. We did not deal with that yesterday in terms of our discussions but we have communicated our position I would say approximately - well in the past month.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I have a supplementary then. The First Minister is not in a position to indicate that any amount or a formula was indicated to him or to the government to be received from the Federal Government in connection with this particular aspect of equalization?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the reason that there is some uncertainty with respect to the ultimate implications under the equalization formula for provinces such as Manitoba and other provinces receiving equalization payments, is that the position of the Government of Canada is that those additional revenues received by the oil producing provinces that will be allocated to capital account as opposed to current revenue account will not be deemed to be revenues that constitute part of the equalization formula, would not come under the equalization formula. And since we do not have definitive indication from the two producing provinces as to the precise amount of revenues that they will be allocating to capital and current revenue accounts neither the Federal Government nor ourselves are able to have a very specific estimate as to what equalization revenues for Manitoba will be next year. That is to say, applicable to this year. We can estimate that but that would be conducting an estimate on the basis of hearsay to date as to what amounts of the incremental oil revenues will be put into capital and current accounts in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That's the nature of the problem.

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

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the First Minister can indicate whether it would be the government's position that - the Provincial Government's position for Manitoba that we would accept the allocation by the oil producing provinces as to what will be capital and what will be considered non-capital.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is not the only point that is at issue. What is also at issue and which we have communicated to the Federal Government is that it seems to be a case of the Federal Government also interpreting what shall be revenues deemed to be calculable under the equalization formula, and we have communicated our disagreement, strong disagreement with what appears to us to be a very unilateral decision by the Federal Government with respect to the equalization formula and policy, and in that connection it's my understanding that one of the premiers of the Maritime provinces has communicated this concern and disagreement as well.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. Will he confirm that his department commissioned and received a report from a Mr. Tremblay from Quebec which recommended the establishment of a co-ordinator for French language promotion in Manitoba; and will he also confirm that the same Mr. Tremblay is about to be appointed some time today or tomorrow to the very position that he recommended should be established?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister explain to the House why a Quebecer is being appointed to this position rather than a qualified Franco Manitoban?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in making this appointment we certainly did not take into account the province of origin of those whom we considered for the position. We enacted

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . . legislation to allow for the Francais instruction, for French being used as a language of instruction and Mr. Tremblay just happened to have been the most capable, competent qualified applicant to fill this post.

MR. ASPER: I'm not sure if the Minister answered one question. I wonder if he could indicate were Manitobans considered for the position, were they given the opportunity to apply and were they considered and turned down because of lack of qualification?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I will repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Tremblay was considered to have been the most capable, qualified and competent applicant to fill this post.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Were there any applicants from Manitoba considered?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, having said that he was the most competent, capable and qualified applicant considered for this post that it goes without saying that there must have been more than one that was considered.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has he received yet a petition from the French speaking teachers' association in Manitoba asking that a Manitoban be appointed to the new post?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister in the absence of the Minister responsible for Housing. Can he tell us whether the government has yet investigated the situation in Lord Selkirk Park where charges were made last night at the Police Commission of the harassing and mugging of senior citizens by people in that project area?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a provincial matter. Order please. It's a municipal area and I'm not going to debate the matter. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can he tell the House whether the Manitoba Labour Board is having difficulty certifying the University of Manitoba Faculty Association?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, of course the actions of the Manitoba Labour Board are within their prerogative and they don't report to me as to whether or not they are having any difficulties at all. The Manitoba Labour Board once established operate under their rules and regulations and I cannot interfere, despite accusations that I have done in the past, with the operation of the Manitoba Labour Board.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House whether he has had private meetings with individual members of the Labour Board on this question?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then advise the House that no pressure whatever is being exerted by the government on the Manitoba Labour Board in this matter.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I assure, you, all members of this Legislative Assembly that no pressure is ever exercised either by the Minister of Labour or the Government of Manitoba on the Manitoba Labour Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Education. I wonder if he would now be prepared to table the report on French as the language of instruction in Manitoba prepared by Olivier Tremblay who is a consultant to the Planning and Research Department in Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this was an in-house report for the use of the Minister of the day for the department and I'm not quite certain that it would be in keeping with the rules of the House if such a report were tabled.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question. I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could tell the House why this in-house report was withdrawn from circulation within his department?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, the report was not designed for circulation, whatever

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd). . .circulation means in the mind of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. It was certainly circulated to all of those for whom it was meant to be used and was used by them and is in the process of being implemented.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. How does he characterize something as an in-house report when it's done by somebody in Quebec who is not exactly in our House?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, people move from house to house, people are often seconded from one house to another as happened in the case of Mr. Olivier Tremblay, who at that time was seconded from the service of the Department of Education of the Province of Quebec to the Department of Education of the Province of Manitoba, and it was during that period of secondment that the report was prepared for myself and my department; and this happens interdepartmentally quite frequently.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister confirm that the Tremblay report actually recommended that the person who is to be hired for this job be a Franco Manitoban and not somebody from outside of Manitoba?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party would know that we would not want anything contained in any report nor would we pay any cognizance to it, if the recommendation were contrary to any legislation of ours, and particularly legislation passed by this government; and the honourable member would know that ones racial ethnic origin is not a fact to be taken into account in the hiring of any individual for any post.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I address this question to the First Minister. When will the First Minister announce what percentage of the increase in the price of crude oil produced in Manitoba will accrue to the producers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which is under advisement and will remain so as we continue to gather additional information with respect to oil price adjustments, some of which flow from the decision taken at the meeting in Ottawa a couple of weeks ago, and some of which changes flow from Federal Government decisions that have been announced subsequently. So when we are in a position to indicate policy it will probably be introduced in the form of legislation.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplement, again addressed to the First Minister. Has the Manitoba Government been advised of any shutdowns of marginal producing oil wells in Manitoba as a result of a cost-price squeeze?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a question which could better be directed to the Minister of Mines and Resources in that if in fact there are such reports they would no doubt have been directed to the Department of Mines and Resources. Personally I'm not aware of any such reports.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has the Minister received any correspondence from employees from the Winnipeg Free Press protesting that they have been unsuccessful in their attempts to resign from the union guild?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister elect to get the circumstances of the Free Press case in view of the fact that there are some 30 employees who claim that they were told by their organizers if they changed their minds joining the guild they would be able to resign and their application, the deposits would be refunded, and they're unable to do so at the present time?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. You may recall that insofar as the Free Press is concerned and the attempt to have certain of their employees certified under a collective agreement I ran into considerable difficulty insofar as procedures are concerned which were ultimately after going through all of the courts I thought very successful, to give to the employees of the Free Press the same rights as are given to all other employees in the Province of

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . .Manitoba, and certainly I think that it would be improper for me to go on a witch hunt with the employees of the Winnipeg Free Press or indeed any other industry to ascertain their inclinations and their desires. The Labour Relations Act makes provision for action by employees either to join or to withdraw from an organization; it is no affair of mine. I think that the least governmental intervention in the affairs between management and the employees is the desirable procedure for us to take in Manitoba.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister received any letters from the employees concerning this matter?

MR. PAULLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated in the answer to the original question of my honourable friend, to my knowledge as of this moment I have not received any communication. It could conceivably be in the process of going through my office but I have not personally received it, if there is such a document as of yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister, please. Can he inform us whether the government four years ago received a report from the Age and Opportunity Centre recommending the establishment of guest and boarding-room houses for senior citizens as an alternative to high rise senior citizen units built by MHRC?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): What date?

MR. AXWORTHY: April 1971.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the report referred to is a report that was allegedly submitted four years ago I would have to check to ascertain which Minister or which office in fact received that report, if in fact such a report was received. I will make a note and check.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the First Minister could also find out why the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation did not avail itself of CMHC financial provisions to build guest and boarding house facilities for senior citizens as alternatives to high rise senior citizen housing.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is something which perhaps could be pursued by the honourable member during consideration of estimates of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, when the Minister for that corporation has his estimates before the House. I would think that one of the reasons that might bear on this is the fact that in relative terms the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation did avail itself of substantial amounts of financing in order to proceed with the construction of several thousand units of senior citizen and family housing in a way that was greatly escalated over past practices; and also therefore put a considerable strain on the existing staff personnel of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation since they were responsible for a greatly accelerated program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister tell us whether it is a policy of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to supply security guards in senior citizens units which are subject to large increases in crime, mugging and assaults?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which I'm not in a position to indicate or answer just offhand. If the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is referring to some incident or incidents allegedly occurring at the Lord Selkirk Park housing project, I have to advise my honourable friend that Burrows-Keewatin and Lord Selkirk Park are the two housing projects which were constructed at a time when the municipality took the initiative and the responsibility for administration thereof. Those two - I believe of all the senior citizen and public housing in the province, those two are administered under the aegis of the City of Winnipeg since they were proceeded with in the mid-1960s.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can he advise the House of the progress of his. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SHERMAN: To the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Can he advise the House of the progress of his conciliation officer, if any, in attempting to avert a threatened strike of 1,600 non-professional workers at the Health Sciences Centre?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to answer the question raised by my honourable friend from Fort Garry and also to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that I did receive a report from the conciliation officer involved that meetings have taken place between the two parties and that the conciliation officer has been involved in these discussions. Those discussions are going on and hopefully within a day or two this matter will be resolved one way or the other.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his information. I would like to ask him whether that would indicate that mass meetings of the workers involved, such as the one that was scheduled for this evening, will now be deferred pending the outcome of the talks currently taking place?

