

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 22, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 79, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) 1962.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 66, an Act to amend The Reserve for Debt Retirement Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House.

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

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 87, an Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 71, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Women's Tribute Memorial Lodge Foundation."

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 77, an Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded; and Bill No. 78, an Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation; and Bill No. 82, The Winnipeg General Hospital Act; and Bill No. 83, an Act to incorporate The Westminster United Church Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 12 standing, of the Boissevain Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. McCullough. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

We also have with us today 60 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Froese and Mr. Blahey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

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

Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Is it correct that Mr. Bill Fallis has been named the Chairman of the Hydro Board.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, no appointment has been made to that position.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question. Is it correct that the appointment will be announced this week?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if I had the ability to look into the crystal ball and forecast events, I sure as the devil wouldn't be sitting in here.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 14 dated March 18, 1968, from the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Are there any plans made presently to renovate, clean up the Brandon Jail situation?

MR. LYON: Is my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, referring to the jail or to a situation? There are regular renovations being carried on at the jail institution annually.

MR. DOW: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. This building is so antiquated, I was wondering if any program is being made to set this up, bring it modern.

April 22, 1968

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has she had any discussions either by telephone or in person with the Mayor of Carberry since the allegations were made by one of the councillors? Has the Minister had any discussions with the Mayor of Carberry either in person or by telephone since the allegations were made last week by one of the members of the council?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I often speak to the Mayor of Carberry.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, my question was: has she talked to him since the allegations were made?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, yes, but I don't have to tell him what my private conversation is.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask her what she was talking about. I just asked her if she did talk to him.

MR. LYON: ... the question period end very quickly on items of urgent concern, if there are indeed any items that fall in that category.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Attorney-General. Is he completely satisfied with the condition of the jail and the problem, if there is one, at Brandon?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not completely satisfied with the condition of any jail, anywhere.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Since the wind-up proceedings of Westbank have now been dismissed from the provincial courts, I wonder if he could tell me whether or not the Provincial Government did anything to attempt to retain Westbank in Manitoba.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware of the fact that they had been dismissed and I'm not prepared to make any statement on it at the moment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Acting Minister of Highways. The question is: in consideration of the fact that the road maps presently and in the past were prepared by the National Survey, Chester, Vermont, U.S.A., is there not a company in Manitoba that is in a position to prepare the road maps for Manitoba?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to take that question as notice and will answer my honourable friend.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Provincial Secretary could tell me when I might expect the return on the Order for the Day he accepted March 28th, with regard to some tenders.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps that had been tabled but I'll be glad to check it. I'm sorry.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it true that the Brandon Poultry Company is in the process of closing its doors?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence and contracts between the Manitoba Government and/or Manitoba Hydro, and Dryden Chemicals Limited, regarding the supplying of power to Dryden Chemicals Limited.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCLEAN: ... one word, in indicating that as far as I'm concerned this is satisfactory, that I'm assuming we would require the approval of Dryden Chemicals Limited since part of this would relate to their correspondence, and subject only to that, we're quite satisfied.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.)

1. Names of all members of the Boundaries Commission;
2. Number, date and duration of meetings held by the Boundaries Commission since its formation;
3. Places where meetings were held;
4. Members in attendance;
5. Amount paid to each member, including chairman and vice-chairman, since their appointment;
6. Total cost of the Boundaries Commission to date including travel and all other expenses.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: What is the latest total estimated cost of the Portage Diversion?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur, standing in my name,

I'd like to inform the House that on Friday last the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, when dealing with several bills which included Bill No. 37, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, moved that the Report of the Committee be received, whereupon the Honourable Member for Gladstone moved the following amendment: That the Report of the Committee be not now received with regard to Bill 37, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, and that it be referred back to the Committee for further consideration with regard to the breathalizer tests and for the inclusion of such tests in the Act.

In reviewing this matter, I find that there has been an Order, there's been on the Order Paper for some time a proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia requesting that legislation be enacted, which reads in part as follows: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the requisite legislation be enacted enabling the law enforcement agencies to require drivers, who are believed on reasonable and probable grounds to be under the influence of alcohol, to submit to a breathalyzer test." In the light of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, the latter in my opinion anticipates a matter already appointed for consideration and contrary to our Rule 31. Furthermore, discussion last Friday on the subject brought forward an opinion that the government will be bringing down legislation this Session pursuant to the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, dealing with the use of the breathalyzer in the Province of Manitoba. In addition, I find that Speaker Lemieux in Ottawa, on March 19, 1929, ruled out of order a motion for an infraction because it anticipated the debate on the Order Paper. In this regard I would refer the honourable members to Beauschesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Third Edition 1943, Page 793. Under the rules of this House no debate can anticipate a question which is already on the Order Paper. I therefore declare the amendment out of order.

Are you ready for the question of the motion?

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend realizes that there was a motion proposed by the Chairman of the Committee reporting back on third reading of bills. Is this what he wishes to adjourn?

MR. FROESE: Yes. Yes. Very much so.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member was present in the House when this matter was dealt with the other day and I feel confident that he has full knowledge of the expression of the Honourable the Attorney-General as it has to do with Bill 37.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): No, no ... if I may. I believe the Honourable Member for Rhineland wishes to adjourn the debate ... the receipt of the report from the Committee, which of course he has the right so to do.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough now, Sir, to call the Committee of Supply?

April 22, 1968

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. We were on Resolution No. 55, Industry and Commerce. Resolution 55--passed. Resolution 56 (a)--passed ...

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, during the past few weeks there has been some considerable discussion about the Information Services Branch, better known as the Propaganda Branch. Mr. Chairman, there have been a couple of incidents in the past which just substantiate the allegations made by this side of the House. One instance, I watched a TV program whereby a member of that branch comes on and publicly debated statements that had been made on this side of the House by members of both the Liberal and the NDP Parties. On another occasion, I had occasion to take part in a public affairs broadcast which was subsequently obtained by the Information Services Branch - they obtained a tape of it - and then with the Minister they went over it and over it to see what I had said. Mr. Chairman, these men have now become political hacks because of the Minister's wishes. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that regardless of what is said by any member of this side of the House, it is not the responsibility of that branch to contradict it at any time regardless of whether they agree or disagree with it. That's the responsibility of the Minister or the government members. And the fact that a member of that branch goes on television to contradict statements on this side of the House just substantiates what we have said before.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard a great deal of talk about trying to save money, and it's a disgrace the way the money is being spent in this particular branch. We have in this branch a Director of Information Services, a man who spends most of his time in the gallery taking notes for the Minister, drawing a salary of something like \$17,300. We have a Director of News Service; we have a News Editor; we have a Radio Editor; and we have two secretaries and three writers, one of which I understand has left very recently. Mr. Chairman, now we have two Metropolitan newspapers in this city who have large staffs of reporters and one editor looking after the whole number of them. In this Services Branch we have four editors and three writers. A competent newsman - and there are several in both newspapers - could easily handle the job that you're delegating to four men. Prior to this new change, Norm Donogh looked after the branch with a helper and there was no one questioned that this man was most competent and did an excellent job. All of a sudden you have to hire a number of men to do the same work that's being done there now.

