

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 15, 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 60 students Grade 9 standing of the Sisler High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jim Cumming. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

TABLING OF REPORT and ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 12

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1973 for the Department of Industry and Commerce, and also including the Manitoba Design Institute, the Manitoba Export Corporation, and the Manitoba Research Council.

Also Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table Order for Return to the House No. 12.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other reports or Ministerial Statements? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. My question is, does the Minister or the government have any emergency plans ready in the event that the possible strike should take place at the Health Sciences Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, that's a question which I hope will not have to find a resolution. I hope that this matter will be settled. The hospitals themselves are the ones that are charged with the responsibility of dealing with the matter and I assume that they are probably taking whatever steps they feel are necessary, although as I say, it is hypothetical and I hope that it'll never come about.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that I as well as all other Manitobans share the Minister's hope, but nonetheless what specific plans has the government taken to consult perhaps other hospitals with respect to whether they can take the patients that would be normally routed to the Health Sciences Centre, or what specific contingency plans does the government, specifically the Department of Health, have in the event that this is a reality.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health does not run the hospitals and the plans, if there are any, will be developed I'm sure by the hospitals within the Greater Winnipeg region. They are the ones who will be working this out between them and probably with the assistance of the Commission, if the Commission is called upon.

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

MR. I.H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Could he indicate to the House why the Manitoba Development Corporation chairman made a decision, apparently polled at the other members of the Board, to advance the \$2 million to Saunders Aircraft when no board meeting was held to ratify that decision after a previous board meeting denied the request.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The length of the question and the urgency does not seem to be apparent. Would the honourable member rephrase it?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister explain to the House why the Manitoba Development Corporation chairman made a decision to advance \$2 million to Saunders

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ASPER Cont'd) Aircraft after the Board had voted against it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the chairman on Wednesday had polled the board, regarded that, I believe, as a meeting, and made the decision on the basis of that polled meeting.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Is it normal for the Manitoba Development Corporation to advance sums of that substantial amount of \$2 million by a telephone poll from the chairman, or do they normally have Board of Directors' meetings to decide that?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker it is not normal. It is also not normal for a commercial firm in Manitoba to be faced with a statement in the newspapers that a financing has been refused on the basis of a procedure which was not terminated.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister indicate whether all members of the Board were polled and whether the decision to advance was unanimous?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe as many members of the Board were polled as could be polled, and I have no intention of talking about what the split was or if indeed there was a split on the Board.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to just not accept one of the premises made in one of the previous questions raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I indicated that the procedure with regard to the first application had not been terminated, the entire procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter of privilege?

MR. ENNS: Just for the record, Sir, the public record, the Leader of the Opposition made no such supposition. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines make a correction?

MR. GREEN: I agree Mr. Speaker. I was referring to the Leader of the Liberal Party.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question to the Minister is: is it proper, is it legal, is it all right, for the Board of Directors of the Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member is asking for a legal opinion and that's wrong.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister: is it satisfactory or appropriate in his operation of the MDC for decisions involving loans of \$2 million to be made by telephone?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is not usually done. I indicated to the Honourable Member that it was not normal. The circumstances created the situation in which it was done; the circumstances were created in part by the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALDW. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to either the First Minister or the Minister of Finance. I wonder in view of the announcement of the Bank of Canada rate going up one percent, whether the government has determined the implications this has for Manitoba in view of the some \$700 million capital authority being asked for and the reflection it will have on interest charges to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that when interest rates go up, then it costs more. On the other hand, it is not a direct relationship necessarily because that's very short-term financing as compared with long-term that we're involved in; but generally speaking it is unfortunate when rates go up and if it's done deliberately in order to fight inflation, in order to create unemployment, then it's even worse, but in this case it is not completely unexpected. The banks in United States I think went up in their prime rate only last week. These fluctuations do take place and they are not welcomed by any long-range borrower such as Manitoba.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wonder if the Finance Minister could indicate that the borrowing authority asked for for capital authority is presumably for long-term bonds. If it goes up by one percent, or something near one percent, does this not have a very severe impact on the debt cost to Manitoba?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. CHERNIACK: No, it does not, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I assume we'll be in Capital Supply today in which case the questions could be better discussed, especially hypothetical ones such as the one asked by the honourable member, but I would say no, not necessarily, because a one percent differential has to be taken in the light of the total borrowing, past, present and future, and therefore it is not necessarily a big factor, but nevertheless it's one that we have to learn to deal with. There are fluctuations of greater than one percent throughout, year by year.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if generally speaking on experience, if he can give any figure that might be used to show an effect on long-term rates by a move such as this. I think that he's indicated that it may not be one percent it might be less.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is asking the Minister to hypothesize and theorize. The Honourable Minister wish to hypothesize and theorize?

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't want to prophesy or theorize, I just want to point out to the honourable member that he is a Member of Public Accounts and if we ever got around to dealing with the capital debt in public accounts, then in the presence of my deputy minister, who is an acknowledged authority in this very field, this kind of question could be better discussed, not asked but discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I wonder can the Honourable Minister advise the House if Manitoba or the Manitoba Lotteries Commission will be represented at the first Canadian Olympic draw which is scheduled for 8:00 o'clock tonight in the Ottawa Civic Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCKENZIE: Can the Honourable Minister advise the House if the Manitoba Lotteries Commission or his department are familiar with all the details of this draw tonight which is some \$8 million.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, some of my officials are - I must confess that I personally as the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs am not familiar with all the details of the Olympic Lottery. I'm attempting to get all the details that I can, and we do have officials that are discussing the possibility of WesCan representing the Olympics here in the western provinces, but to this date we have had no success.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Minister may wish to take this under advisement. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House if this Canadian Olympic draw is legal within the terms of the Criminal Code of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Asking for a legal opinion. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. I wonder if the Attorney-General would indicate to the House when the report on the findings of the experimental ban on the sale of inexpensive wines in northern Manitoba will be made public?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I expect to have some analysis completed fairly shortly in that respect.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Manitoba Liquor Commission planning any other experimental projects within the government control liquor commission stores?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if it is a matter which administratively falls within the auspices of the Liquor Control Commission, then I would hazard an estimate that they would some time in the future wish to embark on projects of an administrative nature. If the honourable member is relating to this particular question issue, then they would not expand on this project without I'm sure approval of the Minister responsible for the Liquor Control Commission.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise the public in advance of any future projects of this nature or this type, so that there would be no unfairness or discrimination that may be, I believe, avoided and unnecessary.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would add my reservation as to any suggestion that there has been in fact any discrimination pertaining to this particular project, so that in answering the question I would not like to leave the impression that I am concurring with the honourable member's assumption. Certainly, insofar as projects of this nature are concerned much of the responsibility for proceeding on administrative tests, experimentation as to the sale of certain brands, alcoholic content, etc., rests administratively with the board of the Liquor Control Commission, so that I would not want to say that they might not from time to time remove or add certain brands to their stores.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Communities Economic Development Fund relating to answers given to questions asked on Thursday relative to the loan by the CEDF to the purchasers of Schmidt Cartage in Thompson. My question is: has the Minister now made the inquiries he indicated he would, and can he now indicate to the House whether the real buyer of Schmidt Cartage and the real recipient of a loan from the CEDF was Ben Thompson or his brother-in-law, Mr. Lamirande?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that I undertook to make inquiries relative to insurance. I have verbal advice that the premises were leased premises, that they were insured, that the vehicles themselves were insured by Autopac. I indicated to the Honourable member that the loan was made to a brother-in-law of Ben Thompson; I gave this answer to the House a year ago. I indicated that Mr. Thompson was one of the original applicants but was not acceptable as a borrower, that the loan was subsequently made to Mr. Lamirande who was to incorporate a company. I believe that Mr. Thompson then had an involvement in the operation of that company, but that is not something that I have any direct knowledge of, but the loan was made to Lamirande, a brother-in-law of Thompson, to be incorporated to a company.

Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat there were several other questions that I was asked, which I took as notice, and which I have answers to.

One relates to a question asked by Mr. Blake with regard to the Member for Minnedosa - with regard to assistance being provided for deer losses. I am advised that in southwest Manitoba, south and southwest of Brandon, deer losses are expected to be isolated; north and east of Brandon moderate losses are expected in agricultural areas, with increased losses expected in non-agricultural deer wintering areas. Bulldozing has been carried on in the Sprucewoods Provincial Forest to provide deer with access to native vegetation. From Dauphin north deer are scattered throughout the area. Isolated concentrations of up to 200 deer have been identified and bulldozing for access to native food supply has been carried out since February. Lesser concentration on timber sale areas appeared to be maintaining themselves. Losses north of Dauphin are expected to be greater than in the southwest. Loss estimates will not be available before early May.

With respect to a question that was asked by the Honourable Member for Lakeside concerning salmon, even though there was no salmon given as a token for the question, Manitoba has experimented unsuccessfully with the Kokanee salmon in past years. Indigenous populations of predatory fish make the survival of salmon smolt plantings questionable due to their susceptibility to carnivorous fish. Water characteristics and temperature cast further doubt on planting success. Fisheries research considers it wiser to manage native fishes and does not consider it feasible at this time to initiate further stocking programs for salmon without research. The Federal Government will be experimenting in 1974 with Coho, Sockeye and Chum salmon in connection with the Agriculture Research Program. This may have implications for salmon stocking by the Provincial Government at a later date. It must however be pointed out that eggs from diseased-free stock are not available in any great numbers thus limiting the extent of any future salmon stocking.

The Honourable Member for Riel asked me about the note that was given to Canada by the United States relative to the Garrison Diversion. I have a copy of that for the honourable member, so he can have it.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN Cont'd)

With regard to the use of pesticides with respect to cankerworms - I believe I was asked by the Member for St. James whether this order is going to be made. I am advised that the Chairman is not able to commit himself as to the specific date on which the order will be granted, but is aware of the need to have the order granted.