MR. PAULLEY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be held responsible as to whether or not there will be a mass meeting of the membership tonight, but I do want to indicate to you, Sir, and to the assembly that the conciliation officer is meeting with both parties this afternoon prior to the meeting being held and there is the possibility that as a result of this afternoon's meeting between the parties concerned, that there is the possibility of some new suggestion being made to the membership of the employees for their consideration.

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

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister and it has to do with the Ombudsman's report which was tabled yesterday. Why has the Cabinet failed to act on the one and only case referred to it by the Ombudsman after getting no satisfaction from the Minister of Agriculture; namely the rescinding of a loan by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to a group of Dauphin Businessmen for hog farming?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little astounded by the implication or insinuation inherent in the question. I believe it would be true to say that in those jurisdictions that have adopted and established the office of Ombudsman, as we did here in Manitoba in 1970, that I don't believe that in any single one of those jurisdictions that every single recommendation of the Ombudsman is always acceded to by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I would put it this way, Sir. That the proportion of recommendations made by the office of the Ombudsman to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council here I think would stack up and compare favourably with that of any other Ombudsman wherever such office exists in any other province or country.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. By his answer I take it then that the Cabinet decided to do nothing about the situation and to allow the decision to stand. Is that correct?

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, that assumption is not correct either. The matter was considered by the Ombudsmans report and recommendation was considered by Cabinet. There are complicating factors involved in the entire matter and we took a decision that on balance there was insufficient justification to proceed along the lines indicated. But taking the entire activity of the office of Ombudsman and all of his recommendations into account we feel that we have moved to remedy maladministration or malpractice in a good proportion of the cases as favourably as anywhere else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister, in one sense is a repeat of a question that was given to the Acting First Minister yesterday. I repeat it to him because at the time we had just received the report of the Ombudsman and we did not have a chance to peruse it. The ombudsman has indicated essentially in the report that he is prepared to come before a Committee of the Legislature. I wonder in view of the answer just given by the First Minister with particular reference to this item, in view of the other matters discussed by the Ombudsman, would the First Minister now consider an immediate amendment to the Act, to allow the Ombudsman at this Session to come before a legislative committee to appear and to be examined by the members of the committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's my impression, although I'm going on the basis of recollection of legislation we processed here I would think three or four years ago, nevertheless it is my recollection that an amendment to the act, a statutory change, would not be necessary. It's a matter of just determining whether this would be desirable practice. I

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . haven't had an opportunity to consider the matter and to consult with my colleagues, which I will do and attempt to have a definitive answer for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition by the first day next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Would the First Minister care to give an explanation as to the discrimination against members on this side of the House due to the fact that they've received an Easter gift on that side and we haven't?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have an answer to that. I did note that fact myself; I notice that not all desks on this side have the Easter egg present either, but there are members on both sides of the House to commiserate on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In that regard, in respect to the coloured eggs, permission was asked of me whether these could be placed on the desks. I was not aware of how many would be placed, but anyways the young lady didn't want to be mentioned and all she said was "if it was necessary she wanted to extend a greeting without her name being mentioned and she said these are Ukrainian Easter eggs or Pysanky and they are presented with the best wishes for a Happy Easter and a proclamation "christos voskres".

The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD CRAIK (Riel): On a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that the eggs are on the wrong side of the House. It's well-known after observing here that the Government's capable of laying it's own eggs.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Finance. Is the government now prepared to reconsider its refusal to remove sales tax from necessities in light of the announcement that Ontario is going to remove the sales tax from all those items which are considered necessities of life?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the government has done considerable in advance of other provinces in reducing the imposition of taxation on certain necessities of life and is constantly reviewing further changes. The statement of "continuing to refuse" of course is in itself a contradiction because we have been reviewing and making changes all along and there's some in the current legislation.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is now to the Minister of Agriculture. In the light of the announcement by Saskatchewan introducing legislation and last night's announcement by Ontario introducing legislation to curb foreign ownership of farmland in Ontario and Saskatchewan, will he now be bringing in legislation to complement this in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I think that is a clear matter of policy and will be announced if it is established.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I asked him a question yesterday in connection with the appointment by way of contract to the department of Mr. Ben Thompson and his ownership at that time in operation of Schmidt Cartage. Is he in a position to answer that question now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, the question that was asked in that regard my awareness, the answer was no. There was another different question that was asked I took as notice. I don't have the answer to that one as yet.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. Well by way of another question of the Minister. There was another question taken as notice and that was to indicate the time or the commencement of the employment of Mr. John Howden with the department and whether it was by contract within the civil service. Is he in a position to answer that now?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't aware of the urgency of this present witch hunt so I haven't urged the department to get the information any quicker than they have.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate at the present time whether Mr. Ben Thompson is employed with the Department of Northern Affairs by contract

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . or has been transferred to the Executive Council or to the Premier's office?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the employee of the Department of Northern Affairs who the Leader of the Opposition mentioned and who for some reason is out to get is still an employee of the Department of Northern Affairs.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can now proceed with the bills in the orders in which they appear on the order paper. All of the bills that presently appear on the order paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 7, and amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rhineland adjourned this debate for the Member for St. James who is prepared to proceed at this time.

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

BILL NO. 7

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the amendment that the bill be not read at this time, and I do so believing that there are many unanswered questions on what effects that this bill will have on the morale and the efficiency of our Civil Service. And I think that this concern has also been shown by our Civil Service in a recent issue of the Association's paper, stating that they are very concerned about some of the sections of this Act and the effect that it will have on the civil servants. And in particular to a point where they are recommending that they make a strong presentation to the Law Amendments Committee if it should reach that stage of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about some 12,000 people in the Province of Manitoba, a fair number of people who are involved. And as we indicated earlier in speaking against the main motion that there are many sections in the Act that it would appear that it would be more rewarding as a civil servant to take part in politics than not take part in politics. So then the question comes up, Mr. Speaker, what assurance, what protection do we have for that civil servant who does not want to take part in politics? What assurance do we have that this individual - and I'm sure that there are many such individuals in our civil service - what kind of protection will they have that they won't be pressured into taking part in politics either by straight indication from some member that they work with or some superior administrator or just from the very nature of the Act itself. Mr. Speaker, we had spoken and indicated to the Honourable Minister of Labour that there is a section in the Act that relates to political involvement of the civil servants and that we have no objections to our civil service or civil servants taking part in politics if they wish to be a candidate or to work with a candidate if they like but, Mr. Speaker, when it gets to a point where it would appear the legislation suggests that the individual in the Civil Service could propose to be a candidate. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MINAKER: . . . could propose to be a candidate, go through the motions of nomination and not receiving it and still could resign on a leave of absence for 90 days after the official results of an election are declared and become, if he wished, a bagman for that political party. I know that this is a concern of all of the members on this side, that would we be getting into a political party ripoff where they would make use of this legislation and allow people to clear the halls at times of election, go out and raise moneys for their political party, return some 90 days after the election has been officially declared and come back to work. Now what would this do to the morale of our civil servants and the actual operations of our departments?

Mr. Speaker, as we go through this Act it would appear that there is changes in the Act that would make it rewarding to become politically involved with a political party as a civil servant, and I suggest, Sir, under Section 4 that the classification, "pay where

BILL 7

(MR. MINAKER cont'd). . . classification is changed", and with this proposed change in the Act it allows the classification and the rate of pay to be set by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this could mean that a favourite son could be rewarded if he did a good job and he was on a temporary classification or a change in classification that the numbers or dollars that were to be the salary for that classification was not such that the Cabinet if they wished to could select out an individual or individuals and decide that they should make more money and quite legally within the Act give them a raise in pay. With this type of legislation--and I'm not suggesting that this particular government would take this approach but future governments or people who are the government of the day if this Act becomes law could use this section of the Act and do this. Pick out a favourite son, a favourite supporter and reclassify him with a rate of pay higher than any other civil servant in the same classification. I suggest that this lends itself to patronage; again pressuring, in my opinion, the civil servant to take part in politics whether he likes to or not, because it would appear that there would be rewards in doing so.

Further under Section 6 of the Act there is an area dealing with the Selection of appeal. And again it appears that one would wonder if there would be patronage carried out under this section of the Act. Before or under the present Act anybody who wants to appeal a decision can do so to the Commission which is a government-appointed body. Now with this proposed change under Section 13, Subsection (8) they now appeal to the Minister, as the only recourse.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I may suggest to the honourable member that we are dealing with the bill in principle not section by section and would he kindly adhere to the rules.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, my apologies, Mr. Speaker, on that. Mr. Speaker, then what we are concerned about is that in principle we do not believe that consideration has been given to this principle of possible patronage at some future date by utilization of certain sections of the Act, and particularly when one looks at how a civil servant would go about making an appeal on a decision.