One of the things that intrigues me and other people is why a man was brought from Ontario to run this department which had been run effectively by Mr. Donogh. We have now learned from sources in Brandon that the Minister has hired a TV editor but is waiting for the Legislature to prorogue before he takes him on staff. We also discover that upstairs where the Civil Service have their offices, they have now spent some \$7,000 refurbishing the rooms; they have put radio equipment in it, a switchboard; and he tells the news media he is reassessing the department. Now who does he think he's kidding? He's waiting till the House prorogues and then they're going to move in.

Mr. Chairman, four of these men are driving government cars. I expect him to say they need these cars for other members of the department but I've seen them on occasion using their own cars. I'm advised they have expensive Sony radios on their desk. This is the Minister who is trying to tell us that government is spending the taxpayers' money in a proper manner. Mr. Chairman, the Information Services Branch has become nothing but a department to blow up the ego of the present Minister.

I want to show you one of the recent pictures that arrived in the news media to show just a small incident of what's going on in this department. Metro is considering buying some buses from the city, from Western Flyer Coach, and who do you think the department sends out pictures of? The Minister of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Chairman, I have access to the material that comes out of that department and I can tell you, before this issue was raised that nearly all the information centered around the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) it's so bad that on one occasion they didn't mention his name in an article as many times as he felt it was necessary, and it was sent down to be re-written to inject his name more often in the article. Now this is just the height of this department, how ridiculous it's getting.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there's no secret that this man is slowly building up an organization with the idea of taking over the Premier's chair...

SOME MEMBERS: Oh no!

MR. GUTTORMSON: He may deny it but there are certain people who are aware of this and have made it aware to me.

The Minister has said on occasion that this department spends less money than other provinces. Well, Mr. Chairman, this doesn't wash with me. I don't care how much money another province is spending. If they're spending too much money it's no excuse for this Minister to go on a spending spree. This present Minister has the good fortune to come from a well-to-do family and I suggest if they ran their affairs like he runs that department they'd go bankrupt in an awful hurry. The squandering of money is disgraceful and I suggest that something should be done about it in a hurry. People are fed up paying high taxes and for this Minister to go on blowing the money out the window just to build up his own ego. For example, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that amongst the furniture bought they bought three chairs - \$500.00 for these chairs.

As I said earlier in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, the Information Services Branch was handled in a very effective manner by a very competent man, Mr. Donogh, and all of a sudden he is replaced by a man from the outside. Yet this man wasn't competent enough to do the job; they had to send him around Canada to look at all the Information Services Branches in other governments to learn the job. Now does this make sense? I suggest that it doesn't and it's just another waste of money. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, they have in this room upstairs a bunch of radio equipment now, to put into effect as soon as the House prorogues. We have in the press gallery in this House a number of competent newsmen and newspaper men, and I suggest that they can handle the news themselves. They don't need the Minister giving them tapes. This is just an insult to the news people. I think it's time that we let the newspaper people interview the Ministers to discuss the various government programs if they want to make them known. This is perfectly in order. But the responsibility is not for the government to write the information for these newspaper men, and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, it's so slanted that ninety-odd percent of all the material that goes to a newspaper has to be junked or rewritten because it can't possibly be written or run the way it is today. It's so slanted under the present circumstances.

Oh, he's sitting there -- the Minister is taking it I think as a great joke that he's got this department, blowing the money of the taxpayers, but I suggest, and I'm hoping, that the Premier will soon step in and stop this tremendous waste that's going on with this Minister. When a Minister's ego is such that he has to get them to write stories over again because his name isn't in the story enough and because nearly every story has to be about him -- I must confess, though, that since the House started on the seventh we've seen less of his name in the releases and other Ministers are starting to get a share of the action, but I can assure you that when the House prorogues it'll all be one Minister again. And you know, Mr. Chairman, he's had this department brought under his jurisdiction now - it used to be under the Cabinet's jurisdiction, now I understand it's under his jurisdiction now - so he will have full say over all the information that goes out. He's not anxious to mention anybody except himself.

And I'd be interested, Mr. Chairman, to know why such a high salary of \$17,000-odd was paid to this man when he had a competent man there before; he was brought from the outside. There are untold number of competent newsmen in this city who could have been hired for a great deal less, but yet he's the big shot. He's got to pay big money at the taxpayers' expense. And when I look around the gallery, we see these men in the House all the time because they've got nothing else to do, and yet you can spend \$17,000 a year on these men. This is \$4,000 more than the Premier of the last government received. This just gives you an example of the waste of this Minister.

I suggest, if you want to have an Information Services Branch, that the head of it should make it possible for newsmen to interview the different Ministers when they have a program and give them an opportunity to discuss the program with the Minister, but don't try to shove it down their throat with a release and not give the news people an opportunity to ask the

April 22, 1968

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) Ministers questions on these programs. And I suggest that this department has no right debating issues that are raised by the Opposition, and I suggest that they have no right going down to the CEC to pick up tapes, then study them with the Minister. This just substantiates that they're political hacks and they're made this way by the Minister. I think it's a disgrace and I think it's time that something was done to change it.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Chairman, I think the Member from St. George has covered the situation very well, and in view of the remarks that he has just made I'm prepared to move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that

Whereas the over 100 percent increase in the appropriation in Resolution No. 56 is in direct contradiction to the Premier's stated policy to separate our needs from our wants; and

Whereas there has been no noticeable increase in Manitoba's population to justify such a huge increase of public spending in this department;

Therefore that the amount of \$148, 610 be reduced to \$73, 663, which was the amount of the 1966 level of spending.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'm sorry, the motion wasn't put by you -- I'll wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of form, I wonder if I could either hear or see the exact wording at the end there. It doesn't really seem to -- it's in the form of a resolution but I didn't hear the words "Therefore be it resolved", nor did I hear moved that some straight action be taken. The last words here: Therefore that the amount of so and so be reduced. Now I don't think there's any particular point of being sticky about it. I take it it's a motion to reduce the amount of \$148, 000 as specified in the last ... It's just simply that the wording isn't correct.

MR. DAWSON: ... I think is all we need in there. Is that not correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Order, please. May I have the indulgence of the committee for a moment?