With regard to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition as to whether there is interest accruing and being charged as an operational cost of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation on moneys which the Federal Government is hoping to receive from Manitoba, I'm able to advise that Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta have not agreed, or have not paid in any event a contribution towards the losses of that corporation. I indicated that there was still disagreement between our government and the government at Ottawa relative to the exact terms under which the amount would be paid. As long as it's not paid it is an operational interest cost. Mr. Speaker, of course that could be changed if the Federal Government chose to pay it and waited for the province to advance the money, or if when it is advanced interest is taken into account. None of which have been agreed to.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Community Economic Development Fund. Has it been brought to his attention - has he been informed by his officials that in fact a gimmick was used in the case of Schmidt Cartage; and in fact the original applicant, Ben Thompson, in fact managed the company and had power to hire and fire, and in fact signed cheques on the company even though he was to have no interest in it under the law?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can use whatever description he wants. The information which he has now mentioned I mentioned to the House, that originally Ben Thompson was one of the applicants. I understand that there were two applicants, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Lamirande; that when the application went forward it could, although Mr. Thompson absented himself from the meeting, the board could not advance the money on that basis because he was one of the applicants and a member of the Board of Directors; the board still thought that it was a good loan to make and made the loan to Mr. Lamirande on the basis of his operation of the company. Since then Mr. Thompson may indeed have been involved, and I do not suggest that he wasn't. The question of those operations and whether things were done in the way in which they should have done is now under review by the receiver of the corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has the Minister had sent to him an affidavit sworn by John Webster on the 3rd day of April, 1974 to which is attached xeroxed copies of cheques on Schmidt Cartage which were signed by Ben Thompson, indicating that in fact Thompson was the real owner of the operation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the affidavit. I do not say that Mr. Thompson did not sign cheques on the corporation. Mr. Thompson is no longer a member of the Board of Directors of the Communities Economic Development Fund. I have been told from time to time that he has been involved in the operation of that company. The fact that he was is something that is now being looked at by the receiver to determine just what relationship that has to the original loan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Natural Resources, and I thank him for the answer to a previous question. I would ask him now if his department is considering, or would consider, compensation for anyone who has suffered loss of food through wildlife damage, or those that have contributed food to the upkeep of wildlife, if this department would consider compensation to these people under that particular section of the Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I'd be prepared to take that question as notice. I'm not aware of it. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I did not receive an affidavit. To my knowledge

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) I have not; sometimes things get to my office which I do not see for a day or two. However, Mr. Speaker, it would not be a matter which was subject to great disclosure if a cheque was written in that way because it would be contained in the blank cheques of the company, which the receiver is now dealing with. It would not be a secret.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General if he has completed his investigations into charges of harassment of employees of the Tudor House of Selkirk by picketers at that place, and if he has, what action . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Second question hypothetical.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . has he taken on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should indicate that the procedure that is followed in respect to picketing at any establishment which is out on strike is that when complaints are made that a particular offence has been committed that those complaints are filed with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and then the complaints, if the Royal Canadian Mounted Police so wish, are discussed with Crown counsel, and Crown counsel may then recommend that charges be brought to bear in respect to any case in which they feel there is reasonable and probable cause for the laying of charges. Short of that, short of that charges are not brought to bear unless it is with the joint concurrence of the Crown attorneys and the RCMP investigating a particular complaint or complaints.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question. I believe the Minister carried out a personal investigation on Friday and I was hoping he would give us a report of that.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I took it onto myself to visit constituents in my own constituency on the picket line and to speak to them for a few minutes, and while in the process of speaking to my constituents on a picket line I found that a picture was taken of myself, and I suppose that's what the honourable member is referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question was intended for the Minister of Colleges and Universities. In his absence I would direct it to the Honourable the First Minister, and ask him if in view of the fact that a former colleague of his has said that one of his Ministers misled the House, would the First Minister like to clarify the answers given in respect to the separation of Mr. Gonick as Director of the FOCUS Program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to provide clarification on a statement that I haven't seen. I will certainly attempt to obtain a copy of said statement and see what it purports to say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. Can the Minister tell us whether he or the government plans to introduce at this session the recommendations on boundary changes in the City of Winnipeg that were introduced in their report last week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the sequence really will be as follows: that when a decision is taken with respect to the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission Report that will be announced, and the method by which the recommendations would be effected would be pursuant to legislation that is presently before the House, namely amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister tell whether the government intends to provide any opportunity for meetings or hearings wherein councillors or residents of those community committees that have been affected by the proposed changes will have an opportunity to submit their representations or views concerning the said changes.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that those who care to express a view with respect to the recommended boundaries would avail themselves of an opportunity to direct those views in writing to the government; and then, too, at the time of the passage of amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act there may be an opportunity there to those who are

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) making representations on the Act to give some general views. But I think the **parallel** here, Sir, is the way in which changes are made in federal and provincial boundaries, and I don't believe that there is a mechanism for holding extended hearings after an independent commission has made the recommendations.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a supplementary question then. Does the Minister intend to direct officials of his government to provide information related to boundary changes to community committees and councillors who are affected, as is the case in many cases with federal boundary changes on electoral boundaries; and do they intend to hold or meet with them to exchange information or explanation of said changes prior to legislation being introduced.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is suggesting that there could be a mechanism by which written inquiries or views are taken into consideration, I would undertake to attempt to provide information by way of reply to letters of inquiry or representation that I received.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Minister responsible for the Communities Economic Development Fund. Would he confirm to the House in connection with the Schmidt Cartage Loan that at the time of the takeover and financing by CEDF that there was some \$30,000 of cash in the company's account and that money has disappeared?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will be able to get details of such matters when the Communities Economic Development Corporation appears before the committee on Economic Development. There were various things relative to that operation that did not go as it was hoped it would go. That was one of the expectations, Mr. Speaker, that was envisaged when the Communities Economic Development Fund was set up to try to develop entrepreneurial leadership amongst people who were indigenous to northern Manitoba.

MR. ASPER: Will the Minister responsible for the Fund confirm that the purchasers of the company put up no money and the government put up 100 percent of the money but that the company was owned 100 percent by the people who put up no money?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this was a loan in which the purchasers were advanced the full purchase price and the hope was that there would be a going concern which had some goodwill and some very good contracts for the shipping of materials, and that that goodwill was to be something which would accrue to an organization of indigenous northerners who would then be able to demonstrate their effectiveness in operating a company. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of Directors' decision was based on that. Whether the honourable member would agree that such a decision were made or should not have been made, it was directly within the terms of reference of the board to make that type of decision.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate one example, any example whatever, in which the CEDF or the MDC has advanced a 100 percent of the purchase price of any business to anyone who was not a member of the NDP?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that over 100 percent was advanced to the principals of the Churchill Forest Industry. --(Interjection)--

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge Alex Kasser and et al were not members of the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister of Labour can indicate to the House if there is any studies currently under way investigating the minimum wage in Manitoba, and how it relates to the cost of living, and the reflection on say five members in a family?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to announce to the House that the Minimum Wage Board is sitting at the present time - I don't mean at this precise moment, Mr. Speaker - but I requested the Minimum Wage Board to sit to consider an impact study that was made as to the effects of minimum wages in Manitoba; to consider the adequacy or the inadequacy of the minimum wage in Manitoba in relation to cost of living and other factors. I have been informed by the Chairman

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) of the Minimum Wage Board that hearings will be held in three communities early in May; he has informed me that a report will be made to me by May 15th as to the recommendations of the Minimum Wage Board. Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity to indicate to all concerned parties that I believe that adjustments will be made in the minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba, effective on or near the 1st of July of this year after receipt of the report. I mention the date of the 1st of July, Mr. Speaker, because I realize that it is a responsibility of myself as Minister of Labour and of the Government of Manitoba to give as much notification as possible by way of lead time to industry. What the precise change will be however, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to be able to indicate at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House when the study was commissioned, when was it started, and when does he expect the study to be completed?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the study was started some time shortly after the last increase that was made in the minimum wage, which I believe was the 1st of October or the 1st of November of last year. It was made at my request, and incidentally at somewhere in the cost of around about \$50,000 - I'm not sure of that figure at the present time. It was received in unedited form, Mr. Speaker, by me two or three weeks ago; it was immediately referred to the Minimum Wage Board for its consideration. I hope to have copies available to the interested parties before too long but I wanted the unedited editions to be edited before making it fully public. It is in the hands however, Mr. Speaker, of the Minimum Wage Board at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Could the Minister tell us whether his department has provided any form of direct assistance to small independent grocery or small business outlets in the City of Winnipeg to provide better marketing or distribution services in order to compete with large supermarkets in food distribution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, if the question refers to whether the department has to date provided such assistance to small independent groceries, the answer is no.

MR. AXWORTHY: I've a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister tell us whether his department or he himself, have made recommendations to either the Minister of Industry and Commerce to ask them to provide financial incentives or research assistance to small grocery outlets in the City of Winnipeg to enable them to compete better with large supermarkets?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, not only has the department not undertaken to make such a recommendation to the Department of Finance, but I, as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, have not had requests from independent grocers to provide that kind of assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the statement that he has recently made that it is now his intention to reconsider the withdrawal of the home economists and the executive councils from the W.I. and the 4-H Clubs in the Province of Manitoba. Since the plan had gone into effect, my question is, will those people that have been affected, will they be reinstated in their positions until such decision has been arrived at by the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I don't know what my honourable friend is talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Thompson. Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: . . . know anything about what anybody's talking about in this House?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member alleges things that are not true, so therefore based on his preface to the question I can't answer him in any other way.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): I have a question of the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Has an investigation been conducted with regard to questions raised by the Honourable Member from Morris in his speech of April 11th with regard to the Pensioners Home Repair Program and Mrs. Dowdy of Wabowden.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a member of the Committee dealing with Pensioner Home Repair program, I have made inquiries in respect to the allegations that were made by the Honourable Member from Morris. The Honourable Member from Morris read a letter to the House and tabled it in which a lady from Wabowden, a Mrs. Dowdy indicated she had not applied for a grant, and indicated that she had received a letter from the Premier telling her that her application had been approved. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we do have an application form - a copy of which I will table in the House - which bears the signature of Mrs. Mary Dowdy of Wabowden, Manitoba, and this application does indicate that the Wabowden Community Council are shown as the contractors. On two occasions, I'm informed, Mrs. Dowdy did in fact visit the offices of the Job Office in Winnipeg inquiring as to the progress that was being made in respect to the house. An estimate was done on the community-owned house in Wabowden and by the Job Office. They were prepared to proceed with the work when Mrs. Dowdy changed her mind and decided that she would not take possession of the house. She is still entitled to a grant from the Job Office and upon application by her - the only area that is quite important is that she must reside in a home that is owned by her, she cannot be a tenant in a home that is owned by somebody else - but from the documents we have here she did apply, her application was approved, estimate was given, and two visits were made by her to the Job Office pursuant to the acceptance of the application until such time she changed her mind in respect to the House in Wabowden which the community council had been proposing to provide here.