The other concern that we have is that we are also proposing, or at least the government is proposing in the Act to remove the power of the Civil Service Commission to deal with employee originated appeals, and we question whether this is a sensible approach at this time.

The other reason that we support the amendment is that when one looks at the section that deals with those people exempted or the principle of exemption to allowing civil servants to take part in political activities, and one looks at such positions as the Ombudsman, the only section of The Civil Service Act that the Ombudsman is responsible to is the section - one of the sections is that dealing with political involvement. Similarly, when one looks at the Act covering the Provincial Auditor that the only sections, or one of the sections that the Provincial Auditor is responsible to under the Civil Service Act is the section dealing with political involvement. Now I am wondering as a Member of the Opposition if the government is suggesting that these two particular positions should have the full opportunity to become politically involved, I believe that this should be discussed and debated to some extent because I question whether we would like these individuals or these offices to take part fully and politically as suggested in that section of the Act dealing with political involvement. I would also wonder whether the present individuals, the Ombudsman and the Provincial Auditor, whether they would want to become involved in political activities when they are holding that position. And there is no mention, or at least when I have been in the House there has been no mention when the Minister introduced the bill that they were giving consideration to this particular subject or these individuals.

There is an area in the Act that says that groups or classes of people can be considered by the Cabinet as being exempt from that section but I question whether you could call the Ombudsman a group or a class, it's an individual position in our government operation that is recognized as important enough to have a separate Act covering these positions. So again we're wondering whether full thought has gone into the construction of this particular Act. And for this reason, because it is involving the lives of some 12, 000 people, the people themselves, the civil servants have indicated that they are concerned about particular sections in this Act and should it get to Law Amendments that they will strongly recommend that consideration be given to certain principles that are being put forward in the Act, and because we feel that there are too many bad holes in this legislation that are question marks, if you

BILL 7

(MR. MINAKER cont'd). . . want to call holes question marks, that we believe that it should not be read at this time and we will support that particular amendment.

QUESTION put on the amendment, MOTION lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The motion before the House is the amendment to Bill No. 7 that it not be read now.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS

MESSRS. Banman	McGill
Bilton	McGregor
Blake	McKellar
Craik	McKenzie
Graham	Minaker
Henderson	Moug
F. Johnston	Sherman
Jorgenson	Spivak

NAYS

MESSRS: Adam	Osland
Asper	Patrick
Bostrom	Patterson
Burtniak	Paulley
Cherniack	Pawley
Derewianchuk	Petursson
Dillen	Schreyer
Gottfried	Shafransky
Green	Toupin
Hanuschak	Turnbull
Johannson	Uruski
G. Johnston	Uskiw
McBryde	Walding
Malinowski	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 16; Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it, declare the amendment lost.

All those in favour - the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Birtle-Russell, the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just on a point. I wonder if there could be a check as to whether my friend the Honourable Member for Morris has spoken on the main. . . they have checked? Well that's quite all right. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is because we got into some confusion the other day and I didn't want to repeat. That's fine. I'm looking in anticipation to my honourable friend's contribution.

BILL 17

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks that I'd like to make about this proposed amendment to Bill 17. I'm glad to see that the Attorney-General's in his place because I think possibly if we'd had a better explanation of the bill in the first place we maybe wouldn't be confused by it. But to the average layman drafting a bill is very complicated to analyse objectively and even when we talk about a lawyer, barrister-at-law or solicitor to the average person we wonder which is which and what right one has over the other. And in looking at this here amendment I think possibly it's rather poorly written, it's rather confusing anyway and I think possibly that the introduction that the Attorney-General gave was a

BILL 17

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd). . . little too brief. I have done some research work on my own on the bill and have found out some further information and I think probably it's not all this bad, but the way I have it sized up now is that the government through the solicitor is going to be able to collect extra money for the Consolidated Fund.

Now as you would read this amendment you really wouldn't think it was that way because it sounds like as if the lawyer, the barrister, the solicitor or one of these three is collecting money in addition to the remuneration paid to him by the Consolidated Fund, and we are naturally thinking that they're paid through the Consolidated Fund so they don't need any further remuneration. It's not for me to make an addition or an amendment to the bill at this time but I think possibly if we had a statement in there which would clarify it very much which would say "and that this money be credited to the Consolidated Fund" - this is really what it means I guess in its legal terms but it's very confusing to people.

Now the final result of this bill after we get the proper interpretation of it is that the government is going to get more money, because by the solicitor or the lawyer being able to collect these things and turn them back to the Consolidated Fund the Consolidated Fund is going to get more money on this account. That's the way I have it sized up.

Now a number of years ago the government done a good turn for some of the lawyers when they brought in free legal aid and made a slush fund for some of the lawyers and now it seems as if one good turn deserves another and now we've got the lawyers helping so the government can get more money. So this is the way I see it.

A MEMBER: The fat cats, George.

MR. HENDERSON: Otherwise I don't think I'd have any objections to this bill, except that I see that if it goes through it's more money for the government and I wonder sometimes if the government couldn't let. . . like if they aren't getting enough one way or another without adding a bit here and adding a bit there and collecting more and then giving it back in different forms. So it just seems to me that this is the only objection that I have. I'm prepared to see it go to second reading and see if there's any further changes or if maybe the Minister can explain it further.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to peruse the bill and we have no objection; we're prepared to let it go to second reading.

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

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't intend to deal at any great length. I appreciate the remarks. I want to say to the Honourable Member from Pembina, however, that I regret reference to the Legal Aid Fund as being a slush fund established for lawyers. I think one of the most successful programs that have been developed in order to ensure that all receive equal and fair opportunity before the courts of this province has been the gradual development and establishment of a legal aid system so that the poorest individual can march shoulder to shoulder with the wealthiest individual to the court and expect the proper end and return of justice to him regardless of status or background, and I think we should keep that in mind that legal aid was established in order to provide fair and equal treatment, legal equity before the courts. It was not a slush fund established for a few lawyers.

Insofar as the bill itself is concerned the net result of this I suppose would be that there would be less draw upon the Consolidated Fund of the province, less draw to the effect that now the agencies of government unlike any other party before the courts, are unable to receive the awarding of costs in their favor in the event of a successful action before the courts. All other parties when they are successful in the courts are entitled to the award of costs based upon party to party costs; for instance, the days spent in court, the costs of issuance of documents, etc. in the courts, the cost of bailiffs and service of those documents, and it is only fitting and proper that in any case before the courts there be some awarding of costs against the unsuccessful party in favor of the successful party in order to assist in the defraying of legal costs. Otherwise you would find that there would be very little deterrent to the initiation of frivolous and unnecessary causes of actions before the court. So it's true that although there will be awarding of costs here that that should be reflected upon a lessening charge or call upon the Consolidated Fund because unless such costs are awarded the lawyer acting on behalf

BILL 17

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . of the Crown can recover those amounts through the process of taxation of the lawyer's costs from the Crown itself. So to that extent it will be a lessening of the draw or the claim upon the Consolidated Fund of the province.

QUESTION put and MOTION carried.

BILL 27

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Well, Mr. Speaker, since the press release of, I believe it was early October, by the former Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs announcing the Western Provincial Lottery or the possibilities of such a lottery, there has been a great deal of anxiety expressed by especially the agencies - some 200 of them in this province - who in the past several years since they first brought about the Manitoba Lotteries Commission have enjoyed the benefits of that legislation and the moneys that flowed from the sale of lottery tickets. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Manitoba lottery scheme which was passed in this Legislature not very many years ago has boggled the minds of most people in this province by the way it has operated and the efficiency and the good management that we've had.

Some figures that come to my mind real quickly of course are those of the years April '72 to March 31, '73 where I believe the gross sales in that particular year were well over \$6 million - I guess close to \$6-1/2 million and the disbursements were about \$1.8 if my memory serves me correctly, in grants and commissions to the agencies around our province. And then of course there was the prize money as well, the million two I guess it was, something like that went out in prize money, and then of course the million six or so that was turned over to the coffers of the Provincial Consolidated Trust Fund. So all in all, Mr. Speaker, the lottery scheme in this province that we have enjoyed has been an excellent mechanism for the people of this province who seemingly like to buy lottery tickets, and of course the moneys then are turned over to the recreation, the sports groups, the cultural people of our province. So we have enjoyed an excellent experience with it.