Well, I think that in view of the fact, according to our rules, that the one motion that we can make in committee outside of the one that I mentioned the other day, that the amount that we are considering under any particular item in the estimates is the motion to reduce, I believe that the motion is in order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order again, if I may, I had no objection to the substance of the motion. I was directing attention to the fact the way it was worded. It was not a complete motion. However, if I take it you're ruling, Mr. Chairman, that it is a motion by the honourable gentleman, duly seconded, that the amount specified first be reduced to the amount specified second, in that case it's in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that it is. I think the intent is there to reduce the amount. Are you ready for the question? The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, when I took a look at the estimates and the amount that we are going to spend for Public Information Branch, that's the item we're on, \$148, 610, and on the other side of that sheet we have last year's figures of \$73, 663, this is a very substantial increase - more than 100 percent; and when I take a look at the previous year's estimates, we have to take a look at the Provincial Secretary's estimates, because that's where they'll find this item, Information Services is listed here as \$45, 149 for the previous year, and for the year previous to that one it shows \$39, 097, so actually the increase is much larger than what is given to understand on the new estimates, the way I can figure it out, because it's almost four times the figure of the item of the previous year. I would like to know from the Minister just what these increases contain. What are they there for? What are we getting for the additional monies, and just on what point are we getting the increased services? Is it going for supplies, or is it going for extra salaries, or just what is the additional amount going for?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, possibly for some differences of reason. I'm not sure, however, whether or not the reason that I have in mind judging from the resolution, and I'm sorry I haven't a copy of it with me so that I could have considered, but it did seem to me that one of the principal objectives of the resolution was to reduce the amount back to what it was in the estimates for the year ending 1968, and that appears to me to be one of the purposes of the resolution.

But it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that irrespective of what the amount is, that if

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the government continues to use the appropriation for the purposes that it has been using over the number of years, that really the reduction in itself will not make too much difference, because with \$73,000-odd of last year, the same complaint as we're levying today against the government prevailed, because you see, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with an appropriation of \$148,000 for the year that just started here, 23 or 24 days ago, and we're basing our criticisms on what happened last year because last year we did have the highfalutin Lord High Pooh Bah of the propaganda machine. It's not somebody who's going to start in now after the approval of these estimates. The new set-up of the department, this new hierarchy and higher echelons have been in force or have been in employment under the \$73,000.00.

Now, whether they are going to be given additional emolument or staff to almost double the appropriation or not, of course we don't know, because one thing that the department, and particularly the Department of Industry and Commerce, neglect to do unless we really squeeze it out of them, is to tell us what they want the money in detail for. Now the criticism of last year, the \$73,000 now doubled to \$148,000, doesn't really solve the problem. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce really wanted an additional \$73,000 to bring about an exposé of the prevailing situation in Manitoba and the lack of advancement, then I think that I would be prepared to oppose the motion so that my honourable friend would have the finances to do it, because we've tried and tried and tried to extract from government more details, precise details of the economy of Manitoba. We tried it during the budget debate and it was pretty hard going to try and extract some of the detailed answers to detailed questions that were raised in particular by my colleague from St. John's, and if this is what my honourable friend originally thought he wanted the extra 70,000 bucks for, well it might have been all right. But it isn't, and while we're still going to continue to get the ever-recurring tripe that we get from the Department of Informational Services, and apparently to be augmented or maybe we're going to get twice as much of the guff at \$148,000 as against \$73,000, we should in this House, in this Committee, raise our voices in protest. Of course, it might be you know, Mr. Chairman, what was considered as a speculative story in the press some time ago of additional awards to Dalton Camp and Company in Toronto of some considerable amount of money, that speculative story - you might have recalled it, Mr. Chairman - that was so vehemently denied and vigorously denied by my friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, maybe there was some foundation to the news story and maybe this...

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Leader of the New Democratic Party would refer to the time that I denied that.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon? I didn't hear you.

MR. SPIVAK: You referred to a time that I denied something. I'd like you to refer specifically, give me the facts.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, my honourable friend denied that the speculative story in the Winnipeg newspapers to the effect that the Dalton and Company were going to be awarded a contract or an undertaking for an expenditure of \$700,000 was incorrect. That's what the story ...

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the New Democratic Party said that I denied something. I don't know what he's referring to. I denied nothing.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend, if he would just turn his head this way instead of his back, he may be in a far better position to listen. I said that there was this speculative story in the newspapers which was denied by my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: On what occasion, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PAULLEY: I'll write my honourable friend a letter, because -- the reason I'm suggesting that I would write my honourable friend a letter is, if I recall, his picture was alongside of the news article of denial of the fact that a contract had been awarded to Camp and Company from your department. You don't remember it. There you are, you see. Possibly it's a good job we have got an Informational Service because even the Minister can find out through it what he's supposed to be doing.

MR. SPIVAK: I would be happy if the Leader of the New Democratic Party would furnish me with such an article and such a picture.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe I'm in the fortunate position, Mr. Chairman, that I will be able to give that. Unfortunately, I don't have that filing cabinet with me but I'm sure that this

April 22, 1968

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) particular item - because I thought it was a very juicy one - is contained in my filing cabinet. Then too, you know, maybe my honourable friend went so far in the hole with some of his propagand efforts that he's got to try and make up for it by the additional \$70,000 that he's now asking for in this Information appropriation. I don't know, because we haven't had from our honourable friend a full exposé or disclosure of why he wants to double the amount contained within the propaganda sheet. And I understand too, Mr. Chairman, that possibly there could be a reduction because I understand the staff are beginning to leave. One of the most capable has already left the department to form a new business on her own, and maybe, even without the motion of the Honourable Member for Hamiota, we should consider a reduction.

But I want to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman, that in speaking of informational services neither I nor my Party have any objection to the government informing people as to the activities of government, as to what facilities and services are available to them, because it is well-known all too often that we pass legislation in this House, or regulations are established that affect people, and there has to be some media by which people are informed. And that was the purpose of this section and that was the reason it was set up, but it's gone far and far beyond all of that. All the jiggery pokery that goes on in the Department of Informational Services should make the Minister of Industry and Commerce really feel that he's rendering a disservice to our province, particularly, as somebody suggested a few moments ago, when we're caught in the cost squeeze in Manitoba. Where we can't get a Medicare card for an old-age pensioner who only has a low income, or practically no income, we can afford this sort of, as I said, hokey-pokey.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, I support the motion of the reduction to the amount of last year, but in doing so I want to point out to this committee and to the mover of the resolution, that notwithstanding that, unless we've been able to educate to some degree the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the amount of money that he had last year allowed him and his staff to carry on at least part of the year in a matter to which we object. And now I note my honourable friend is not paying any attention to me. He's having a caucus meeting with the Attorney-General, and I love to have somebody who listens to me, who is concerned, and for the time being at least I will cease my criticism until such time as the caucus meeting is over.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the caucus meeting is over or whether it isn't over, but I suppose that my honourable friend wouldn't be at all surprised if he heard that it was my intention to vote for the resolution that's before you. I think that would really be a shock for my honourable friend. I guess that in consideration of the fact that our Honourable Minister supported the Attorney-General for the leadership of the party and both of them failed in that regard, that they feel they must have a caucus quite frequently to see what went wrong -- (Interjection) -- Did my honourable friend want to ask me a question? Not yet, eh? O.K. Well, Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose that you have had time, in your busy hour that we've spent this afternoon, to survey the Order for Return that was just tabled about 30 minutes ago, but in that Order for a Return these questions are asked in respect to the Information Services Branch: 1. Names of department, excluding the Crown corporations, which issue departmental news letters or issue informational bulletins. 2. The number of employees in each department concerned. 3. Title and salary of each employee in each department referred to above that receive a salary in excess of \$6,500 a year. And 4. The length of employment of each employee concerned under Question 3.