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

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Community Economic Development Fund and it relates to the Schmidt loan. Could the Minister inform the House when the loan of \$75,000 was made to the party that bought the firm, is it correct that there was no security taken. In other words, the trucks and equipment were not held by way of mortgage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to leap where angels fear to tread; I am sure that there was security taken because the receiver has now gone in and retaken the assets, so there would certainly have been security taken on the vehicles and everything that the company owned - there would be a debenture for everything that the company owned, would be taken as security by the Communities Economic Development Corporation. However, having leapt, I will now check to see that my answer is correct.

MR. JOHNSTON: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister check with the Royal Bank at Thompson because they have seized the assets of the firm which were not secured for the loan that was given by the CED?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll check with the Communities Economic Development Corporation; they will be able to tell me what security that they had.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Could the First Minister inform the House as to whether or not the Cabinet is going to advance, either by way of cash grant or loan, moneys to the McKeag group to keep the Winnipeg Jets in Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, despite the unusual reference to the group and the name by which they are styled, I would simply indicate that it is true, we have been approached with the request asking the the Province take some course of action to support the prospects of the retaining of a professional hockey team in the City of Winnipeg. Thus far I have not been in a position to give any definite indication of intent other than to suggest that we would want to be consistent insofar as the Amusements Tax is concerned, vis-a-vis the professional football club that exists as a community club here in the City of Winnipeg. Beyond that I have not been able to give any indication of intent until such time as the matter has been discussed

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd) with the city officials, and I understand that that is proceeding and there may well be an opportunity tomorrow to learn of the city's interest, if any, in the matter.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if you would call Bill No. 7 and then the Bills in the order of their appearance on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 7 proposed by the Honourable Minister of Labour - being closed by the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill has been taken as an opportunity for members to debate at length all aspects of governmental jurisdiction, including many matters not under the consideration or contained within the Civil Service Act. When one notes the speeches recorded in Hansard, less than 20 percent of what was said referred to Bill No. 7. What was said regarding the contents of the Bill were in my opinion deliberate attempts to discredit . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Riel state his matter of privilege?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister dwelling on this is a direct reflection on your integrity as Speaker, in bringing forth this kind of a statement that 80 percent of the debate was unrelated to the Bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order, I mean no criticism of the conduct of yourself, Sir. You attempted, you attempted on a number of occasions to draw to the attention of the honourable members, particularly the honourable members opposite, that they were not dealing with Bill No. 7. All my observation is not to discredit you, Mr. Speaker, but the Honourable Member for Riel has really put his voice at the nut, the kernel of the whole thing when he apparently now, belatedly, admits that the honourable members opposite did not listen to your sage advice insofar as the deliberations are concerned, and I reject the point that he makes, as indeed I am sure you will too.

And it is a fact, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that less than 20 percent of the discussions that took place on Bill No. 7 referred to the contents of that bill, or indeed to the Civil Service Act as we have it at the present time, but rather it was a deliberate attempt, in my opinion at least, on the Opposition to rehash an election in which they were trounced by the public of the Province of Manitoba.

Another endeavour of the Opposition dealing with discussion on Bill No. 7 was in my opinion an effort to sow seeds of discontent, not only in our Civil Service but in the public as well.

Just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the position taken by the Government Employees Association in respect to Bill No. 7. I do this, Sir, not in opposition to their right to take the position but to indicate, Sir, to you and to this House an inability on my part, and I confess it's an inability on my part, to really ascertain what is the position of the Government Employees Association.

Mr. Speaker, I say whatever position the Association takes is their business. It is also the right of the Association to carry to its readers for consideration the distorted, inaccurate, and political editorial of the *Stonewall Argus*, which in effect was the speech given in this House by the Member from Lakeside. I refer to this piece of editorial tripe published in *Contact*, and I pose the question: is this the attitude of the employees in government? And if so, that there must be a change from previous positions taken by the Manitoba Government Employees Association. I refer first of all, Mr. Speaker, to a resolution which was passed by the Association in October of 1969 which reads as follows, dealing with the matter of political activity, and I quote from that resolution:

"Whereas the provisions of the Civil Service Act regarding regulating the political activities of employees within the scope of its application are somewhat ambiguous, limiting, and inadequate as a guide to permissible conduct, and,

"Whereas the freedom of expression and the right to participate in political affairs of one country are an unalienable right of every citizen; and,

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd)

"Whereas a decent respect and concern for wholesome relationship between government and its employees suggests there should be some reasonable restrictions on the exercise of full political rights, but not inconsistent with the exercise of such rights;

"Therefore be it resolved, that the Provincial Executive be directed to urge on government the adoption of the following policy for regulating the political activities of those government employees who are members of the Manitoba Government Employees Association:

(a) To allow an employee to be a candidate or supporter in municipal or school board elections.

(b) To allow an employee to be a candidate in provincial or federal elections with it being mandatory on government to give leave of absence with full reinstatement rights if defeated.

(c) To allow an employee to solicit funds, Mr. Speaker, for a political party and to work on its behalf during off-duty work hours only.

(d) To allow an employee to speak or write on the platform policy of a political party, except in regard to the affairs of the agency in which he is employed, and providing he does not reveal any information which he obtains by virtue of his position.

(e) To prohibit an employee from engaging in formal political activity during working hours."

That resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, was a resolution coming from the Provincial Executive of the Manitoba Government Employees Association in October of 1969.

In 1973 there was contained in an issue of the Employees Magazine, a paper called Contact, a reference to a resolution that was passed on October 13th and 14th in 1972, requests the Provincial Government to make it permissible for all government employees to take part in political activity of promotion and election of a party of their choice and belief without jeopardizing their position. This political activity should be confined only to after work hours. Again, Mr. Speaker, from the association I received a communication from the Executive Director, Mr. Garth Metcalfe, on February 21st of this year wherein he says: "As you know when the Association conducted its every-member ballot last August on the ratification of agreements also included was a ballot asking the membership to express its views on the question of political activity. That is, they were asked to vote on whether or not they favored the Manitoba Government Employees being given the right to engage in political activity at the provincial and federal levels. The result of that ballot was communicated to the government and was given fairly extensive publicity."

Again for the record: "The ballot was returned with 3,726 members voting in favour, and 2,869 against." And then the letter goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say: "Consequently the official position of the Association as a result of that ballot is one of supporting the present bill before the Legislature as that bill relates to the question of political rights."

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary report of the association, datelined March 15th, indicated a sort of a slightly different stance of the executive of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, and I quote from this supplementary report of March 15th, which states: "That up to now the MGEA has officially remained politically neutral." This after having requested the government to change the Civil Service Act. "However," - this article goes on to say - "if the present Government of Manitoba wishes to carry Bill 7 through the present sitting of the Legislature, the Association should, and probably will, quickly take advantage of this removal of restrictions on the political activity of government employees." The article then went on to indicate that they would require an amendment to their constitution so that this would be permissible.

And then the article, or the report, of March 15th, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say, "that the Manitoba Government Employees Association in recent months has been subjected to the actions of those who have violated the constitution from within its ranks; there have also been those critics in the employ of government on a contract basis who are too often mistaken for the MGEA." And of course, Mr. Speaker, I need not say to you and to members of this House, this was the whole thrust of the Opposition in respect to Bill 7. They were bringing out of the woods anybody who even remotely were concerned with contracts between government or any of its agencies in respect of performance of work. And this is so true.

And then this article goes on: "There have been raiding attempts by rival unions" -

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) which is unrelated entirely to Bill No. 7 which that Opposition over there attempted to use in opposition to Bill No. 7, Mr. Speaker; quite improperly, because it had nothing to do with the contents of the bill.

And then the final sentence of the bill says, or the article I referred to from the association: "When the right to become freely involved in political activity is given to members of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, the opportunity will be there, and if we so choose to 'reward our friends and punish our enemies'." I don't know what threat that really means, Mr. Speaker. They've always had the right to vote and to elect their friends and to defeat enemies. What that really means in this article, I do not know.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that the issue of Contact Paper, volume 3, No. 3, datelined April of 1974, is really a switcheroo completely from a historic position of the Employees Association wherein in this particular paper there is contained therein an editorial of the Stonewall Argus covered in full which indicates the position taken by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, which was in absolute opposition to the bill, which was in absolute opposition to the basic principle contained in at least a few sections of the bill, to give to our civil servants the right of free participation in a free democracy. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the indication is that by publishing the editorial of the Stonewall Argus, and the full speech of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, as an indication of the support of the Employees Association, or its executive, to the position taken by the Member for Lakeside, it is a complete reversal of the position that has been indicated to me as the Minister responsible to report to this House on the activities of the civil servants.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while there may be certain sections of Bill No. 7 that will be considered by the Association when we go before Law Amendments, I pose the question, Mr. Speaker: is this issue of April of 1974 containing the asinine contribution made in this House by the Member for Lakeside an indication of the present position of the Employees Association? I have said, Mr. Speaker, and I repeatedly say, their position is their business. They have indicated to me --(Interjection)-- I'm not in trouble at all. They have indicated to me on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by my documentation here this afternoon, that they want to be allowed to be free citizens in a free society. I simply want to know, what is their position now in the light of their last official publication? Do they want it or don't they want it? Do they want to support the position of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, or do they want to be freed of the restrictions that they've had in the past imposed on them by Conservative and Liberal government in the Province of Manitoba? --(Interjection)-- Yes, Yes, and I even saw another asinine news article the other day which indicates that the Conservative Party have been vindicated by this article as contained in the Contact Paper, that they have now been vindicated in the stance of the Conservatives. Thank goodness the Liberals have at least a little intelligence in the approach on this particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to these papers to indicate the government is not attempting to force out employees to become active in politics but to give them the choice so to do if they want it. No one has said, I have never said, the bill doesn't say, to our civil servants that you must become involved in politics. All we're attempting to say: if you so desire you are not going to be under the present constraints as contained in the Civil Service Act of the Province of Manitoba. In removing the present sections in the Civil Service Act, Mr. Speaker, we would allow our employees the same right as enjoyed by most citizens of the province; that is, to participate or not to participate in active politics.