And of course when the former Minister as I said, of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs made the announcement I believe in early October that Manitoba would be heading into a Western Provincial type of lottery the concerns started coming my way and they still are today, to try and find out by these various agencies where we're going and how we're going to get there. And of course the Honourable Minister in his remarks the other day specifically pointed out, and no doubt that will relieve some of the anxieties of the people. But I myself Mr. Speaker, in reading the Honourable Minister's speech can't still understand why we can't continue to operate as the Manitoba Lotteries Commission was established. The Criminal Code is a problem at the moment and I don't see why we couldn't have traded off with the Federal Government and gained some consideration for amendments to the Criminal Code that would have let us carry on with our own scheme. --(Interjection)--Well the Province of Quebec is operating a lottery organization and that province as I understand it seems to be able to keep its legal skirts clean, because when it sends the tickets out of the country or to non-participating provinces they seem to be able to live with the present sections of the Criminal Code. I think they then go on "as per request" basis, I think that was the way the legal counsel described it when I checked it out, and with no soliciting of business and no wholesale orders being accepted they apparently can live within the terms of the Criminal Code. And there's a possibility, there's a strong possibility no doubt that maybe this scheme will be in some years ahead may be even better than the one that we've got, but it's going to be difficult for us to tell the people, especially the agencies in our province who have enjoyed as the Minister remarked in his statement the other day, the highest commission of any in North America. They've done well. I don't know of any agency that has participated in the lotteries that has been critical in any way. I think they've praised the government and the legislature for the legislation and for the moneys that have been flowing into these various avenues of recreation and sports and culture.

So, Mr. Speaker, those concerns are ones that maybe will show up in the Committee of Law Amendments when we get there and we will find out if in fact the agencies are still concerned after the Minister's statement.

There's certainly a lot of questions that comes to my mind, Mr. Speaker, like what will

BILL 27

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . be the future disposition of revenue earned by Manitoba through this proposed WestCan scheme and how it will be earmarked. I think that will no doubt come up in further debate, and then I was wondering of the specific switch of revenue between government and the agencies as is pointed out by the Minister, that will be the same in all the provinces.

The other thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is how we're going to possibly control the flow of tickets. I understand we'll only get credit for the tickets sold in the Province of Manitoba but we won't get credit for tickets sold in the other participating provinces. In other words, if somebody in Alberta sold a ticket, or B. C. or Saskatchewan, then we wouldn't get credit if a Manitoba person sold a ticket to somebody there. I think that is going to create some problems; first of all to account for these tickets and to be able to tell somebody that you can't sell a ticket in another jurisdiction, I find that very difficult and maybe later on we will get some more answers regarding how this is going to be handled.

I don't believe that the Minister in his remarks mentioned how the revenue by the various provinces is going to be shared. Are we going to share on an equal basis or is it just going to be strictly on the sale of the tickets that you sell or how they're going to arrive at the allocation of the revenue from these and what kind of special advantage we will be getting in Manitoba, because we have the head office here, we have the building, we have all the facilities, so therefore we should certainly have some advantage over the other participating provinces in the scheme.

I was wondering possibly that the Minister would be more specific on who the directors might be and when we could maybe expect some names to be floated around that are possible candidates for the commission. I think the board that we've had in the past have been exemplified of what good solid people can do in this direction but I think it's time now that some place along the line that we find out who the candidates are.

The other things, Mr. Speaker, that no doubt will come up in the debate I'm sure will appear in the Committee of Law Amendments. We're certainly going to let the matter be debated here in second reading and hopefully move into Law Amendments. I'm looking forward to hearing what the man on the street or the agencies will - what views they will present at the second reading of the bill.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): A question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member a question in regards to the intent of pursuing the possibility of reciprocal arrangements between provinces. In the future if that was had even though we do have an interprovincial agreement between provinces, leaving aside the number, and having larger say, prize money being paid to individuals participating, would the honourable member not agree that since we are contravening the Criminal Code now and we are pursuing the possibility of reciprocal arrangements with all provinces in Canada, that this would eventually certainly be more beneficial than it is now because of those facts?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I think I would agree with the comments by the Honourable the Minister. I wonder though at the same time, Mr. Speaker, is it not possible for the Criminal Code to be amended so that one province can conduct a lottery scheme by itself or is the Federal Government sitting tight on it and refusing to amend the Criminal Code? Those are questions that have been raised of me and I haven't got the answers, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. --(Interjection)-- Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Could we have this stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

BILL NO. 36

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to review the remarks of the Minister in respect to Bill 36, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act, and he has explained to the Legislature that this is not the major amendment to The Public Schools Act, which I take

BILL 36

(MR. MCGILL cont'd). . . from his remarks we can anticipate as being introduced some time during the present session.

Mr. Speaker, the bill includes some specifics as to the way in which annual indemnities for school trustees may be established. It's I see, permissive in that respect and in respect to the annual indemnity I think that this part of the Act is reasonably precise. The other features of the amounts that may be paid to the trustees as contained in the amending bill raise some questions in our minds. The fact that there is now a permissive section which would enable a school board to provide an hourly rate payment to school trustees for duties undertaken in connection with their responsibilities to the school board, Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be an area in which there might be some further consideration given.

It is customary I know in most business operations that a certain group of administrative personnel are paid on a salary basis and there are others in the operation whose contributions lend themselves more to payment on an hourly basis. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we may be entering an area here where there is a great deal of lack of precision in the proposed amendments where there will be possibly difficulties arising in the administration of this section, if in fact the school board does undertake at all to use an hourly rate payment for the activities of school trustees. It's always been my conception of a salaried or a person who is paid on an indemnity basis that it is one of the privileges of their office that they are permitted to work at all hours and as many hours as they wish depending on the degree of their dedication to their task. Mr. Speaker, the school trustees who are elected and who have a great dedication are likely to put in a great deal more time on that job than others who may be less enthusiastic about their duties or may find that they're able to discharge totally their responsibilities by attending the meetings of the school boards.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would leave these questions about this particular part of the amendment to The School Board Act and hope that the Minister has considered these possibilities, that there may indeed be more difficulties arising from an extension to an hourly rate kind of return for trustees than there will be benefits attaching thereto.

There is another part of this amending bill that perhaps is less precise than we would have hoped would be the case and the language I think we need to examine and relate it to the difficulties which may arise for the school board in interpreting the proposal. I refer to the part which deals with hours for religious teaching. Now the hours and the time and the day that this teaching may take place I think are not changed in any way but there is an extension of the part which designates what kind of people will be acceptable to the boards to carry out this religious teaching. And I'm wondering how the school board will be able to determine what constitutes a religious group. I'm not so sure that the Act attempts to make that definition and if it's a difficult definition for the Department I'm sure it's equally difficult for the school boards who will be now charged with this responsibility. There may be areas which become exceedingly grey when we try to determine whether we are in fact dealing with a religious group or a group which has such strong feelings on a certain topic as to be almost a religion with them. We've heard it said that some people think so strongly and have such strong feelings on certain subjects that it becomes almost a religion and I--(Interjection)--Well I didn't mention any particular philosophy but there is an area here where it's difficult to determine where religion begins and where other group philosophies might cease.

Also in the same area we refer to "or other spiritual leader". That seems to me to again be a very general phrase and lacks definition in the Act and shouldn't I think be the responsibility of a school board to determine what would be acceptable under the general heading of "religious leader". It's been a subject that there have been other difficulties with. Not in respect to education but we have run into it in respect to elections and so forth. So I think precision here is desirable and vagueness is to be - well remote insofar as it is possible, and if it's difficult for the Department to provide these definitions then I should think that it would be equally difficult for the school boards who are now charged with that duty.

Other proposals related to this amending bill have to do with bringing into phase with municipal elections the elections of school trustees. And I see no problem involved there. These are at the request of certain school divisions and I would think that this would be a general improvement if we can at the same time as municipal elections are held for aldermen or for other municipal posts that the electorate could also be called upon to make a decision in respect to their choice of school trustee.

BILL 36

(MR. MCGILL cont'd)

One part of the amending bill deals with the same matter in respect to Brandon School Division, No. 40, and I bring to the attention of the Minister that the wording of this I think is understandable and somewhat detailed because of the difficulty of bringing all of the elections into phase with the City of Brandon's municipal election. But I think it would add to the clarity here and perhaps be worth consideration by the Minister to also have a clause in here which would specifically say that in 1977 that the trustees will be elected for a period of three years and thereafter. Now the bill can be read as inferring that this will take place but I think it would again be a useful addition to this general amendment to include a statement in words that in 1977 election shall be for three years and shall be coincident with the elections for the municipal officers of the City of Brandon.

There is one other specific problem peculiar to the Brandon School Division No. 40 and that is that of their 10 school trustees three are elected from rural areas and really their elections are more related to the municipal elections in the Municipalities of Whitehead and Cornwallis than they are to the elections in the City of Brandon. But I assume, Mr. Speaker, and without wishing to further complicate this amendment which is at the request I believe of the Brandon School Division, that those three non-city resident trustees will also be elected in phase with the City of Brandon elections. And I presume that the section which refers to the school trustees in the Brandon School Division No. 40 and the way in which they will be elected also refers to those school trustees in Brandon School Division No. 40 who live outside of the City of Brandon and I would suggest that perhaps the Minister might make certain that this is the intent of the amendments to the Act.