Now of course, my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party who put the Order for Return in, he is not concerned with salaries below the \$6,500 level. He's made it nice and easy for my honourable friend to table the Order for Return because he's asking for the new employees that are earning in excess of \$6,500.00. And here are the answers. In the Public Information Branch there are nine employees and the Director of Public Information receives the sum of \$17,316 a year; the Director of News Services \$13,572; the News Editor \$11,160; and an Information Writer No. 2 \$7,000.00. So that you have a total under that answer there in dollars of roughly, roughly \$50,000.00. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Didn't get it. Roughly 50,000. Now he doesn't say how many more there are that are receiving less than \$6,500, but there's \$50,000 paid out to four high-priced help in Information Services. Now the Director of Public Information has only been in the employ of the government nine months, the Director 12 years, the News Editor, six months and the Informational Writer No. 2, 14 months, so that three out of four are relatively new, relatively new men in

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) the department.

That was Public Information Branch, in the Department of Industry and Commerce. They also put out a bulletin - I have them before me here, covering my desk. This is all information propaganda, Mr. Chairman, all of it that's on here, and I've got a lot more. And Welfare put out a bulletin; they say in the Order for Return just two or three times a year. They have an Executive Assistant at \$7,300.00 per annum that has been there for two years, and I would like my honourable friend to answer this question. It says that they publish two or three times a year a staff newsletter. Is this the extent of the services required of the \$7,300.00-a-year Executive Assistant?

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): They spend a day or two at the most in preparing a letter of that kind. Obviously this man has many other responsibilities and that's why it's so difficult, I suppose, to file an Order for Return based on the kind of question that was asked. If one had asked it more precisely, how much staff time is dedicated to this service, you'd get a much more precise answer, but I'm quite sure my honourable friend wasn't really interested in a precise answer.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, then the Order for Return is not quite correct? Is that what he's saying? It's not ..

MR. SPIVAK: The Return is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It is correct. Then they'd better have another caucus meeting over there.

Now the Department of Education also issue a newsletter. One, it says. One employee, at a salary of \$8,500 and he's been with the department for approximately two years. Treasury - they publish one. The only newsletter information piece provided by the Treasury is prepared by the Revenue Tax Branch so that's charged up to the Sales Tax. Agriculture; they have one editor, publishing the green newsletters at a cost of \$7,470.00. Health; no full-time staff but they also publish a newsletter. Urban Development and Municipal Affairs; they publish a newsletter. They have a director, salary \$14,964.00. Mines and Natural Resources; three there. So that it would seem to me that if we do not pass this item there's going to be a lot of people losing jobs, because the number of dollars that is set out in the Order for Return would seem to me in itself pretty well total the new amount of \$148,610 as shown here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never said that all of the information that came forward was wrong, like the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The problem we have is trying to sift the wheat from the chaff - that's a term that the former Premier used to use all the time. He found it a great difficulty at times, he said, to separate the wheat from the chaff. Well, we find it rather difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff in this Informational Services Branch, and so many of the propaganda sheets that come out is misinformation, or as the Honourable the Attorney-General used to say on so many occasions - lazy inaccuracies. That's the term that my honourable friend over on this side of the House now used to say about so many things. Lazy inaccuracies. Well, there's a great deal of these Information Services bulletins that have a great deal of lazy inaccuracies in them; and a great deal of them. And I can cite scads of them. Give you an example? I could go on all afternoon giving you examples but here's one dated January 27, 1967, headed "Farm Income Issue Needs Action -- Roblin." Roblin was the editor of this one. But when he, 10 years ago, on coming into office promised that he was going to alleviate the cost-price squeeze, on January 27, 1967 he had not only admitted that he wasn't going to alleviate the cost-price squeeze, but he blamed it all on the inefficiency of the farmers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not on Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, Public Information. You're talking about the cost-price squeeze.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I know I'm -- talking about the cost-price of wheat. You're the first one that should be interested in it though, but I am talking about the fertilizer that emanates from the Department of Industry and Commerce, and if I'm not going to be permitted to read any of these propaganda sheets I'm going to soon have to sit down, I guess, because I was attempting to establish that most of it was straight out-and-out lazy inaccuracies, and you can go through page after page. February 6, 1967: "Priorities Controls Stressed in Program" and it goes on to boost the government's position and maintain the old argument that this government never does anything unless it has a whole program of priorities established before they do, and then the first thing they do, following the last election, is what? Increase the Ministers' salaries. Now it just doesn't add up.

April 22, 1968

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)

Mr. Chairman, as I said the other evening, on Friday of last week I had breakfast with the manager of the radio station in Dauphin and the Mayor of Dauphin, and he said that some of the information, some of the information is so good that he now has a sponsor for it, and I suggest to my honourable friend that it is possible that he could design information that I could use in Neepawa and say: "This is information supplied by the Provincial Government sponsored by Nelson Shoemaker." Now if it is that good, then there is nothing wrong with it and it isn't costing my honourable friends anything to do it. If the information that is provided by this government can be designed - and surely it can with all of this high-priced help we have - if it can be designed to be placed in the hands of businessmen who will sponsor it on the air, sponsor it on TV or sponsor it in the newspapers, placed in the newspapers courtesy of so-and-so, then it certainly will have the approval of the business community and the people of Manitoba, but you could go through a bushel basketful of the material that we have here and nobody would sponsor it. There's no doubt about that.

Now the department have claimed on numerous occasions that they had to communicate with the people - that's a great word that they use all the time - that it is necessary for governments to communicate with people and that it is through the Information Services Branch that they're able to communicate. This is what they said.

Now speaking -- and I don't know whether the Chairman will cut me off on this one but I'm trying to prove a point here. When the First Minister was speaking down at Hartney just two months ago, he said -- "The greatest challenge facing Manitoba is to develop proper communication between the community and the government, the Premier said." But you know what he went on to say? He said the only way you can get that proper communication is to elect the Tory Member in Turtle Mountain. Now this is an absolute fact. "It is easy to get word from the government to the people, Mr. Weir said, but it is much more difficult for people to reach the government. He said that Mr. Rose as a candidate, and hopefully an elected government member, will be in the position to present his ideas on policy and legislative change to the government." Well, what my honourable friend is then saying, is that it is absolutely impossible for the government to comprehend what we are saying and there's only one way to cure that and that is either (a) by having 57 Tory candidates, or (b) by sending out a lot of propaganda so you can communicate with the people. Well, this is absolutely nonsense.