Isn't it true, Mr. Speaker, that one of the tragedies that we're encountering at the present time insofar as activities and involvement in public affairs, that many of our municipal councillors, municipal councillors go uncontested year after year; many of our school boards cannot even find sufficient candidates to run - these are barred under the present Civil Service Act of the Province of Manitoba.

The Member for Morris asked me the other day whether there should be any coercion used, or would be any coercion used on an employee who refused to take part in politics. I would say, and I agree with him that there should not; and I would agree, I would agree that if it's necessary to spell this out in the Civil Service Act, I would be quite prepared to have a clause in the bill similar to that that is contained in the Saskatchewan bill, which is in effect at the present time and has been for some considerable period of time.

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) And Section 52 of the Saskatchewan Public Service Act says: "No person in public service shall (a) be in any manner compelled to take part in any political undertaking, or to make any contribution to a political party, or in any manner threatened or discriminated against for refusing to take part in any political undertaking."

A MEMBER: You didn't say that before.

MR. PAULLEY: I said, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- Of course not. He doesn't believe me, Mr. Speaker. Isn't this a trait of the opposition? They don't believe anything except their own asinine intelligence. I said just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker - and I don't know if my honourable friend from Assiniboia heard me or not - I said that in answer to the direct question of the Member for Morris that this can be considered, and would be considered. I say that sincerely, Mr. Speaker, and if my honourable friend questions my sincerity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I'm prepared, I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to consider anything that isn't asinine but there's so damned much over there that is asinine, that that is the reason that we don't consider very much. But the Honourable Member for Morris did make, and did raise a pertinent question, and it being raised, I indicate consideration can and most likely will be given to the inclusion of such a clause. That was a valuable progressive consideration from my honourable friend, not like the asinine nincompoopish contributions made by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

Much ado, Mr. Speaker, has been made during the debate on the sections in the bill which deals with the question of eliminations or exclusions from the right to run for political office. Here in the present bill before us we indicate the deputy ministers and others designated by Order-in-Council would not be permitted to participate in politics during an election. Mr. Speaker, this is standard legislation in practically every jurisdiction across the world that those that are in authority, those that can dictate policy, those that can -- the privy to confidential information should not be retained, given the privilege of running unless they leave the service - and many do, Mr. Speaker. This is standard legislation. The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, in its sinister approach to Bill No. 7 deliberately attempted to misinterpret the section of the bill to indicate Cabinet would have control on an individual basis as to whether a person could take part in politics or not. Had they the honesty, Mr. Speaker, of really taking a look at the bill they would have seen that this section does not apply to individuals, it applies only to classes or groups of individuals. But they were less than honest, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that is so typical of the Opposition today.

During debate, Mr. Speaker, some members referred to other jurisdictions and countries which have legislation regarding participation in politics by their civil servants. One member in particular, the Honourable Member for Swan River, referred to the British tradition. He of course oriented his thinking to the mid-Victorian era and was not aware that even the United Kingdom had advanced in this area of human endeavour and in the rights of individuals to be participators in the process of democracy. And I want to refer to the situation that is prevailing at the present time in the United Kingdom. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes you did.

In the report - I quote from a paper, Mr. Speaker, I have, extracts from literature references concerning the subject of political activity of civil servants dealing, and it's contained in a report from a group that was set up in the United States Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel. In reference to the United Kingdom, and of course my Honourable friend from Swan River with mid-Victorian - I'm sure he wouldn't apologize for that, he's said it on a number of occasions in this House. And I quote from this paper, Mr. Speaker, "That, in a report of the Committee on Political Activities of Civil Servants of 1949, it was stated that the Civil Service political neutrality is a fundamental characteristic of the British democratic government. It is essential to its effective functioning." Then the article goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "The rules were opposed to any public expression of opinion; no employees were allowed to run for elective office. These rules however have been relaxed in that certain grades of the Civil Service have now been allowed more freedom under the British system." When my honourable friend from Swan River was talking he referred and made reference to the British

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) Parliamentary System which forbade in his opinion participation by the British public service, or Civil Service I should say, in the field of politics. I wonder when my honourable friend is going to be dragged - as indeed he should be - and will have to be dragged out of the last century into this one where people are people and they have equal rights within the governmental process - kicking and screaming. Lord, that's all he can do is scream.

In the sections dealing with the composition and powers of the Civil Service Commission many comments were heard and written on this important matter. Here, Mr. Speaker, more red herrings were attempted to be used than in other sections of the bill. It is obvious that the Leader of the Conservative party never read the present Act and related it to the amendments contained within Bill No. 7. He attempted, Mr. Speaker, in his usual flamboyant manner to suggest that the objective of the proposal was for the government to have power to control the Commission by increasing its membership. --(Interjection)-- One honourable member says, hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced Bill No. 7, I indicated that one of the reasons for suggesting an increase in the membership of the Commission was so that a woman could be appointed to the Commission. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that today, that now after the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition condemned us for making a suggestion of an increase in the numbers on the Civil Service Commission lo and behold that honourable member now has a Private Members' Resolution before this House asking for the appointment of a woman to the Civil Service Commission. He knows or he should know - although I believe he is ignorant of the fact that unless the amendment contained in Bill No. 7 passes it will not be possible. There are three men on the Civil Service Commission at the present time.

A MEMBER: You take one away and add a woman.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. Take one away - and do you know, Mr. Speaker, that shows the ignorance of the Member for Lakeside because we can't take one away unless he died, unless he is shot. Maybe that's what the Honourable Member for Lakeside is suggesting, that in order to accommodate the appointment of a woman we should shoot one of the three men that is on the Commission. Because we haven't got that authority at the present time. You know that - the interjections at the present time, Mr. Speaker, are so typical of the attitude of the Opposition in this House. They don't know a damn thing about the legislation that we have; they come along with resolutions, making suggestions that they know that under the present legislation cannot be adhered to. How inconsistent, Mr. Speaker, can the Leader of the Opposition be. On one hand he says to allow for an increase in the number of commissioners - which is our suggestion, and our suggestion of retirement at 65 should be defeated and not accepted in this House. He says that on one hand, and then on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, he says that we should appoint a fourth member, or a woman to the Commission. I have no objections at all to the appointment of a woman to the Commission. It was for that reason, that reason, Mr. Speaker, that in order to maintain the Commission under the rules that we can't fire them, subject to two-thirds majority of this House; the objective was to increase the number of persons there to make accommodation for the possibility of the appointment of a woman. Oh no, Mr. Speaker, that gang over there they don't want that, . . .

A MEMBER: We want a woman.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, you want a woman. You've got it in a resolution but you don't want the provision made in the Act so that it can be accomplished. What Jekyll and Hyde approach is adopted by that gang over there, Mr. Speaker! And some suggestion was made during the debate by some other asinine contribution to the bill, Mr. Speaker, that if the bill passed in its present form in respect of the number on the Commission we'd appoint thousands of people to the Civil Service Commission and lose control. How stupid and nincompoopish is a suggestion like that - and I believe that that is one of the suggestions, that is one of the suggestions contained in the article contained in Contact that was given such prominence by the Argus or Oracle, or whatever the heck you want to call it, of Stonewall. And I say, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--

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

MR. ENNS: I believe in fairness to the newspaper involved, which is located in the

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . NDP held constituency of Gimli, the full name of the paper, and it is a very fine paper, is the Stonewall Argus and Teulon Times.

MR. SPEAKER: That's not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Of course not, Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of privilege, and I only referred to the paper because it referred to that stupid speech that was made in this House by the Member for Lakeside. If Stonewall happens to be in Gimli, it borders on Lakeside and maybe instead of going into the area that is represented in this House, that is Gimli, it chose to go slightly outside and pick up - it would be unparliamentary if I said what I'm thinking - the words spoken by the Member from Lakeside.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if it is the desire of the committee to consider a limitation of the number of members of the committee, and I'm amenable to it. But even if it were 150, Mr. Speaker, they could only be dismissed by two-thirds of a vote of this Assembly in any case. I'm sure not a Conservative was aware of that because they didn't do their homework, they didn't read the present Civil Service Act.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, on page 1008 of March 4th in Hansard, spoke as usual with forked tongue. He said on one hand, "We do not object to a civil servant being given the right to run for political office." That was the end of that quote. A little later on in the same issue - on the same page, Mr. Speaker, - the Honourable Member for River Heights says, "We do not believe that civil servants should be allowed to work within the political process." Now how constantly inconsistent can the Leader of the Opposition be? On one hand he says "we don't disagree with them being allowed to participate in the political process" and then about four or five sentences down he says, "We do not believe that civil servants should be allowed to work within the political process." Stupidity.