Mr. Speaker, these are really the main points which we wish to bring again to the attention of the Minister. We may have some additional comments and there may be some who will wish to make representations on this amending bill and they will have the opportunity at the proper time in the committee stage. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 38. The Honourable First Minister.

BILL NO. 38

MR. SCHREYER: I can be, Sir, and really should be very brief with respect to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman first introduce it?

MR. SCHREYER presented Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I was saying, Sir, that I can be very brief and really should be very brief explaining the contents of Bill No. 38, for the reason that Bill 38 is really a compendium of a number, quite a number of that, of technical amendments. Almost all of the amendments that are contained in this bill, amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act, emanate from the City of Winnipeg Council and the administration through the council, has advised us as to the nature of changes that are desired, requested, to The City of Winnipeg Act so as to enable the administration of the affairs of the city to be carried out perhaps a little more expeditiously than was possible under the original Act. It is really in the light of experience that most of these amendments are being recommended and brought forward at this time.

In addition to that there is one other source of some of these amendments and that comes from the Law Reform Commission which was asked to consider the City of Winnipeg Act and to advise on such changes as might be desirable in order to provide for better safeguards of rights of appeal, rights of - well protection of the individual rights under conditions of search and inspection requiring a warrant in those circumstances, making it more clear the circumstances under which a warrant must be obtained, etc. But I have no means, Mr. Speaker, of dealing with the substance of the bill, so to say, because each separate section has to do with technical matters. I suppose in trying very hard to summarize the substance of this particular bill it

BILL 38

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . would be to say that it is a collection of sections which go to clarify and make more expeditious the operations of the city with respect to land use and zoning control zoning variances and procedures related thereto. That's about the only way in which I can sum the purpose of this bill in a few words.

I have arranged for honourable members to be provided with a copy of explanatory notes which runs to some 12 pages in layman's terms and I would think if honourable members relate the explanatory notes section by section to the bill that is about the most manageable way to deal with this particular piece of legislation.

I would expect that at committee stage there may be questioning and discussion with respect to certain of the specific sections and look forward to an exchange at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Charleswood that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I'll accept the motion. . . . but I'd like to say to the Press Gallery that the giggling and the noise is unnecessary.

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

. . . . Continued on next page.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - CAPITAL

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1974-75 Capital Authority requirements. Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation \$20 million - pass? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the Minister for the Housing Renewal program is not here today but possibly the Minister of Finance may be able to give the answers. I'm not sure that he will be. It wouldn't necessarily come under the Finance Minister. But the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has had the habit of granting each tenant I believe \$10 a year to become members of community clubs, etc. in the districts. There is a group set up in each housing program which is sort of a council and committee that would be the advisory and the governing body for the sake of representing that community as to how they run their affairs, etc. And after they have set up a governing body in each unit or each set of homes there has now been set up with a budget of \$54,000 an over-all housing group, a group of people who have representation from housing, they have representation from the self-help groups, I believe it's \$38,000 for the community officers and - community officers that are also advisory community officers. I'm not sure of the name. The balance of the money is set up to run the association of tenants in the public and low cost housing.

The charge for each unit is \$2.00 and if you have 32 units in this housing group they all must pay \$2.00, that would be \$64.00, and if any one of the units in this group does not pay up and become a part of the head association as I understand, I'm informed that they do not receive their \$10 grant from the Manitoba Housing for helping them out for joining community clubs or becoming part of recreation in that area.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the case. If the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Association are donating \$10 or putting \$10 aside in their budget for each unit for them to join these community clubs in their areas, I would certainly hope that because a certain person within the units decided that they didn't want to become a member of an association that that would be the reason why they would not get their \$10.00. I think they all should have their \$10 regardless and possibly the Minister could take that up, or if he so desires I would ask the Minister of the Public Housing on his Estimates or I would give him notice ahead of time. I think we're a long way from his Estimates at the present time.

The other question that I would ask, Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned yesterday that there is an accounting being done to clear up the situation in northern Manitoba with the Northern Manpower Corporation, and can he tell the House or can he estimate just when we will have this situation cleared up, when we will have this report in front of us approximately so that we will know where this million dollars that everybody is questioning just where it stands and what the Northern Manpower Corporation owes the housing authority. I think that matter has to be cleared up, Mr. Speaker, because we're being asked to vote a lot of money to the housing authority and we want to know where their financial position stands.

The other matter is that I know that there has been discussion between the Member from St. Matthews and the Member from Fort Rouge on housing and many of the arguments from the Member for Fort Rouge we've heard in this House before, and he insinuates that we've been talking about who's to blame and who's not to blame about things not getting done. I would only say that the government, as far as the housing is concerned I know that it's federal money. I know that they have been making an effort to make their units smaller. I think what we've seen in the papers today is proof that there should not be a 100 or a 125 houses in any one area. You can create problems and if you say there won't be you're just sticking your head in the sand. There will be.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the government has made any effort to speak of to fight with the federal government on the basis of how public housing is done. We get told that the federal government has got a fair amount of control over how it's done. We don't have urban renewal anymore to speak of. But why, Mr. Speaker, as I've said before, when we have a very large sum of money from the federal government, and we borrow it at approximately 7 1/2 percent for housing, why, Mr. Speaker, cannot we loan money at that rate to contractors or somebody that does own land to build separate units on it. If that is done he will be responsible for the maintenance of the house, you can write into the contract that he must keep the maintenance of the house proper. And, Mr. Speaker, if that happens we might change a situation that is starting to happen.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Public Housing Corporation in 1972 had a subsidy for housing of \$75,000, 75,313. In 1973 we had a subsidy of \$718,000. I know we're building more units.

CAPITAL SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON Cont'd) In 1974 the subsidy is now \$3,727,000, and in 1975 the subsidy is going to be in our estimates that were presented to us \$6,029,000. This is becoming a fabulous increase of maintenance. And there is no reason whatsoever why, why - pardon me, on the \$6 million I would suggest that there could be \$700,000 off that for administration. In the other figures of '74 and '73 we have the figures for administration taken off, so I would suggest maybe from your figure in the estimates of \$6,029,000 we could take off approximately 700,000 for administration of the corporation.

Mr. Chairman, why have we not been looking at the process of letting somebody borrow money at a low interest rate, such that you can keep rents down and on the basis of borrowing that money you have certain terms and regulations which they must live by as far as the upkeep of the homes, the maintenance of the homes, and the government would then be free, would then be free of this heavy maintenance costs that we're looking into. And of course the subsidies could probably come down because we know that when we're dealing with low interest we could at least get a much better situation financially with the province.

That type of thing, Mr. Chairman, does not seem to have been done, there doesn't seem to be any argument whatsoever that the government, this government, doesn't put up any argument. They want to own them. They let private industry build them, they put them out on contract, they put them out to the Northern Manpower Corporation. My only comment on that particular procedure is that . . . we have nothing wrong, I've been through the plant in Churchill where they're building those homes, where they're training natives. The only thing wrong I see a lot of ads in the paper asking for men to go north, craftsman to help train the natives. They're offering about \$600 a month and a trip home every so often, all expenses paid, for these men up here and we are getting more chiefs up there than we have people learning. The Northern Manpower Corporation as far as the instructive people are concerned is getting very very top heavy and I think that is very apparent. In fact I think we are working to one instructor for three people at the present time and I would ask the Minister of Finance to check into that because the ratio of people doing the training is pretty soon going to be bigger than the people that's being trained.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the programs of gathering land for public housing, I don't really get too excited about that, but I would like to see the programs go on the basis of gathering lands on this corner and then on another corner and build your units throughout districts rather than putting them all together. The example that we had of those men that were living in the house on Talbot Avenue is the best example in the world as far as I can see for, if you have six men and they're getting an average of \$200 apiece from government sources you've got a total of \$1,200.

Now I have seen a program with boys and girls in this province that Mrs. Steinkopf has been mainly the sponsor of, where young people who are just sort of between the greats in mental retardation and are able to live on their own, where they have bought a house and there are six boys and girls living there with a lady who sees that they eat well, they go to work in the morning, they live and they're on their own. Now there are lots of houses in this city, even the one on Talbot Avenue, if it was taken and fixed up properly, and there is \$1,200 a month there, you could pay the rent, you could see that they were well fed, you could see also see that there was a person there that could do the cooking for them, see that they had clean laundry; and you know they could even buy their food wholesale as far as I'm concerned.

Now why, why isn't the Manitoba Public Housing Corporation looking to things like this. You have a lot of senior citizens houses that have been built but I can tell you right now, Mr. Chairman, that most of the people in the senior citizens housing are deserving and should be living in senior citizens homes but we haven't even come near helping those people that are living in houses, three or four people sharing one bathroom and a little wee corner room, etc., cooking in the same room. We haven't even come close, and there's one way you could come close to helping people. There are lots of older homes in this city with, you know, beautiful bedrooms, beautiful big rooms, they were built that way to begin with, that could be put to good use for people in that area. And you have got six people, you've got close to \$1,200. You may have to subsidize it a couple of hundred a month. I haven't really sat down and worked out the cost but you'll be a lot better off that way than spending this great masses of money other ways.