Out in the Interlake - and I'd like to hear someone that represents that area have something to say about it - but I have an article here somewhere and I think it went out by way of propaganda sheet, that Mr. Smellie said that if he had been able to place his report in different language to the people of the Interlake, then they would have accepted the program. Well, what he was saying; either (a) the people out there were so dumb they couldn't understand him, or (b) he was so dumb that he couldn't frame it in language that they could comprehend. Well, I don't know, Mr. Chairman, but I don't think that this is any way to communicate to the people. If this government feels that communication is the number one challenge and that's what the Premier said: "It's the Number One challenge." Not the last one, but Number One; and he sees this as the way of communicating with the people.

One of these propaganda sheets that I have before me, just about a year old, tells about the \$100 million expansion at Inco, Thompson, inferring that if it had not been for the Minister this \$100 million expansion would never have taken place. Well, the phase number one that took place - what? 12 years ago or thereabouts - I believe that it resulted in about \$175 million expansion at that time, and surely phase number two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight or nine - whatever one you called that the other day, the \$100 million one - would have come anyway because of the fact that the natural resources were there and it was just natural that it would be expected that they would come.

Now my honourable friend, too, likes to take credit for most of the industries that have settled in Manitoba in the last 10 years, although he's only been Minister for about two years, but my observations are that -- let's take the Simplot plant at Brandon as a striking example. I understand, and my honourable friend can correct me if I'm wrong, but I understand that the Simplot in Brandon, the Seagrams at Gimli, to name two, qualified for the maximum federal grant of \$5 million. I think they both qualified for the maximum, did they not? And I understand further that the \$5 million that they did receive as an incentive grant from the Federal Government never has to be paid back at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've already asked the Member for Gladstone to consider the item that

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) we're discussing now - Resolution 56, Information Branch. If he is prepared to proceed with the Resolution or the motion that's before us, he may proceed. If not, we'll ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm still talking about a propaganda sheet that went out from the Department of Industry and Commerce, dated July-August, 1965, in which they attempt to take credit for a lot of the new industries when in fact they would not likely have settled in those places if it had not been for the outright gift of \$5 million from Ottawa that they never have to pay back. And not only that, I understand that they can show depreciation on the \$5 million that they have got. So it's a double gift.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is much more that could be said but I think my honourable friend is just itching to get up and tell us some more and programs that he has in mind for us on this side of the House.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, as I listen to some of the reactionary members of the Liberal Party it reminds me of the old western saying that some people like to take the bull by the horns and others like to shoot it. It seems to me that we've reached the point in this debate where we better put a partition between our imagination and our facts, and if we do this then we're going to be able to intelligently debate an aspect of government that is worthy of debate but so far has been debated on the basis of (a) a personal attack on myself, or (b) on some general nefarious doing on the part of government.

Now I have listened in this Chamber to almost a whole session which has been devoted to this one small aspect of government, and in the course of it I haven't heard one concrete evidence that would support the argument that this in fact is being used to propagandize the political party that this government represents. There is no evidence -- (Interjection) -- I will tell you about that. That was requested by Western Flyer Coach, by the people who in fact built the buses - not by ourselves. And I want to tell you something: that I stood and I had a picture taken with Soo-Security who also painted one of their trucks with a 'Spirit of '70' program and they requested that and that was my function, and I performed it. The problem is that you don't like that. The problem is that in effect this does enhance the value of the government because for once -- (Interjection) -- No. And I'll explain this. Because there is a proper function. We happen to be the government; you happen to be the Opposition - and I can say thank God for that.

Now it's my intention to try and deal with this matter positively, properly, and I'm going to enter into the record certain evidence which I think supports our position. It's not my belief that the Opposition will accept it. They have nothing else in this Session; they only intend to blow this up and to bluff and bluster as they've done in the past in other debates, so that they can present this as some reason in which to defeat this government. But I suggest to all those members on the other side that it's time that you stopped doing this. You're not fooling the press and you're not fooling the people. You're trying to build up a case that doesn't exist in a hope of trying to gain some political advantage for yourself, and this is in substitution to any constructive policies about anything that would reflect on government. You've criticized everything that has ever happened in this government and you haven't come out with one concrete proposal about anything. Now...

MR. FROESE: I take exception to that statement.

MR. SPIVAK: ... the Honourable Member from Rhineland asks a proper question as to the estimates. May I point out to him that the estimates of \$73,663 includes the \$45,000 that was included in the Information Service plus the Photography Section which was in the Department of Industry and Commerce before combining, because in effect what did take place was that the Information Service Section and the Photography Section were combined, so that the estimate on one side of \$73,000 is a total vote that was passed in connection with both departments that are now joined into one, and the new estimate of \$148,000 reflects the increase in both aspects or both sections of the department.

There was a reference made to the fact that there were some people who had in fact left the department, and that's correct. But my understanding is that this had nothing to do with the present inquisition being conducted by the Opposition. Now, there are three points that are important. The government has a responsibility to communicate to the people and they have a responsibility to have a form of information service. The Glassco Commission recognized this. There are authoritative sources and I'm going to quote from one which recognizes this and we have done this. The second is we have an obligation to do this professionally, and we

April 22, 1968

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) have - and we've hired professional people. The third is that we have an obligation to do this economically, and we have; and notwithstanding this increase we are the lowest of any province in this country. -- (Interjection) -- Now it's common knowledge that with some of the members on the other side, as they talk in the hallways, they have already indicated: "By God, if we ever got into power we would make that Information Service work. We would increase it." This is common knowledge. This is a joke. So who are we trying to kid?

You've suggested that the members of the press have no right to come to the Ministers and enquire. Well I would like to know an example where the Information Service has prevented any member of the press from coming forth to see any ...

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you where. Mr. Epp told a newsman, "You have no right to see the Minister without my permission." And don't deny it because it's true.

MR. SPIVAK: I asked to be given a concrete example and if you want to give us the concrete example -- (Interjection) -- Well, as far as I know to the best of my knowledge and it certainly is -- (Interjection) -- there is nothing declared in any policy that would prevent any member from the press from seeing any Minister on any occasion. Now I know nothing of this and there's no declared policy and the members of the press know this as well. As a matter of fact, the real funny part about this is that in this Chamber you, the Opposition, are using the press to propagandize your views because you - this is in effect what you're doing - by talking in the Chamber the way you are, by making these charges, you are hoping that the press in fact will become your propaganda instrument in this connection.

Now I'd like to refer to a book called "The Government Explains." This book was used by the department on the reorganization of the Information Service Branch, and I'm going to read just a few chapters to you — (Interjections) -- I would like to read a chapter. But before I do this I'd like to read the summary on the jacket which will explain who is responsible for this work and what it's to contain :

"An informed public is the basis of a sound democracy. Public authorities must publicize their work if they are to carry out their duties effectively. But the dividing line between information and propaganda is finely drawn and the public authorities must be on their guard against misuse of public relations techniques. This study examines the way in which the central government information services have developed within the British constitution as a valuable supplement to the more traditional channels of communication of parliament and the press. The book traces the growth of government information services from tentative beginnings in the late nineteenth century through two world wars, the second in particular, providing the impetus for rapid growth, to the firmly established public relations organizations which exist today. At the apex of this organization is the Minister, responsible for co-ordinating information policy, and particular attention is given to the development and growth of the co-ordinating role at both the ministerial and official level. The study describes the structure and work of the information division and discusses the function of the central office of information providing them with the professional and technical services they require. In 1949 a new information officer class was created. The book describes the discussions which led to its formation, and analyses its form and structure, and examines its relationship with the other Treasury classes."