He did indicate one of the failings of the bill, and I accept it; and it does not make provision for the return to the Civil Service of somebody who has been elected to a political office and subsequently retires, is defeated, and desires to come back. We're prepared to consider a clause dealing with that. But I think far more importantly, Mr. Speaker, is that the present contents of Bill No. 7 does something that was never ever done before insofar as the civil servant is concerned. It gives them protection for their job. Under the present act, under the present act which was concocted by the Conservative Party of Manitoba, if a civil servant took part in the political process he lost his job. If he went out campaigning, he lost his job. What we are attempting to do in this bill is to give them security of tenure in their positions in the event they're defeated in their efforts to be full citizens of the Province of Manitoba - a right denied by the Conservatives and, if I understand their contributions correctly, Mr. Speaker, would still be denied.

It was suggested, I believe by the Honourable Member for Riel, that all we need to do is to remove present Section 44 from the act. To remove Section 44 in its entirety would be all right, Mr. Speaker; it would simply mean that there wouldn't be any prohibition. But it wouldn't be any guarantee that any of our civil servants who took part in the political process would be entitled and would, under legislation be allowed to come back to his job. You talk about oppression and suppression by Ministers and the civil servant in the higher category. Lord love a duck. That has been the way historically. We're going to change it and I don't give a continental whether or not I have the support of the Conservative Party in this area, it will become law that anyone who does take part in the political process will have the rights of tenure in their job if they're defeated, something the Conservatives wouldn't do under the present act.

Mr. Speaker, when I introduced Bill No. 7, I indicated that there were many sections that were of a tidying up nature, such as definitions of categories of employee and to make sure the departmental employees have the same rights of appeal under our collective agreement as others do. This was a subject, Mr. Speaker, of some controversy. The result was that the right of appeal of departmental employees was taken to the court and Mr. Justice Tritschler, by way of a court order, indicated that the departmental employees, albeit not members of the Civil Service Act per se, have the same rights and privileges under the collective agreement as all other employees do. And, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the provisions of this Bill No. 7 so vigorously opposed by the Conservative Party of this province. They don't want in effect, they wanted to kill this bill, so that the likes of the departmental employees didn't have the same rights as the others under collective agreement. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that these are

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . the areas that are far more important than the political skulduggery of the utterances of Conservative government.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we as members of a so-called free society, have legislated many items and bills in the field of the rights of our citizens. There has been legislated bills of rights; we in Manitoba legislated a Human Rights Commission, we provided for the provision of an Ombudsman, for the elimination of sex discrimination. We have gone a long way, Mr. Speaker, in efforts to eliminate racial discrimination, and I would agree there's still a long way to go but we're heading in the proper direction and I ask the question of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker: is it not time now to eliminate present discrimination regarding the political involvement within the Civil Service?

When speaking on Bill 7 previously, I made certain suggestions as to what had been done in broader areas in human endeavour and utterances of other people. I did, Mr. Speaker, indicate that much has been done, that much more has to be done, to eliminate discrimination and differences prevailing at the present time. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friends opposite really know what the situation is today in the Province of Manitoba in regard to those employees in our two major Crown corporations, the Telephones and Manitoba Hydro. They have suggested during their speeches, Mr. Speaker, that our civil servants should not have the right of participation. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should take a look at what our Crown corporations have done.

In the Manitoba Telephone System they have an order, a circular indicating the position of the employees of the Manitoba Telephone System, and in that statement of principles it is said, and I'm quoting from general circular 02510, "An employee may engage in political activities with respect to municipal or federal affairs, provided such activities do not interfere with the performance of the employee's duties to the system. Employees shall not engage in political activities with respect to provincial affairs." Mr. Speaker, how unfair is this! Of course our present act forbids any employee of the Civil Service to take active part in federal elections or other provincial.

The edict, the circular of the Telephone System simply says, "An employee can engage in anything other than provincial affairs." And it goes on: "An employee may obtain leave of absence, without pay, for the purpose of campaigning for a political office in the municipal or federal fields." An employee, Mr. Speaker, who is elected to a municipal political office which may require occasional time off, he can have it. "An employee who is elected to the House of Commons of Canada will be granted leave of absence without pay for his term of office. An employee on such leave of absence, providing he shall have applied for re-appointment within three months of ceasing to be a Member of the House of Commons, will be given preference of re-employment. An employee shall not engage in political activities during working hours." That is the circular of the Manitoba Telephone System.

What is the position taken, Mr. Speaker, in respect of our own Manitoba Hydro? The Manitoba Hydro edict, or circular, says, "An employee may obtain leave of absence without pay for the purpose of campaigning for a political office. An employee who is elected to a municipal political office which may require occasional absences from work, not exceeding a day at a time, will be expected to arrange leave of absence in advance. An employee, "Mr. Speaker, "who is elected to the House of Commons of Canada, will be granted leave of absence, without pay, for his term. An employee," - and get this, Sir, this is the edict of the Manitoba Hydro that we all pride ourselves in, and listen to this - "An employee who is elected to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba" may obtain leave of absence without pay during each session." In other words, here are our two major Crown corporations by circular give to their employees a reasonable shake insofar as participation in the political arena. But what about those gentlemen opposite? They would deny the same privileges to the Civil Service under the direct control of this Assembly.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair, it is unjust, and I say that it's damn near time the Conservative Party instead of using the likes of Bill No. 7 to fight an election, should get down to brass tacks, even apart from all of that, even apart from all of that, Mr. --(Interjection)-- no this isn't, this is an excerpt or an editorial, call it what you will, that was contained in the Winnipeg Tribune, and I'm sorry I haven't the date, Mr. Speaker; it was written by one I believe Mrs. S. June Menzies, and in this article this woman indicates that by Bill No. 7 we are eroding the Civil Service morale. How stupid--(Interjection)-- asinine yes; how stupid and asinine is the contents of this writer on the editorial page of the Winnipeg Tribune. She has even less knowledge of the contents of Bill No. 7 than does the Conservative representatives

BILL 7

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . in this House. And she, Mr. Speaker, - I believe it's the same person - is the Vice-Chairman of the Canada Council on the Equal Status of Women and the Rights of Women. Here by this editorial she's suggesting that we're attempted to erode the Civil Service of Manitoba, at the same time she's wearing a hat that says we should have equal opportunity for all but more in particular, women.

Now I agree, I agree, Mr. Speaker, with the Honourable the Member for Lakeside that that is an asinine approach by that particular editorial writer. --(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker - I'm in trouble? - yes, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend says that I'm in trouble. My honourable friend from Rock Lake says I'm in trouble. Mr. Speaker, the day that I am in trouble because I want to bring about equal opportunity for all of the people of Manitoba for equal participation by all of the citizens--with some exceptions, I recognize the exceptions may be insofar as certain aspects of the judiciary in this particular field because they may be called upon to make judicial decisions in respect to controverted elections, and we know we had quite a few of those--I would suggest that there are certain areas. But if my honourable friend says to me that I'm in trouble because of what I am proposing on behalf of the government in Bill No. 7, I'm prepared, Mr. Speaker, to be in trouble, I'm prepared to take any criticism directed at me; but I want to say, I want to say to my honourable friends I think they're in far more trouble than I, because in all of the years that the Conservatives had the opportunity of governing Manitoba the years that the Liberals had the opportunity of governing Manitoba, they had the right to do something, indeed, Mr. Speaker, they had the obligation to do something about it and they didn't. And now, Mr. Speaker, all that I can get from my honourable friend from Lakeside that my time of participation in this Bill may be up and he's saying shut up.

Mr. Speaker, I will not shut up, during the years that I have an opportunity to breath while there's inequality within the citizens of this province and while there's inequality within the rights of a free society. When I introduced this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I quoted, I quoted some remarks that were given by the late President Roosevelt when he was being inaugurated, and among other things he said, "We have four principles: The right of free expression and opportunity all over the world; the right of freedom from want everywhere in the world; the right of participation in democracy all over the world, and the right of also being part and parcel of a society". He suggested, wanted also in his four points freedom from fear, everywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence in the civil servants in the Province of Manitoba; I've had the opportunity of being the Minister in charge for the last five years. I know how they work and I respect them for it. I want them to be relieved of the freedom from fear that has prevailed for many years within the Civil Service. How well I recall it, when a Member in Opposition, that I had to meet with the Executive Director of the Employees Association in dark corridors.

Mr. Speaker, during this debate many members seemed to indicate our civil servants needed protection from the right of participation in politics. At times from the remarks made by members opposite, it would appear that, particularly the Conservative Party, that the members of the civil service, our employees, were not capable of decisions, not capable of thinking for themselves--(Interjection)--you are all wrong, and you're all wet too. Mr. Speaker, I have far greater faith in the ability of our civil servants and our employees to decide as to whether they participate in politics or not. The main purpose of Bill No. 7 is to give them the opportunity of choice, an opportunity which is now denied them under our legislation. I highly recommend the adoption of the principles contained in Bill No. 7.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order please.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs: Adam	Asper
Axworthy	Barrow
Bostrom	Boyce
Burtniak	Cherniack
Derewianchuk	Dillen
Doern	Evans
Gottfried	Green

BILL 7

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd). . .

Messrs: Johannson
 McBryde
 Marion
 Patrick
 Paulley
 Petursson
 Shafransky
 Turnbull
 Uskiw

Johnston (Portage la Prairie)
 Malinowski
 Miller
 Patterson
 Pawley
 Schreyer
 Toupin
 Uruski
 Walding

NAYS

Messrs: Banman
 Blake
 Craik
 Enns
 Graham
 Johnston (Sturgeon Cr.)
 McGill
 McKellar
 Minaker
 Watt

Bilton
 Brown
 Einarson
 Ferguson
 Henderson
 Jorgenson
 McGregor
 McKenzie
 Moug

CLERK: Yeas 32; Nays 19.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Yeas have it. Declare the motion carried.

. . . . Continued on next page.

BILL NO. 27

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Member for St. Boniface.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to for the next few minutes give the opinion of our party with respect to Bill 27. I think that by and large the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs has given us an insight into the reasons which prompt him into bringing forward this Bill, and I think that the rationale that he used is one that we can readily subscribe to, if it proves to be as conclusive in directing that we should enact this enabling legislation and then follow it up with exercising the enabling legislation. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in our province today there are a number of charitable and non-profit organizations who have been permitted through the Manitoba Golden Lotteries in helping themselves create the funds that they require to follow up on their preferred projects and many are the Manitobans who have benefitted by the sudden realization of funds through this self-help method.