CAPITAL SUPPLY

A MEMBER: And senior people would be happier.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right, my colleague says the senior people are usually happier if they can stay in the neighborhood that they know best and live there. I would only say that I think there's some work to be done in neighborhoods in this city. I think we've got to look to urban renewal. The federal government didn't like the amount of housing they got for the amount of cost as far as urban renewal was concerned but I think we have to look to urban renewal because we've got to change some of the blighted areas in the city. Once we start to clean up the areas with urban renewal we can then expect that people will clean up at the same time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has gone far enough and fought hard enough with the federal government as to how the money should be spent. If there's any restrictions from the federal government you should try to get rid of them. You should also try to get rid of the federal act that keeps your interest rate high in some of the nursing homes that were built privately so they can lower their rates. And this still hasn't been done.

Mr. Chairman, there are all kinds of ways that we can start helping the people in this city, in this province, other than just saying I am going to build the houses and own them. If you're talking in \$58 million you can do one heck of a lot with it, and you aren't doing nearly the right thing with that money by sticking to one or two policies.

You'll only help them if you broaden your policies and get into every area of help. So, Mr. Chairman, as I said, we probably are about five million two for subsidies at the present time and we should be looking to cut that down. We should be looking to build houses and at the same time cutting down our subsidies, and that can be done, but the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation hasn't.

I believe we have a group of people at the head of that corporation who just have one line, they won't think any other way and obviously it's been proved. I believe in Transcona they are planning to build another large group of houses on the basis of 75 or more - I'm told it's 150 - but I would hope that they haven't done it after the experiences we've had. The experiences we've had in Toronto, Chicago, everywhere, where you put large groups of people in one area is unsatisfactory. I'm told that in one of our public housing units we have something like - I'm quoting now from memory - I think we have a little over 150 adults and something like 400 children. And I don't care what the Member from St. Matthews says about recreation, and I don't think he's ever been on a recreation board or a recreation committee in his life. But let me tell you in my area where the public housing was built, and I posed it on the basis that you put it in the wrong place, you didn't have enough recreation, and you have problems, and it's probably one of the better ones. But recreation is not little lots for little children under five or so to swing on. --(Interjection)-- Yes, certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the honourable member would prevent a private developer from building 75 houses on lands owned for that purpose, and selling them to whoever they want, and with as many children as they have?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would answer the Member from Ste. Rose's question at the same time if he'd like me to.

MR. A.R. (PETE) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Well it was for clarification, and I wanted to ask you before the house, before we adjourn. The member mentioned something about wholesale food. I wonder if you could explain that. It seems to go against the free enterprise system.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to call the member narrow but I will explain that in the House, the three houses that I have seen where there's been tremendous work done, there are five or six boys and girls in each who have mental problems who are capable of going out and taking care of themselves each day, and working, and the lady in that home has the privilege of phoning up one of the wholesalers in town, who is a free enterprises and says, I will be glad to sell you, madam, at wholesale prices for this particular situation. --(Interjection)-- I'll answer the member's question --(Interjection)-- No, I'll answer it right now, I don't have to think about it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pretty sure the Minister well knows that when we're dealing with private contractors there is usually a basis where they come before the council or zoning and

CAPITAL SUPPLY

(MR. F. JOHNSTON Cont'd) places and committee, and they are told that if you're building so many houses we either have the school facilities or we don't, we have the recreation facilities or we don't. The Manitoba Public Housing Renewal Corporation have not taken that into consideration. If they get a piece of property they are determined to build on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member will have an opportunity to answer that question at the next sitting.

The hour being 4:30, Committee rise. 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 Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item Wednesday afternoon, Private Members' Hour is Orders for Return set over for debate. The Honourable Member for Wolseley, Leader of the Liberal Party.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return requested has considerable relevance before the House at this time. We have had notice in the Budget Address and in the Speech from the Throne and in a White Paper, or in a policy paper tabled by the Honourable Minister of Mines, that at this session of the House we'll be called on to consider some very serious, very major, and very novel mining tax changes, or charges made against the mining companies of Manitoba. And so, Mr. Speaker, it behooves members opposite, members of the Opposition that is, who are not privy to the information that the government has and which government has shown a profound reluctance to make available to Opposition in general terms to ask government at this time for as much data as is possible so that when that legislation comes before the House we can be effective in dealing with it. Mr. Speaker, that's how the House is supposed to work, the government proposes, the Opposition must be in a position to evaluate and study.

And so, particularly in light of the events of the past few days wherein the Province of Ontario has announced a dramatic change in its mining policy and its tax rate which is at tremendous variance with what the Mines Minister of Manitoba has suggested he intends to do; and the Government of British Columbia has introduced something very similar to what the Government of Manitoba proposes or indicates it's going to introduce. We believe that opposition members ought to at the earliest possible moment be put into the picture to find out what the mining industry is paying at the present, under the present system, in the year ended 72/73.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with no ulterior motive, and no thought of embarrassing government whatever we proposed a simple request to government that they inform members of the House, and the public, just how much these companies are paying now in the various royalties, rentals, licenses, fees and stumpage. Now it would be argued normally, Mr. Speaker, ah it is a sacred rule that the tax returns, or tax information, or taxpayers not be made public. Well, Mr. Speaker, that would normally obtain -- although I'm sure American President Nixon would wish that that rule obtained in his country -- that might obtain if the company's were private companies. The companies involved in the Order for Return are not. Every single one of them, Mr. Speaker, is a public company, or is a company owned by the Government of Manitoba, or a company in which the Government of Manitoba has an interest, or is a subsidiary of a public company, and under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, a shareholder of these companies whether it's Hudson Bay or Inco, Sherritt-Gordon, Falconbridge, Abitibi and Chemalloy, which is the parent company of Tantalum, could go to a shareholders meeting and ask for that information. Now I concede, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of Directors of the company might not be bound to give that information, but certainly in the new mood of full disclosure that's sweeping the corporate community and the financial community of Canada, I doubt very much if any corporation would deny the shareholders that information. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance may say, "Well that's fine, go to a shareholders meeting

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) of Sherritt Gordon to get the information." And I don't think we have to do that. I think this is public information, particularly since the companies involved are public.

I confess to a typographical error in the Order for Return, Mr. Speaker, Churchill -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it's a duplication, Churchill Forest Industries is mentioned twice, that was typed in twice, that should obviously be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, certainly there's nothing untoward about us asking to know what stumpage and royalty fees a company, that we the public own, is paying, and certainly it wouldn't be unfair to ask what our company Tantalum, in which we've invested a considerable amount of money, and which lost I think about half a million dollars last year. We'd like to know if we're getting something back in mining royalties and mining taxes. And the other companies, Mr. Speaker, are under negotiation with the government now and so, because they're public, we feel no embarrassment in asking what they pay.

Now if the Minister of Finance is at all concerned about the quality of debate that takes place when he brings in his mining tax bill then he will be anxious I'm sure to put into the hands of the Opposition as much information as enables them to debate effectively and to evaluate his proposals, to agree with those which are reasonable and to limit their debate to those which they find unacceptable. And it's this kind of information, Mr. Speaker, that enables us to do it. Take the information away from us and we're left hearing the tirades of government that the mining industry isn't paying enough - without telling us what they're paying - and it makes it difficult for us to proceed. So I would appeal to the Minister of Finance, who apparently expressed some objection to the Order for Return, I would appeal to him to reconsider his position and make this information available. Should he wish to protect the identity of the individual payer then, Mr. Speaker, we would be quite happy if the amounts were camouflaged by corporate name and only the amounts given. I would amend the order in that way if that were his sole concern over the Order. And so that instead of identifying the company at least give us the amounts in individual cases without identifying which company it comes from.

Mr. Speaker, we were under the impression that this kind of information has in the past been made available in this House. I'm not able at the moment to cite the precedent, but, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Member from Assiniboia suggests that there is a precedent, that this information has been given before. I'd like the Minister of Finance to consider that in framing his response, and I assure him that our request for this information is in no way an intention to embarrass the government by finding some wrongdoing, we simply want to know the factual information so that when the debate comes on we can know what we're talking about, and we can know effectively. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the explanations he's given us. I must tell him that as I recall the rules, it's not possible to amend an Order for Return

MR. SPEAKER: Correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . and since I'm going to oppose it in this form then possibly he will want to consider another one that might be acceptable.

I must also say that I have no recollection which supports the statement given to him by the Member for Assiniboia, and it would be of interest to me if indeed that information was given in the past. Because, Mr. Speaker, I personally don't have any particular hang-up about giving that kind of information except that which is - that restriction which is imposed on me either by law or by tradition or by practice.

Of course looking at the resolution itself, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Honourable Member won't mind some criticism of the form of it. It starts out by saying "amounts received by government in the fiscal year", and I have to say is he speaking about provincial government only or does government include municipal governments, school boards, federal government, because reading this as I do it means by government. If it said "the" government, it would be clearer to me and then I would assume he meant provincial.