MR. PAULLEY: Would you read about that "fine line" again.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I'm going to read it even finer than that. This is Great Britain. This is the government information service in Great Britain. Now the most important paragraph - and I'm going to read the one that I think is important - is that "An informed public is the basis of a sound democracy, and public authorities must publicize their work if they are to carry out their duties effectively." Point No. 2, and I'm quoting directly: "Press releases should be and usually are purely factual, although the press should not expect ministerial press releases to make points for the Opposition. -- (Interjection) -- You have no evidence of that. All you've done -- you have absolutely no evidence. You have absolutely no evidence. You stand up there piously but you can't prove a thing, and in a court of law you would be knocked down completely. In this table you've kept -- and you're going to go outside in the public and you're going to make for any kind of representation you can, and one of the reasons for checking your statement was that's in fact what you did, and I -- (Interjection) -- I checked that -- I checked that for a very good reason.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Who checked the ... with you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Please.

MR. SPIVAK: Now, if I may I'd like to read ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Maybe we could modiy the tone of this debate just a little. It might lend a little bit of dignity to this Committee.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. JOHNSTON: has been making insulting remarks ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Minister continue.

MR. SPIVAK: On Page 194. I'd like the honourable members to listen to this. This is called: "The existence of government information helps the party in power. However impartial they are, and however much they try to avoid political entanglement, whether they issue plain statements of fact or explain policy, the existence of the information services undoubtedly helps the government of the day and helps to get its policies accepted. It means that the Party in office has a means of putting out information which is not available to the Opposition. The Opposition, it is true, has equally free access to the press, radio and television, but the activities of Ministers are nearly always more newsworthy than those of their opposite number out of office. Also, Ministers of the Crown are always much better briefed than their opposite numbers, either at press conferences or in debate. That is one of the advantages of being in office and one of the advantages of being a Minister with the civil service working for you." I'll tell you who wrote this in a minute. "The existence of the information services does help the government of the day just as the existence of lawyers, statisticians and ordinary administrators in the civil service also helps them. It would be unrealistic to treat this aspect of information work as a ground for the abolition of the information services as it would be to argue that because an efficient civil service tends to increase the prestige of the government, civil servants should either be inefficient or be abolished."

Now the honourable member asks who wrote this, and I would like to if I may, indicate that this work was done by a study group of the Royal Institute of Public Administration and included the Director of Research of the London Press Exchange Limited, the member in the House of Parliament, or Member of Berkshire County Council, the Public Relations Advisor of the Royal Dutch Shell Group of the United Kingdom and Ireland, the Director-General of the Central Office of Information, the Town Clerk of Lambeth, an alderman of the Leicester City Council, a consultant with the information policy and a member of the Northern Ireland Development Council, a Member of Central Electricity Generating Board, a Member of Parliament for Witness Division of Lancashire, Under-Secretary of a Board of Trade, permanent Under-Secretary of the State of Scotland, and a member of Parliament for ... Division of Wiltshire. Now -- and the research officer was Marjorie Ogilvie Webb.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): ... submit to a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes.

MR. DOERN: Although that is a very interesting book, I wonder whether there is an exact parallel between the information services described in Britain and his own department.

MR. SPIVAK: I may say to the honourable member that the Information Service re-organization was based on this book.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, we are blessed in this province with an excellent civil service, but this Minister has caused the neutrality of this civil service to be violated and I take the strongest exceptions to it. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, a civil servant going over with the Minister - from this branch - going over to the CBC, picking up a tape and ...

MR. SPIVAK: That's not correct, and the honourable member is making statements that are not true.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It is correct. This tape was picked up at the CBC. Are you denying this?

MR. SPIVAK: You suggest that I went over to the CBC ...

MR. GUTTORMSON: I did not.

A MEMBER: You just did.

April 22, 1968

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, you did.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I appeared on Provincial Affairs and a member of the Information Services Branch picked up the tape and proceeded to have it typed out for the Minister, and they went over it together with other members in an effort to find a rebuttal for what my remarks had been. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you, no matter what I said, it is not the responsibility of the civil service to take exception to remarks by the Opposition. It's the responsibility of this Minister. -- (Interjection) -- Not the Information Services Branch. And that's how he's using this branch. I suggest to you that the Director, Mr. Epp, had no license to go on television on "The View From Here" to contradict remarks by the Leader of the NDP and the Leader of the Liberal Party. I suggest to you that this is not correct. If the Minister did not like the remarks made by these honourable gentlemen, it was his responsibility to contradict it or go on and deny it, not a member of the civil service.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I certainly will.

MR. SPIVAK: Could you tell me what Mr. Epp denied?

MR. GUTTORMSON: He denied statements that were made by these gentlemen with respect to The Civil Services Act. He denied statements -- he was asked by the host of the program and he said these were not true.

MR. SPIVAK: Were they true or were they not true?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I think they were true.

MR. SPIVAK: But did he give information or did he make a comment on ...

MR. GUTTORMSON: He has no license to contradict ...

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the honourable member a question. Did Mr. Epp give information or did he make comments?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Comments. And I suggest that ...

MR. SPIVAK: What comments?

MR. PAULLEY: Maybe we should have a replay of the whole thing so we'll know what it's all about.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, this Minister has caused this civil service to be violated, the neutrality of this department or of any civil service. Thank goodness, other members of the civil service -- I have no knowledge of them acting in the same way. Fortunately they don't have a Minister like the one ... runs their affairs or I'm sure he would try to do so. Can you tell me why you have to spend \$17,300 on a man to run the department, to oversee a department which has been run by Mr. Donogh for many many years?