With the advent of WesCan these very same organizations feel that in all probability the magnitude of the funds that are now available for them to follow up on their preferred projects will be dried up to a great extent and they will not then be permitted to follow up on the projects and bring them to fruition in the manner that they have now become accustomed over the past several years.

I think that if one studies very closely a brief which was presented by the 200-odd agencies who are presently in essence the selling agencies for the Manitoba Golden Lotteries, one can't help but query a number of the points that were made by the Minister with the information that he had available. I think that the one query that came to my mind immediately was that the Minister gave us a breakdown with respect to the way sales have been going in the last two or three years and although we had mostly a gradual increase, there had been some valleys. I think that he mentioned in some of his breakdown and this became part of the rationale for preparing this enabling legislation, that could or could not be exercised at a future date, he mentioned that only 30 percent of the tickets were sold in the Province of Manitoba which left 70 percent being sold in other parts of our country.

I read a newspaper article last week which gave a further breakdown of this 70 percent and I will use it as my basis for argument here, the mathematical argument that I would like to present. But it said that 30 of this 70 percent was being sold in Western Canada with the balance being sold, I suppose, elsewhere in Canada and the United States.

It would seem to me that if we exercised the enabling legislation that 21 percent in Western Canada necessarily has to disappear. I'm not sure what happens with the other 49 percent that is sold elsewhere in eastern Canada and to our neighbour south of us, but it would seem to me that if WesCan Lotteries were to come about, the anticipated sales profit, or the anticipated net sales of the tickets for the lottery would certainly be less than what they are today - at least to the extent of the 21 percent.

If I were to follow further the rationale of the Minister, and he placed a great deal of credence on the fact that we did not have a reciprocal agreement with respect to sales, this would then become applicable to the eastern provinces for WesCan because he mentioned that although the Attorney-General of the Province is working along with other Attorneys-General of the other provinces to arrive at a reciprocal agreement, he mentioned that if this reciprocal arrangement cannot be obtained then we dry up the sales possibilities in eastern Canada. I'm not sure of what portion of the remaining 49 percent is made up in eastern Canada but let's assume in the neighbourhood of 25 percent - half of that 49. We are therefore reducing further the potential sales of Manitoba inasmuch as it is the most easterly of the WesCan provinces and we have probably reduced the sales volume of the portion that Manitoba would be responsible for by some 50-odd percent. What then are the possibilities of the total benefits that will be incurred by Manitobans under the WesCan Lottery scheme? It would seem, and we have in the presentation by the 286 agencies the purported agreement - percentage agreement - it would seem that for the agencies themselves, not only do they lose 55 percent of the potential sale but their commissions are reduced by 40 percent. It would then seem that the possibilities of realizing the objectives that they are presently realizing become more and more less realistic.

If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then it would seem that following, or continuing the present Manitoba Golden Lotteries is an option that should certainly be looked at, because

BILL 27

(MR. MARION cont'd) although we do not have the reciprocal agreement no one will argue the fact that the Irish Sweepstakes are selling in large numbers in this province and other provinces of our country, and this is yielding to the Irish Sweepstakes many millions of dollars and I haven't seen the departments of the various Attorneys-General take action on precluding this sale from happening since lotteries have become legal in Canada.

I think that my colleague from Assiniboia mentions that the Olympic Lotteries have been very very successful and I certainly can't dispute that claim because inasmuch as I know today they will be awarding something in the neighbourhood of \$8 million in prizes, it would certainly indicate that the Olympic Lottery has been a very successful venture, and I'm certain, Mr. Speaker, that many millions of dollars have been garnered from the pockets of Manitobans and other western Canadians. Again I think that this would disallow to an extent the apprehension of the Minister with respect to the importance of securing the reciprocal agreement. It certainly has not been a deterrent for Manitobans to purchase these tickets, nor has it been in the case of the Irish Sweepstake as I mentioned.

It would seem then, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Minister should speak to his colleague the Attorney-General and impress upon him that top priority should be given to the dialogue between those Attorney-Generals to obtain a reciprocal agreement in all haste. I think that this would then protect the kind of receipts that the 286 agencies need to make their favorite programs come to fruition and continue to reap the kinds of benefits that they have, and it would also seem to indicate that the province itself that has been awarding the kind of money, the kind of money to all sorts of projects in the province as direct benefits because of the receipts of the Manitoba Golden Lotteries, it would seem that these will suffer as well. So with that in mind it would seem to me that although the premise under which the Minister has presented this kind of legislation has validity, I think that in the long run Manitobans will be the losers because we will not be able to reap the kind of profits from the lottery or the lottery scheme that we have been in the past. And it would seem to me that we will certainly be the major loser in all of this.

I think another point that has to be made, and the more one looks at this the more I am convinced we will come out on the short end of the stick. If the four western provinces go into the scheme we as a group that have the expertise in this kind of plan become the anchor man to making this scheme a viable one right from the outset. I think that the Minister mentioned this in his explanations of why he was bringing about this enabling legislation. Now I think how long will this remain. The moment that the brain has been picked and the other provinces become well versed on how this kind of a lottery system can work, they will then say well you're the most easterly, you're not the central, you don't generate the kind of profit that some of the more populous provinces are generating, it would seem logical that we move it to either Alberta or British Columbia. But I suppose that Alberta would be the benefactor because it would be more centrally located. So this in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is an inevitable kind of reaction in the long run. Again we become the neglected one. With respect, Mr. Speaker, to the kind of financial arrangements that are made I think that nothing is made - no agreement can be made in perpetuity, I think that again I will use the profit generating provinces coming back and saying, look the piece of the pie is too great for you because you're not participating to that extent, we would like a realignment of the kind of distribution to be made. Those are some of the things that can come about and make Manitoba the losers if ever this enabling legislation were acted upon.

We will listen very intently to the kind of representations, Mr. Speaker, that will be made at Law Amendments by the various agencies. I am sure that by now they have studied further the information that's available to them and will certainly have a great deal to say with respect to how they feel or what they feel about this kind of legislation. We will be listening very intently to the arguments that they will bring forth and reserve the right at that time to either support or not support the legislation that we have before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Riel. (Stand) Bill No. 36.

BILL 27

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Could I have this stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL NO. 38

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to thank the First Minister for supplying us with a complete rundown of the changes that are in this bill. It certainly makes it very handy; it also makes it very handy when we had just about exactly the same run-down of the bill last year, so we're also able to compare if there are any changes that came in this year versus last year.

I do not intend to spend a lot of time on this bill because as the First Minister has explained there are many technical changes and certainly many of the changes have been requested by the city to expedite matters faster in the City of Winnipeg and many changes have been recommended by the Law Reform Commission. And I can remember on one occasion being a little tough with the Minister of Urban Affairs at the time because the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission were not put in the first set of amendments but we have many of them here.

But there is one area, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly would have to take issue with and there is a section of the bill that refers that the Minister or the City of Winnipeg will put out any notice in their tax bills that the Government of Manitoba directs them to. Mr. Speaker, I kind of think this is quite an imposition. In fact I think it's rather gall that one form of government would take the time or the authority that it has as the Provincial Government and put legislation in which says you must send our literature or our notices out in your tax bills or whatever we tell you to do. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there probably have been times when the city has ignored or not done what the province requested or the Minister has requested that something go out with the tax bills and the way the bill read before was that "they may" and, Mr. Speaker, it almost seems that because they got turned down once or twice that they would say well they can't do that to us and they go home like little boys and make laws to tell the people that you can. And, Mr. Speaker, it can also be very costly for the city unless there's some money put in by the province to take care of the extra mailing or weight or whatever there may be by this involvement. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's, as I said, downright gall to write legislation saying that you must put your literature in my tax bills when I send out the taxes.

Mr. Speaker, there's another area of this bill that I think is very serious and there's an area of the bill that says it will be retroactive to January 1, 1972. Now this is a very serious matter. Mr. Speaker, when we passed the Winnipeg Act one of the assurances the employees of all areas and cities that were amalgamated was that they would maintain at least their present salaries and they would also maintain their positions and their titles. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that the idea of amalgamation is to amalgamate and maybe cut down, but also one of the principles of amalgamation is to cut down in time, as people retire, etc., you can straighten those situations out. But we now have a situation because of Inner City who have men with much more seniority on the police or fire departments, will now be made the lieutenants over the fellows in the suburbs who may have been captains or lieutenants in forces. You could possibly have a situation where you'd have lieutenant firemen knocked down to a first class fireman because of the seniority situation, and if you didn't change his salary you'd have a first class fireman making a lieutenant's wage working beside a first class fireman making a first class fireman's wage, so you're looking towards a very bad imbalance in the section towards the end of the bill.

And then also, Mr. Speaker, they're making it retroactive to January 1, 1972. And you know I can clearly remember the time when we amalgamated the City of St. James with the municipality of Brooklands and then we amalgamated to become St. James-Assiniboia, I can clearly remember being in Law Amendments one night, Sir, as an alderman of St. James so that we could answer any questions the committee may have of us and the members of the NDP party at that time who were on that commission were very concerned that every employee within those two cities when they amalgamated would be treated fairly. And the concern was there when this bill went through, although I did not agree with the one city bill, but the concern for the employees was there, but now we have a piece of legislation asking us to go right

BILL 38

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) back to day one of the amalgamation of the city and let it be that they can change the classifications or the positions of men who were working with all the cities at that time--(Interjection)--and women, you're quite right.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think governments at any time like retroactive legislation. Certainly I don't like retroactive legislation and this type of retroactive legislation which can have an effect on a man's position because the amalgamation of the 13 cities and municipalities came into effect on January 1, 1972 is very devastating. What you thought was absolutely right then you're changing completely now, instead of having you take the time to phase its way out and correct it.

Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister introduced the legislation he mentioned it was all technical and I have agreed with that but I found that those two areas that I've spoken of now are almost policy, in fact they are policy matters which is certainly not of a technical nature, they certainly have effect on many peoples lives. And there is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, about the legislation regarding positions, regarding classifications, regarding titles. There is a court case in the courts right now which has not been decided. There is a man in the City of Winnipeg who has taken the city to court which is his right, Mr. Speaker, to defend his position. That case is presently in the courts and any passage of this legislation here, any passage of this legislation takes what I would say that man's rights away from him that has not been decided by the courts. I think we all know the case. Presently he's had an accident, he's recovering and the case is still before the courts. I don't think that this Legislature should decide that case for him. Especially when we make it retroactive 1972. If we want to have something come into effect now or the beginning of next year that's a different ball of wax but we have now said that this legislation is retroactive to 1972 and thrown this man's case right out of court. Mr. Speaker, there's not any way that we can support those two items in that bill.

Mr. Speaker, there would be an increase in costs as I say to the city as far as one other change is concerned, where the city used to be able to make a decision about who all of the registered mail and letters would go to regarding specific notices for zoning changes and they used to use their judgment as to whether it was a necessity. You could have a very large amount of mail going out for say a small zoning change for a garage or extension of a garage or say another storey on the top of a house which is going to be allowed and that, Sir, is a much different situation than if you're going to build a 14 or 15 storey high-rise apartment. But you've changed the legislation again into an area of policy here which it says "you must", you must send out all this, and I think that that is going to put quite a cost on the city, and it also, Mr. Speaker, slows up the process of getting these zoning changes through which we have been very, very critical of the city for and I think that in this case they could use their own judgment as to saving of money and hoping that the changes could be made with expediency. I think also that that is a small policy change and I think should be considered.

But, Mr. Speaker, the rest of the bill, I'm certainly sure that I will have questions when we're in the Municipal Committee, to the First Minister. I'm very pleased that the fact that the First Minister is now our Minister of Urban Affairs, he's our fifth one, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the fact that the position has been taken over by the First Minister that he's decided that it's an important portfolio and it will not be bounced around from chair to chair as it has in the past. So, Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say in this bill and I'll have further questions when we get into the Municipal Committee. Thank you.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 42, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 42, the Veterinary Medical Act for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

BILL NO. 42

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this particular bill I want to make a point of the fact that we have had legislation governing the business of veterinary medicine in this province now for some number of years, introduced for the first time I believe away back in 1957, and I want to state that these amendments, or these changes embodied in this new act represent

BILL 42

(MR. USKIW cont'd) the experience of a good number of years, and represent the recommendations indeed of the professional group in question who have had a great deal of dialogue with the political people for some number of years now; and I believe if I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, there was one attempt a few years ago to have a new act drawn and presented to the Legislature, I believe by the then Member for Selkirk.

It is felt that there are needed changes in that professional act and that if we bring about the kind of changes that we are proposing that we will have a much better - a public liaison with the professional group, and indeed will be able to provide the communities of Manitoba with a greater degree of public service and indeed greater degree of public participation.

This act provides for a change in the way in which the professional association would govern the practice of veterinary medicine in this province in that it retains for the association only those areas, Mr. Speaker, responsible for continuing education and things of that kind.

The other aspect here provides for a public representation on a board which will indeed give us much broader public representation and support from the public should therefore come forward because I think it is often felt by many, Mr. Speaker, that many professional associations who do not have general public support and representation on their governing boards do not necessarily always reflect the public interest as a whole. So I want to say for the record, Mr. Speaker, that I give credit to this particular association who is willing to have public participation in the decision making area and in particular where it involves examinations and licensing and discipline of the whole system of veterinary medicine. I think this is a very progressive step on the part of the veterinary medical association group.

There aren't too many changes apart from those, Mr. Speaker, but to name a few: We will no longer require that an individual would have to be a Canadian citizen to belong to the association. We will provide in this new act, Mr. Speaker, authority given by the board for graduates to practice while they are waiting for their documentation and registration. And we will also have provision, Mr. Speaker, for vet college students to practice before they have fully completed their training, and in particular if they are eligible to enter their final year of training, we will allow them under this new act to enter practice for a period of some six months, under supervision of course. We also are providing for the use of paraprofessionals in this area for people which have passed technical studies courses accredited by the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association and indeed recognized by the Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association as well.

Mr. Speaker, this will indeed enhance the over-all approach to veterinary medicine in the Province of Manitoba. You will appreciate that we have launched a very extensive veterinary program, provincewide, through the establishment of veterinary clinics, through the upgrading of our scholarship fund to attract new students. Indeed we hope that all tied together, including the changes that we are proposing in this Act, we will be able to provide a much better service to the Province of Manitoba.

I believe the member wants to ask a question.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister would entertain a question at this time. I was wondering if the Minister would indicate while he is introducing this bill what changes in policy the government is entertaining towards the greater use of the Veterinary Colleges both in Guelph and in Saskatoon, and the availability of space there for Manitobans to attend the colleges?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that particular aspect of course is not germane to this particular piece of legislation and really could have been and should have been discussed under the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. We have a relationship with the Sask. Vet. College, which my honourable friend should be familiar with and I don't believe there's any point in entertaining discussions on that aspect of it since it would be completely out of context of this bill before us, Mr. Speaker.

I believe I have covered all of the essential important changes to the act and I simply want to say to the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that should they want greater clarification and discussion that of course we will have an opportunity in Committee, where we hope there will be people involved and present at that particular time to respond to particular areas that my honourable friends may want to question. So with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I

BILL 42

(MR. USKIW cont'd) recommend the measure to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 43, an Act to Amend the Farm Machinery and Equipment Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

BILL NO. 43

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this particular bill I want to remind members opposite that this is another series of amendments to a very important piece of legislation that we have on the books in this province, and that these changes emanate from the experience of the Farm Machinery Board who are charged with certain responsibilities under the Farm Machinery and Equipment Act, and who recommend these changes based on the last year or two of experience with respect to the current provisions.

I want to take a moment or two to advise members opposite that that particular board has been most active in that in the period October '71 to March 31, '73 the board held some 24 meetings, Mr. Speaker; 12 meetings during the fiscal year 1973-74. They dealt with some 101 applications for repossession up to March 31 of 1973 and 69 during the year April 1, 1973 to March 31, '74. In the corresponding periods 87 and 75 complaints were dealt with in depth with many more inquiries and emergency repair situations and so forth, Mr. Speaker.

Of the 170 applications for repossession received by the board the board was successful in the majority of cases of working out an arrangement which indeed did not require or did not result in a repossession. I think that, Mr. Speaker, should indicate to us all the importance of setting up that particular board some few years ago. It is possible with the right kind of approach to avoid the kind of thing that we have all complained about and that is from time to time the unnecessary repossessions that have taken place over time. Many times not because of the willful negligence of the individual whose machinery is being repossessed, Mr. Speaker, but where there are extenuating circumstances beyond the control of that individual which have to be looked into.

The board has also had some 20-odd meetings throughout rural Manitoba trying to explain the role which they play and trying to explain to both the dealers, the manufacturers and indeed the users of farm machinery, the intent of the legislation.

Based on their experience however, Mr. Speaker, they are recommending a series of changes in the act in order to make things work better; based on the representations that they have had during these 20-some odd rural meetings we are now in a position to again update and improve the workings of that legislation.

To list the changes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise members that the warranty sections are being changed in this particular amendment. As you know, we have a three-year warranty provision with respect to tractors and combines and we are hopeful that by adding to that an hourly limit, so that it's either/or whichever comes first, that we provide a more reasonable approach to warranty provisions in our legislation, again based on the discussions that we have had throughout the countryside.

We also feel, basis the experience of the board that certain component parts should not be legislated in the way that we have to date but rather should be regulated and that of course would allow for greater degrees of flexibility with respect to individual items. Examples would be belts and hydraulic parts, batteries, electrical equipment and things of that nature which do not necessarily have to be tied to the over-all warranty provisions of the machine itself.

Also adjustments in the warranty provisions for transportation are being proposed which will indeed remove essentially the warranty on transportation, with the exception, however, of cases where machines cannot be moved, cannot be driven, for reasons rather of size, weight or immobility. It is also intended with these provisions to license vendors for the greater protection of dealers and farmers. Again that's a tidying up procedure, Mr. Speaker, based on the experience that we have had to date with this particular act.

The changes that are being recommended with respect to bonding we hope will streamline

BILL 43

(MR. USKIW cont'd) the system so that we don't operate a somewhat stereotype system where everyone is treated exactly the same regardless of their mode of operation; will allow us flexibility so that we can proportionately charge the necessary bonding fees based on the kind of enterprise or operation of the dealer.

It is also proposed that we have a central bonding mechanism wherein the Consolidated Fund would be involved to provide for what we might call blanket bonding coverage for a whole host of categories of dealers or repair shops or whatever that may be classified under that section and wherein it may be possible for us to levy varying fees for the support of that blanket bonding provision.

Those are the main changes. I know there are a whole host of other small changes, Mr. Speaker, but they reflect only technical changes and changes relating to the points that I have listed. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation \$20 million--passed. Manitoba Development Corporation \$39,900,000. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews was on his feet when you called the item and said pass with regard . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon. Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to deal with some of the comments made by the Member for Fort Rouge on Thursday last week, during the Supply debate on housing. Sometimes I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether the members of this House either listen to each other or whether they bother to read speeches made by honourable members over whom they're disputing policy or facts and that thought came to my mind when I listened to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge criticising our housing program and also read over his speech carefully this afternoon just to again verify what I thought I had heard. And I find a peculiar thing, particularly among the Liberals, and that is that they just don't seem to listen. We can repeat on this side time after time a certain position and the members of the Liberal Party continually distort that.

Now the Member for Fort Rouge in his closing remarks commented on the fact that he believed his position was that public housing, public family housing must only be one component of a housing program, a general housing program with a variety of programs to deal with a variety of needs. And, Mr. Chairman, I can't dispute that position because that's the position that I have been putting forward for a long time; that's the position the Minister put forward in reply to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, but the members of the Liberal Party don't seem to listen.