He talks about the 72/73 fiscal year, and then he speaks about royalties - that's fairly clear; rentals, licenses, permits and fees and now we go into - and I'm taking this literally, and I'm thinking of car licenses; I'm thinking of permits that are given in the Department of Labour or highways or various other places; fees, I think about the Mines Act, or I think about

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd) the corporate affairs that charges fees to companies for registrations and annual -- I get involved in considering stumpage, and I'm wondering if there's a reference there to the harvest of the trees, and then I'm wondering whether the competitors ought to know how much each is paying because then you start getting information that competition likes to have. I would point out for the benefit of the honourable that the Mineral Acreage Tax was not in effect in the year that he refers to, but when he says, "any other income or taxes" then he's sort of putting us in the obligation to start searching any conceivable tax or revenue form, which I don't think we should be prepared to do.

Then of course in his listing he does list -- well items five and eight clearly were an error on his part -- but he lists four competing mining firms which carry on business in this province, and then he lists others -- well the Churchill Forest Industries which is now still operating on the receivership basis, or no, I think it's already taken over and carrying on the old -- well CFI is the original, Churchill Forest Industries which has been in receivership all this time, and therefore under jurisdiction of the court, and I must express certain reluctance to giving out information which I don't think I'm entitled to give. Of course I am supported by a statement which I could read to the House talking about the giving of information as to taxation, and I will quote: "Is this not moving dangerously close to goldfish bowl society? Where should this be stopped? Should the Federal Minister or the Finance Ministers of the provinces be able to study the tax returns and financial affairs of their political opponents looking for means of attack or embarrassment. They certainly have the power to do so." And I quote further, "The point is that Canadians are on a treadmill that could lead to a kind of individual nakedness not unlike the frightening picture presented in George Orwell's 1894. If the trend continues more and more Canadians may remove their affairs whenever possible to those countries, or through those agencies where their privacy can be maintained. Certainly there is strong evidence that this is happening already. If anyone cares to arrest the trend a good place to begin is with a tax system where both the rules of confidentiality and those relating to publication of improperly obtained information might well be reviewed and tightened." And the author of course knows who it is because it appeared recently in this current year, on January 3rd, 1974, in the Globe and Mail and is an article signed by Mr. Asper, Winnipeg lawyer and Leader of the Manitoba Liberal Party.

So that I have heard today his reaction to his own fears and he is saying, well these are public companies. But, Mr. Speaker, does that then mean that every company which is on the market is subject to this kind of information given by the tax collector. And I'm worried about that because I want to tell the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party that personally, you know, I don't mind, let's tell the people what Eaton's -- is that a public corporation? -- what taxes they pay. Not a public corporation? Let's tell the people what the Royal Bank of Canada pays in taxation. Let's tell the people what these mining companies pay, and I personally don't have a particular reluctance except that I think that I have an obligation and I have a restraint imposed on me.

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

MR. ASPER: Will the Finance Minister look at the financial statement that he was brandishing last evening in the House of those same public companies to discover that the taxes paid are shown by public companies in their publicly stated returns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I will confirm that they show their income tax in the statement. Sometimes they say reserved for income tax but usually you can see the total taxes. But that's the total taxes. And those taxes may well include what they pay in England; it may well include what they pay in Bermuda or Tanganyika. Now the Hansard reporter is going to have to spell that, I'm not going to do it for the Hansard reporter. And exactly the point made by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party who just said, but there is no tax there. So that we start sorting out where do they tax and how much do they pay?

Now you know he said that as a shareholder he's entitled to go to the Annual Meeting of a public corporation and ask for the information. Of course he is, Mr. Speaker, he'd never get that information and he knows it. Imagine going to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting -- and I only picked that because it's the first on his list -- to a meeting of shareholders, an annual, and say how much did you pay in stumpage? -- if they pay stumpage -- or how much did you pay in royalties to the Province of Manitoba? He knows they wouldn't tell him. He knows they wouldn't tell him. And yet he is telling us that we who are the tax collectors, and

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd) there is legislation, you know, there is legislation which indicates that we are not permitted to give out the information. Now we're talking about income tax, and of course the income tax is collected in Ottawa, and the Minister of Finance has the right to enquire about the taxation of a taxpayer and the Federal Minister can give that information to the Minister of Finance. But then the Minister of Finance has the obligation not to give that information out. And, you know, I'm not now arguing whether I agree with that or not, all I'm saying is that until we change the law that I don't think that I should be asked even to give information which I consider to be improperly given.

Now at the end of the Member for Wolseley's introduction of this he said, "however if you don't want to give the names then maybe we can start talking in terms of anonymity." Well that's another thing. If I had the information I would never accept it on this broad scale; if I could give the information with complete anonymity, I would certainly wish to do so, Mr. Speaker. We know how much we collect in total, and it shows up in Public Accounts, and to the extent that I can give information in advance of Public Accounts I think I should do so, and I would feel that I will do so. But that's in bulk sums. But in order to comply with this not only would I be offending against what I think is a law, I think I would be offending against principles which the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party has himself espoused. I would feel rather embarrassed after reading the authority that's quoted in the Globe and Mail only a few months ago and then be told, well now in your own province you proceeded to give the kind of information that would be considered to be drastic.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the insistence, or the statement by the Member for Assiniboia, that such information has been given in the past, I will ask him to give that information, to confirm that to me, and I will consider it, but at the same time I will ask all members opposite whether they support this resolution as it is, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, I will want all members to take into account whether or not they agree because I'd like it on record. If I'm going to give that information voluntarily or by way of an Order for Return, I want to know which members agree that I should do so and which agree I shouldn't. So I may be very much tempted, unless the debate gives me the kind of information, I may be very much tempted to ask for a recorded vote so we know whether this kind of information is a desire of the House or not. If it is, I will have to go back and reflect because certainly I can volunteer the information. I don't need an Order of the House to give it, but so that - although I oppose it, and I intend to vote against it, I will be influenced strongly by what the Opposition thinks about giving this information, as to whether or not I should give it voluntarily.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I join with my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance in the presentation that he has made this afternoon, but I do want to indicate to the House that I recall back in 1954 and 1955 when a former colleague of mine, a Mr. Donovan Swailes by name, attempted to obtain this information from the Liberal Government of the day, and it was rejected on the basis of the privacy of information and the involvement into income taxes by various corporations.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think there's a more important principle involved than even that, because of the questions being asked by the present Leader of the Liberal Party for disclosure of information, that it may be distorted because of the various types of agreements that have been entered into by the government of the day in respect of certain undertakings. I refer, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the resolution of the Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party, dealing with royalties, rentals, licences, permits and fees, stumpage, and any other income or taxes, including mineral acreage tax for the year 1972-1973. I recall very very vividly that back in about 1957 - there may be an error of the actual year, Mr. Speaker - but I recall that in around 1957, 1958, there was an agreement entered into by the then government of the day giving to International Nickel certain concessions that in respect of taxation an agreement that was entered into that is still, as I understand it, an agreement that is valid and binding on the Government of the Province of Manitoba. And if we relate that to 1973, or 1972 and 1973 as suggested by the Member for Wolseley, we can distort the actual picture if it is related to other corporations with which - which are engaged in business in the Province of Manitoba.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, when the former Conservative Government of the Province of

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) Manitoba entered into an agreement with Churchill Forest Industries insofar as stumpage was concerned, and incidental to stumpage fire protection as well. And that was compared to the agreements that were entered into, or the levy which was being made at that particular time on Abitibi Pulp and Paper. Now if we're going to do it on a comparative basis I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we can distort the whole proposition of the Honourable Member for -- the Leader of the Liberal Party, unless there is accompanying with this a clear delineation as to the effects of agreements that have been entered into in respect of taxation, in respect of stumpage charges, and the likes, by agreement with the various governments of the day.

I recall having had some discussion in this House in the past as to the effect of Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting agreements with their operation in the Town of Flin Flon whereby certain concessions were made.

Now I would suggest in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, that the position taken by the Honourable the Minister of Finance is a valid one unless we are absolutely clear that when the information is provided that it should take into account agreements that have been entered into by governments. I would suggest that it would be improper, Mr. Speaker, to accept the Order for Return, and I'm sure that he is sincere in his desires, but I would suggest that it would really be improper for the acceptance of the Order for Return by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party unless it was clearly delineated that the amount of taxes, rentals and license and permits and stumpage was not revealed as to any differentiation between what is being paid by respective companies today as would be related to government agreements entered into. It wouldn't be fair I would suggest to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, to compare the stumpage charges that are paid for by Abitibi - and I'm not a champion necessarily of Abitibi - I don't think it would be fair for an Order of Return to say that Abitibi paid \$125.00, or whatever it is, in stumpage charges for "X" number of cords of wood, and compare that with Churchill Forest Industries which may be almost negligible as a result of the agreement with Churchill Forest Industries. I think that this would in effect indicate that there wasn't fairness in the application.