Mr. Donogh is unquestionably one of the most effective civil servants and you bring a man from the outside who you have to send around Canada just to try and learn the job. I suggest this is most improper -- and to pay him that kind of money? Is the province so wealthy they tax school books, they tax everything else under the sun, and yet you can pay these outlandish wages to a man from the outside? I suggest to you it's improper and unnecessary when we're trying to cut down. The First Minister has indicated the need to cut down on expenditures and you spend money like this. How can the people of Manitoba believe that there's any sincere attempt to cut expenses when this is going on? I suggest there is not. Four cars in this department. Can you tell me any justification for it? I suggest not. And why did they have to move up to the civil service offices? Why were they lavishly furnished? Why don't you take the members of the House and show the money you spent up there? What about the radio equipment you put up there? Do you suggest these men in the gallery can't interview the Ministers themselves? No, you send a member of that department to interview them and infer that it's coming from the news media and it's coming directly from the Minister. I suggest it's wrong. These men in the gallery are quite capable of doing it and I suggest it be left that way.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can answer the honourable member, because one of the things that concern me: I did not hear the broadcast and this is why I asked for the tape which is a ... which is available, for a very good reason. Because I was told that the honourable member had made a statement which was rather inaccurate, and it seemed to me was either a lapse of memory on his part or possibly straight politicking. I wasn't sure myself. And the honourable member suggested after the estimates had been tabled in the House - and this was taped after the estimates had been tabled - that the Department of Information Service was a quarter of a million dollars. The estimates show \$148,000, and it

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) was remarkable to me how the Honourable Member from St. George could get on television in front of the public and make a representation of a quarter of a million dollars when the estimates had been tabled and he knew it to be \$148,000.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think the big issue at stake here is that the Minister continues to talk about the lack of concrete evidence on the part of the Opposition, and I think that one of the things the Opposition can say back to him is in effect: where is your evidence? Because we have attempted, I think, in this debate - or some of us - to show that some of the things the Minister says he has done either have not in fact been done, or some of the things that he has promised to do, as well haven't been done. Another point is this: that he quotes from a book and he talks about a fine line between the government's function and between a government propaganda effort, and I say to him that the point is - this is the problem; that if you look at some of the activities of this department and you compare them to a propaganda activity, they seem to be identical. And it's up to the Minister I think to show that -- in other words, if a person was intending to propagandize the Conservative Government of this province, he would use very similar techniques to those that the Information Services are using or that the department of Industry and Commerce is using now. For example, the kind of expensive literature and the tone of the literature would be, I think, in effect identical. He reads from a book on the British organization of a public information department. Well and good. And he says that this was the basis of the organization of his department. But that does not answer the question. The question is, the Opposition has argued that there have been abuses of the functions of your Information Services and that is what is at issue here. It is not whether or not the department is set up well; it is not whether it is modelled on the British model or not.

I intend to give some examples, or at least to indicate certain areas. For example, I don't know whether the Minister has in fact justified the expense of this department. Has he pointed out, for example, that there have been any savings? Has he pointed out if we have saved duplication and whether through this rationalization we are in effect better off at this present time? He talks about co-operation with the press. Well, I sometimes speak to the press too, and I get the impression from talking to some of their members that they think they have a great deal of difficulty getting to see certain people, so I say that if it's up to the press it's not up to us to say what they think and it's not up to the Minister. Let they themselves write their own stories on this particular information department. If in fact they have had problems, then I think it is incumbent upon them to write about them so that we can see who's right. Because they're the ones being talked about, let them speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to deal with this question of proving the worth of this department by looking at a recent production of this department which involves the use of this Information Services to promote a specific project in which they were heavily involved, by supplying materials and mailings and lining up people and so on. This is the Business Summit Conference. Now this is related, because I think these are the people who produce the materials and who assisted in the ...

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make a comment on a point of privilege. I have already indicated in the past to the Honourable Member from Elmwood that the Information Service Branch had nothing to do with the preparation of the materials that were used in the Business Summit Conference.

MR. DOERN: Well, may I ask the Minister whether, if we look at this kit that was supplied to us, that none of these materials were either designed, or work was done on none of these materials that were handed out at that Summit Conference?

MR. SPIVAK: Not with respect to the kits that were handed out with the exception of the press kits, and I don't want to mislead the honourable member. With respect to the press kits, the information that was furnished the press who attended the conference, this was properly handled by the Information Service, but the information that's contained in the Business Summit Conference packet that he had shown me in the past and which he has in front of him now, was not prepared by the Information Service.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with a general principle in relation to this department because I have asked some two months ago for a statement on this particular conference, and I would like to deal with the question of whether or not there has been any evidence coming out of this. For example, the Minister has continually said to us that we do not produce evidence of things wrong in his department, and I think the Opposition's counter to that, which is quite simple and quite direct, is that the Minister has not shown in

April 22, 1968

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) effect where some of his expenditures and some of his activities have in fact shown results, and I would like to deal with this very briefly.

The Business Summit Conference was, I think, an expensive pep rally. Now this is the kind of promotion that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has excelled in because he has diverted his department from the kind of activities that they once did, to going more heavily into public relations, and he has taken his resources from that department, his budget and his personnel, and he has put them on to this kind of an activity. So the point is, can the Minister show us what the results are? If he doesn't believe that we can prove our case, then I say he cannot either prove his case because I haven't seen any evidence for it. He has promised us....

MR. SPIVAK: May I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: What results would you like to see?

MR. DOERN: Well, perhaps I could go on and then the Minister could see what I mean.

MR. SPIVAK: ... Mr. Chairman. I really would like the honourable member to indicate.

MR. DOERN: Fine. Well, I would like to see two results. One, I would like to see the worth of that conference in itself; and secondly, I'd like to see whether ...

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I've asked for the honourable member to indicate what results. The worth of the conference doesn't indicate a result.

MR. DOERN: Well, let me just explain the two areas. (1) I think the Minister should prove that the conference was of value to the people who attended it; and (2) that perhaps some new industry was, you know encouraged or was brought in as a result of it, so perhaps you could answer that later, because I would like to deal with the value of that conference. For example, people who attended that conference went there I think to learn something, and I for one did go to see whether or not I would learn anything as a result of the proceedings, and I found that in effect on a practical value basis, a person who went there with an attitude of learning about Manitoba or learning about opportunities learned almost nothing. There were a number of papers presented. I think the only one of value was given by Ralph Hedman on agriculture. Other talks given, I feel, were hastily prepared or almost irrelevant.

And then we asked the Minister for -- in other words, if you went to the conference I feel that you didn't in effect learn anything. I feel that it was in effect an expensive pep rally. Now I'm not opposed to pep rallies; I just wonder whether or not it wasn't too expensive and whether or not it wasn't in some ways impractical.

Now the cost of this rally, Mr. Chairman, we apparently will never find out because two months ago - well O.K., we're going to find out eventually - two months ago the order went in; two months have passed on the first order; it's still not here, it's going to come in a few days from now; at that time it'll be too late. So perhaps the Minister could give us some of his views of the practical value of his Summit Conference which I think was the major event almost of the year. I, for one, believe that it cost \$50,000 to \$100,000. I know, for example, that the materials given out, the public relations materials that were placed in this folder alone can be estimated at from \$5.00 to \$10.00 which was the approximate cost of the membership or the tickets to that do.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister replied to the Honourable Member for St. George, he made a number of startling statements, in my opinion. I think we all know that when a member stands up in this House and makes statements that would be queried by other members in the House, that a member has to stand up and substantiate or explain his remarks. I would like to challenge the Minister to name the members of this House who said outside in the halls that they would increase the size of the propaganda department if they were the party in power. Now the Minister made that statement and I expect an answer.

MR. SPIVAK: ... answer that question.

MR. JOHNSTON: He'll be able to answer it later on.