I agree with the honourable member that public housing can only be one component of a housing program which must have variety to deal with a variety of problems within the housing field and there's no disagreement on that. I would agree with the honourable member in some of his observations on the housing market, housing problems within the City of Winnipeg. I would agree for example that if the province proceeds with a land banking program which is not connected to a general strategy the result can be that the price of land is simply driven up further than it's already rising in the City of Winnipeg. So we have agreement there.

However, I must stress that the government, the housing corporation believes in a variety of programs within the housing field, and I mentioned these on Wednesday. We are proceeding with housing for senior citizens, we are also proceeding with public housing. We are proceeding,

CAPITAL SUPPLY

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) or trying to proceed with assistance to co-ops. We are already in process of proceeding with an assisted home ownership program. As the Minister pointed out, the province is participating along with CMHC in assisted home ownership and the result has been that hopefully people with incomes as low as \$6,000 now can purchase housing through provincial assistance and through federal assistance. The Minister pointed out that this doesn't guarantee that the program is going to work because the present housing market is a very volatile one. Housing prices are proceeding upward at a great rate. The housing corporation is also proceeding with a remote housing program which sells single family dwellings to people, and we've been doing this for years.

The province is proceeding to assist in the development of the neighbourhood improvement program. Again the Minister pointed out this will take time, the result of this program will take years to show up and it won't substantially add to housing stock. The province over the last couple of years has been proceeding with the best, the largest housing renovation program in the country, the pensioner home repair program and this program will be attached to MHRC and will form one of the variety of programs that it delivers. The province has also announced that it will be proceeding with a program to provide mortgages in small communities where CMHC will not provide mortgage funds. So, Mr. Speaker, I've just listed eight programs, only one of which is public housing, which the province is offering as a variety of housing policy alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member brought up the fact that in 1971 a paper was submitted by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to the Cabinet which set as a guideline the objective of building a 21,000 to 22,000 housing units in the province over a five year period and the Member for Fort Rouge castigated us at great length about failure to realize our objectives in this area. We set an objective, a guideline in 1971 of building 21,000 to 22,000 housing units and the member states that we have failed to meet this objective.

Now he claims that we only built 1,500 units in 1972, 500 in 1973 and states that by our own criteria we have been a failure in this area. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that that paper, that cabinet paper in 1971 set out guidelines only, an objective. I would ask the member to also be aware of the fact that that paper in 1971 set as an objective that two-thirds of the housing would be built in the City of Winnipeg--I'm sure his source person probably told him this also, but he didn't mention it--two-thirds of the housing was to be built in the City of Winnipeg and two-thirds of the housing was to be public housing.

I would also stress, Mr. Speaker, that that paper was drafted in 1971, prior to Unicity, prior to the difficulties that emerged for the corporation in doing any building in the City of Winnipeg, and the result is that in three years, the first three years of this program, we've only built 8,000 units of housing - 8 to 9,000 - roughly 8,000 in those three years. And, Mr. Speaker, if we're lucky in the next two years we may build another 7,000. And I stress "if we're lucky" because the City of Winnipeg is a very intangible area right now. It's difficult to predict - I said, it's a very difficult area in which to predict right now. I say if we're lucky we may build 15,000 at the end of that five-year period. But by that criteria our housing program has failed; but, Mr. Chairman, by our own criteria we have failed, but if we measure our performance against the performance of the largest public housing agency in Canada, the Ontario Housing Corporation, the following fact emerges; that we have been building, if you take into consideration our population, twice as much in terms of volume as the Ontario Housing Corporation. And, Mr. Chairman, I would state--(Interjection)--no I wouldn't state categorically, but for the Honourable Member for Lakeside's benefit I would say, that in spite of the fact that there is a Conservative Government in Ontario, and has been for a long time, they have carried out a very admirable housing program. The housing program of the Ontario Housing Corporation has been a very good one; given the problems they have to deal with, they have done a fantastic job. They were the first province in this country to go into the field of public housing in a very large way and they are to be congratulated; the Conservative Government of Ontario is to be congratulated for its progressive policy in this area. The unfortunate thing is, Mr. Chairman, that the members opposite don't seem to share in some of the progressive traits of the Ontario Conservative Party. That is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Fort Rouge implied that the backbenchers in this party, that the members of this party were, to put it mildly, unrealistic; he has now a number of

CAPITAL SUPPLY

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) times claimed that we seem to be high on Bennies or drugs of some sort when we're speaking about our policies. But when I examine his speeches, Mr. Chairman, I wonder really who's being realistic and who's being high. He brought out the fact, for example, that MHRC one year failed to use a \$7 million allotment for land banking, and yet he neglected to mention the fact that that \$7 million allotment wasn't used in 1971; 1971 was the year when MHRC committed about 4,300 units of housing. That's the same year that MHRC was given an additional allocation of \$20 million with six weeks left to go in the year. So, Mr. Speaker, I really don't think that that was any great failure; MHRC failed to use that money in a year when with 23 people on staff they committed half as many housing units for construction as Ontario Housing Corporation committed with a staff of 6 to 700 people. And there's a simple reason why that money wasn't used. The fact is that MHRC simply didn't have the staff to handle that at that time.

I want to deal with some of the comments the honourable member made about the staff of MHRC. The honourable member indulged in some pretty nasty attacks on the personnel and the staff of MHRC. He impugned their professional competence. He impugned their ability. Now this isn't a new thing, he's following the lead of his leader who also has indulged in the past on nasty attacks on members of the Civil Service. The Members of the Official Opposition have done the same thing. The Honourable Member, the Leader of the Liberal Party brought up in the Legislature on the basis of an unsigned anonymous letter, accusations against staff in MHRC, on the basis of an unsigned anonymous letter he brought this up in the Legislature, and in doing so he dragged the names of two staff members, at least three staff members, into the newspapers. These gentlemen didn't have the benefit of being able to reply, being civil servants, so it's a very nasty kind of procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party on a point of order.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps a point of privilege as well. The information that the honourable member refers to as having been given to this Legislature was proved of sufficient substance as to warrant an investigation by the Attorney-General and he should not permit his comments to be not incognizant of the fact that there is a pending investigation by the Attorney-General. He by raising the issue again, invites comments which would be non conducive to an independent investigation by his own Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: What a retort. Mr. Chairman, that doesn't negate what I've said at all. Certainly we're investigating it. If we don't investigate of course we're accused of covering up. Therefore the matter was handed over in a responsible way by the government to the Attorney-General's Department for investigation. Mr. Chairman I am . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Conversing with the honourable . . .

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is indulging in a bit of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well talk to the Chair, I'm very patient.

MR. JOHANNSON: But he has indulged in some very nasty personal attacks on the staff of MHRC and now his backbench follower is indulging in the same sort of stuff only without naming names. --(Interjection)-- If you prove it fine. The government will certainly act if some member of its staff is acting in an improper way, the government will certainly act to correct that situation. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that our rules specify, Beauchesne specifies that members should ascertain for themselves the truth of statements they make before they make them in the House; members should attempt to ascertain the truth of statements before they make them in the House, and that certainly doesn't apply to the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

The Member for Fort Rouge as I said again made some nasty comments about the lack of professional competence of the staff of MHRC. He stated that back in 1971 when MHRC had people of professional competence, they carried out a vast housing program and it's dropped since. Now I would point out to the honourable member a number of things. --(Interjection)-- No, no, not ten times a staff. In 1971 the staff of MHRC was 23 people. This year, right now it's roughly 50 and it's calculated to rise to--no, it's about 50 and it's calculated to rise to about 72. So your figures are wrong.

In 1971 when that program was carried out there were a lot of advantages that we don't have today. Uncity didn't exist, and I would point out also that MHRC proceeded in a very direct way to build housing in areas where people didn't particularly like that housing, but we

CAPITAL SUPPLY

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) built it. And I think if not now at least within a few years a lot of that housing will be accepted by the local community. As the Minister point out, one thing those people found out very quickly was that their property values in the community didn't fall. In fact I would be willing to look at the housing values in St. James around the public housing projects and I would be willing to bet, and I think my bet is a very safe one, that that private housing is worth a great deal more now than it was when those public housing projects were built.

The honourable member stated that the more we build, the more MHRC builds--pardon me, the more we hire, the less we build and that is true. That has been the pattern over the last three years. But I would point out there are a number of reasons for this. And the staff is going to increase inevitably as long as the housing program continues.

In 1971 there were almost no units onstream for management, now there are over 6,000, and I stand to be corrected on that figure but that is probably fairly accurate - over 6,000. Those have to be managed in terms of rent collection, in terms of maintenance, tenants relations programs have to be carried on and this all involves staff. The honourable member has spent a great deal of time offering additional programs that should be carried on by MHRC and I would point out that every time you add an additional program, another variation, you have to hire more staff.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. JOHANNSON: Because each of these has to be carried out. For example, the Assisted Home Ownership Program involves the hiring of some staff on behalf of MHRC to administer the program. The more sophisticated you make your program, the more staff you have to hire.

The member also pointed out, and I'm not sure where he's getting his information but I have a hunch, he pointed out, or he stated that MHRC is increasingly hiring contract employees. At present there are two contract employees. Mr. Chairman, that sure is a trend. Two employees out of a staff of roughly 50 are contract. He made some comment about red hots, we're supposed to be importing red hots - I'm not sure from where, I guess from the bad eastern areas of Toronto and so on. It seems to be a sin bringing people in from the east. I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that as far as I'm aware we haven't brought in anyone from Toronto. On the housing corporation staff, we have one member of the housing corporation board that is an easterner and it may be that the honourable member is referring to that gentleman who is a civil servant. However, I wish the member when he's attacking our housing program, when he's attacking government programs would attack us only on the basis of policy and performance rather than bringing in civil servants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Chairman--the Minister is waiting for his supply. Now I would . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It might be a good point, that is the hour being 5:30 I'll be leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.