And then when we talk about licences, rentals, permits and fees, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is still the case, and unless we have an Order for Return that delineates the application of these permits and licences as the result of governmental agreements, it can so distort the picture as in relation one company to the other. For instance, I recall quite vividly when the agreement was entered into between the then government of the day, the Conservative Government, and the Monaco gang with Kaiser and Reiser and the likes of this, that there was no requirement of Churchill Forest Industries to reforest the areas that they were plundering. Such is not the case, as I understand the agreement, with Abitibi. They have the responsibility of doing this, and also in the area of fees for fire protection, Abitibi at their own cost has to pay certain fees, or undertake certain responsibilities insofar as some fire protection in the forest. As far as Churchill Industries were concerned at the time of the entering into of the agreement with Kaiser-Reiser, and whatever you have, they did not; this became a responsibility of the Provincial Consolidated Revenue as I understand it. So, Mr. Speaker, I think basically, I think basically - while I can appreciate the desire of the Leader of the Liberal Party in requesting this information, I don't think it can be taken in isolation of the agreements that have been entered into by government, and I would suggest to my honourable friend that this might encompass all governments, all political stripes that have had the responsibility of operation over the last, say, 25 years of Liberal, Conservative and New Democrat. So I think that the information requested if produced could be distorted really when we're attempting to arrive at an assessment of what each is paying because of agreements that have been entered into which may not make the comparisons favourable or equitable, or on an even keel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I should indicate this to the House in view of some limited knowledgability, and I emphasize that "limited knowledgability" of the agreements that have been entered into by three governments of three different inclinations.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

QUESTION put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions . . . The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, could I ask for ayes and nays please.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Call in the Members.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The motion before the House is in respect to the Order for Return by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, Leader of the Liberal Party.

AYES

Messrs.	Asper	G. Johnston
	Axworthy	Patrick

NAYS

Messrs.	Adam	McGregor
	Banman	McKellar
	Barrow	McKenzie
	Bilton	Malinowski
	Blake	Minaker
	Bostrom	Moug
	Boyce	Osland
	Brown	Patterson
	Burtniak	Pauley
	Cherniack	Pawley
	Derewianchuk	Petursson
	Dillen	Schreyer
	Gottfried	Shafransky
	Graham	Sherman
	Green	Spivak
	Hanuschak	Toupin
	Henderson	Turnbull
	Johannson	Uruski
	F. Johnston	Uskiw
	Jorgenson	Walding
	McBryde	Watt
	McGill	

MR. CLERK: Ayes 4; Nays 43.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost.

RESOLUTION NO. 15

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolution No. 15, proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, amended thereto by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, when debate was suspended on this resolution the last time it was before us, which was Tuesday, March the 19th, there was some consternation and dismay being felt and experienced by some members of the Chamber over the reaction that the Honourable Member for Rupertsland had expressed to the resolution in its original form as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland expressed grave misgivings about the import and thrust of the resolution and consequently, as all members of the Assembly know, moved an amendment to that resolution himself.

Subsequent to that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia then expressed some disbelief and some consternation, as I've suggested, over the reaction of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, or at least the reaction of that member insofar as he read it. And I think that that reaction, that consternation and surprise was not limited merely to the Member for Assiniboia, I think that there is a fair amount of surprise generally among the members in the Chamber at that time because certainly, although I would suggest that the Member for Assiniboia might have taken a much stricter, placed a much stricter interpretation on the Member for Rupertsland's feelings than I did. Certainly I nonetheless did draw the inference from what the Member for Rupertsland said that he was highly skeptical of the suggestion contained in the original resolution, and indeed perhaps suspicious of the motives of that resolution, or at least

RESOLUTION 15

(MR. SHERMAN Cont'd) . . of the motives of the Federal Government insofar as any offer of assistance in establishing a new northern park in Manitoba is concerned. So I begin my address to the question at this time in that context, Mr. Speaker.

The response of the Member for Assiniboia, as I say, was I think perhaps a little stronger in terms of surprise than mine was, and he was a little tougher on the Member for Rupertsland than I think many of us would have been, but nonetheless there was an inference that many of us drew, and I was one who drew it, that I think was fairly clear, and it's as I've suggested that the Member for Rupertsland is suspicious and wary of the motives contained in the original resolution and of the need and the justification for a new park in the northern part of the province.

I think that his suspicion and his anxiety about the concept is probably based largely on a general suspicion among northern Manitobans as to the legitimate value to be derived from a park development in the north. I think that his suspicion and his anxiety is legitimate in that it is rightfully based on a number of unknowns, on a number of questions that need to be asked and that need to be answered, and that certainly have not been answered up to this point, and which were not answered by the original resolution.

But I would say at this same time, Mr. Speaker, that I think he's being overly cautious and overly fearful of what the resolution in its original form intended, and what it could do for that part of the province which he so ably represents.

The one level on which I would agree in total with him is his suspicion of the offer of assistance from the present Federal Government in establishing a new northern park. And I think I at the time we were debating the resolution earlier when I had an opportunity to direct a question to the Member for Assiniboia, I think I alluded to the fact that I certainly can understand the Member for Rupertsland's suspicions when it comes to viewing and assessing any offer made to anybody by the present federal administration in this country. I must agree with him that I would like to look under every rock and under every stone, and examine every aspect of any kind of proposition coming from the present federal administration in Ottawa. So I align myself with him in wariness on that level. There is a classic admonition that many of us learned as schoolboys which in the original Greek I think went something like this, Mr. Speaker, *timeo danaos et dona ferentes*, and in English, Mr. Speaker, it means, I fear the Greeks bearing gifts. And I think that that position and that admonition can be very legitimately directed to the present government in Ottawa. I certainly fear that government bearing gifts. I fear it in any circumstances, particularly when it comes with an offer of some kind. My attitude, and I would think perhaps the Member for Rupertsland agrees with me where the government in Ottawa is concerned, is, don't do me any more favours. Don't offer me anything; I can't afford it. You've done enough now to make it difficult for Canadians, be they northern Manitobans or be they southern Nova Scotians, to survive economically. So I do align myself with the Member for Rupertsland in his suspicions on that level.

But let me say, Sir, that I think that the Member for Rupertsland perhaps overreacted to the original resolution. I think that he perhaps interpreted it as a direction rather than as a suggestion for the consideration of the House. I think he perhaps regarded it, and with some justification, as a kind of a paternal and colonial suggestion, and he made some reference to that in his remarks, and I think in that respect he perhaps was in error. I don't believe that the original resolution, although it might not have been worded quite the way he would have liked to have seen it worded, I don't believe that it is intended to be paternalistic. I believe, Sir, that it is intended to take into recognition the growing importance, the growing economic value of the tourist industry and the crucial role that it can play in a province like ours that perhaps does not have as many other natural resources to draw upon and compete with in the Canadian economic picture.

I see the Member for Assiniboia wants to put a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

MR. PATRICK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. PATRICK: I wonder if the honourable member is aware that the Federal Government does pay 100 percent of the cost of the park with the exception of the province donating the land and designating the area. And with his concern would he also put the same caveat that he would have rejected the, say the Mint in Winnipeg by the Federal Government, and as well . . .

RESOLUTION 15

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: . . . defense headquarters that are located in Winnipeg . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Let me indicate that questions are a courtesy if the member yields the floor but they should be for clarification and not for opening further debate. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: My answer, Mr. Speaker, my answer to all three prongs of that question is an unequivocal yes. I'm not sure that the shift of the Defense Research Establishment for example accomplishes in terms of western Canadian economics what I would like to see done in western Canada - and I don't want to get into that question at the present time. But I tell my honourable friend and my answer to his questions is yes. That's the short answer. Some time we'll get into a debate on it hopefully, and I'll give him perhaps more detail as to my reasoning on these questions.

But, Mr. Speaker, to return to the proposal before us which is a new northern park and the acceptance of federal initiative in that sphere, I would like to remind the Member for Rupertsland that many of the fears that he expressed in putting on the record a conditional and a qualified kind of opposition to the resolution, many of those fears and concerns I think are really taken care of by the nature of the resolution itself, and by the mechanics of this House when the House is confronted with dealing with a proposal in resolution form. The resolution like all resolutions suggests that this government consider the advisability of moving in a certain direction and the exercise of that option, and of that authority, is certainly a wide one, Mr. Speaker, and certainly contains latitude for total examination of the picture without committing the government to anything.

I think also that the wording in the original resolution specifically eliminated from argument one of the prime concerns that the Member for Rupertsland raised, and that was the question of consultation with the people in the area before any park is proposed to them and before any step is taken towards the development of that kind of a facility. I know the member is deeply concerned about the impact on various aspects of society and economy of such a facility, but I think that if he rechecked the wording in the original resolution he would see that it was carefully stated in there that that kind of consultation should take place before any moves were undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, I see the clock has expired on me at this point. I would like to continue my remarks at the next opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have an opportunity to continue the next time; he will have eight minutes at that time. The Honourable Member for Radisson have a point of order?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have a change for the Economic Development Committee which meets tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock; substitute the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon for that of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) Very well. The Honourable House Leader? Very well.

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