I'm alarmed at what this Minister considers to be the duties of government in respect to giving out information. He seems to think there is nothing wrong with a civil servant taking on a political duty on his behalf.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I don't think I ever made that statement.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

MR. SPIVAK: ... point of privilege, the member has ...

MR. JOHNSTON: The Honourable Member for St. George said, and he's prepared to back it up by proof, by calling before the committee the civil servants involved, that a civil servant was asked to take on a political duty for the Minister in examining political remarks. Am I correct in that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SPIVAK: ... a question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. JOHNSTON: You'll have a chance to answer later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... please proceed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm holding in my hand a sheet that's published by the Information Branch and it's headed: "News Service". Now I wonder, should government be in the News Service business? This means, supposedly in a democracy, a news service is someone's interpretation of events that have taken place. I don't think it means selective reporting news service, and I suggest that this government or any other government should not be in the news business. We don't have to look back very many years. The one that comes most vividly to my mind is Hitlerite Germany who controlled news.

SOME MEMBERS: Oh, shame.

MR. JOHNSTON: Shame, yes. Go ahead and say "shame". I brought this particular item once before. The Minister never did answer me, but when his news service decides to publish court cases that reflect favourably on this government, and by omission decide not to report court cases where they have lost, then this is a gross distortion of what news should be.

MR. SPIVAK: Would the member permit a question?

MR. JOHNSTON: After. And of course I'm referring to the News Service of October 6, 1967, when this Information Branch sends out news service presumably under the direction of a Minister, explaining in detail how the province had won a court case against people who were involved in a land expropriation, and I ask the Minister again - although he didn't answer me the time previously when I asked him - whether or not his department will publish the cases where the Manitoba Government lost. If you're going to go into the news service, well then you'd better go into it and allow your editors a free hand to print news as they see it, not as that Minister sees it. The Minister seems to think there's nothing wrong whatsoever with publishing the activities of Ministers, and I refer him to only one, March 8, 1968: "The Honourable Minister of Agriculture has opening remarks to make at a tea." Now if this is the information that people of the province want, to know what their government is doing, well then there's a sad distortion going on in the News Service Department.

I have in my hand another News Service sheet of November 17, 1967, and this reports in depth a dispute between the Honourable Gurney Evans who at that time was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, it reports a dispute between him and his department with the Federal Government. Now I'm not saying they're right or wrong, but this was one side of a story. This was one side of a story. The headline is: "Ottawa won't support fish marketing policy." The sub-heading is: "Evans expresses shock at failure to aid industry." Well, Mr. Chairman, if any responsible reporter or editor of one of our Canadian newspapers took this approach to news without going to the other side of the question, the people on the other side of the question, and getting their comments, this would be a pretty sad country to live in, if that's the way the news was reported across Canada. So I would like the Honourable Minister to get up and answer the very few questions I've asked Him.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, first of all, the question that I would simply like to ask the Honourable Member from Portage is whether he feels that a news release, which indicates that the government was supported on an expropriation award, is helpful to the political fortunes of the Progressive Conservative Party. No, Mr. Chairman, I'd like the Honourable the Member from Portage to answer.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows very well that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about the principle of whether or not this government should be in the biased news business.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the allegation has been made that the Information Service is being used to enhance and glorify the political fortunes of the Progressive Conservative Party, and I would like the Honourable Member from Portage, who has read this Information Bulletin on more than one occasion, to indicate just exactly how that assists the political fortunes of the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman I refer again to the sheet of March 8, 1968, where the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is making opening remarks at a tea. I would think that

April 22, 1968

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.)..... this is favourable to the fortunes of the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): I think that that's open to debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are a few remarks I'd like to make. I noted the other day, and I'm afraid I do not have the exact day, but there was an article in the Free Press - not published by the Information Service Branch of the government - in which they refer to the debates that were occurring then in the Provincial House in Quebec, and in it they made the following statement: "Mr. Lesage roasted the Cabinet for plans to spend \$10,496,300 on information and publicity, up \$6 million over the last two years, for increasing the cost of government including an increase of 500,000 receptions from 400,000 in the year of Expo '67."

Now I think it's important to this debate, and germane, because I've indicated that we are doing this as reasonably as we can, to indicate again what takes place across the country. We are not going to deal with the Federal Government because we all know what the Federal Government situation is. We know that they have a pretty expansive Information Service, and notwithstanding the fact that the Honourable Member for Gladstone on occasion says that two wrongs do not make a right, I wonder whether he has yet written the new Prime Minister and asked him to save the taxpayers of Canada money by eliminating the Information Service from the Federal Government.

Notwithstanding that, let me now deal with the provinces. In British Columbia, there are 36 on the Information Service. We have, by the way, 17 in total - 17 authorized established positions. British Columbia has 36 with a budget of \$582,000. Alberta has 24 with a budget of \$492,000. Saskatchewan has 17 (we have 17); their budget is \$226,000. Ontario - it's very difficult because each department has its own Information Services but we know that they are over \$2 1/2 million. In Quebec, each department has their own Departmental Information Officers and they have 40 departments - they have some 76 Departmental Information Officers, and without including the Photography Section this is over \$2 million. In New Brunswick it's 14 and there's \$194,000. Nova Scotia, 19, \$462,000. So Information Services do exist. They're recognized as a proper form, a proper function of government by all the political parties, the Liberal Party, the Social Credit Party, the Conservative Party and the Party in Manitoba. So that this ruse, which is all this is, to substitute proper debate on issues is false. It hasn't worked. You haven't proved your case and you may think that you're going to be able to leave here, I suspect, and finish with this item and go out and start to make your allegations, but I warn you now, that if we have the same kind of misrepresentation that occurred on the television broadcast where figures were bandied around that were incorrect, we'll have no course of action left, not to use the Information Service, but to go out and meet these false arguments.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, when the discussion gets back to the affairs over which we have jurisdiction, if the Minister would answer my question about the members who he's reported to have heard make statements that they would increase the size of the propaganda department if they were in power. I wonder if he would name these members:

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to answer.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This is typical. You see he's the fellow accusing us of making all kinds of statements, but he just made one there and he says, "I'm not prepared to answer." He's doing this all the time making wild statements.

MR. SPIVAK: done this all the time just to indicate....

MR. GUTTORMSON: Do you want me to categorize it?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, I will. But I want to ask you to answer my question.

MR. SPIVAK: I would prefer that you answer the other questions.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I haven't got my files here with me but I'll get them. Don't worry. I'd like to know why it was necessary to bring in a man from Ontario to run this department over Mr. Donogh who was a most competent and loyal civil servant. Why was it necessary to bring him in here at that wage? Would you mind telling me - or the House?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies, I wonder if he would either answer my question or withdraw his remarks in that regard.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to answer the questions because I think that this gets into the problem of personalities and I have no intention of dealing with it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: ... withdraw the allegation if you're not prepared to answer it.

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.).... Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Minister withdraw the allegation if he's not prepared to substantiate it. —(Interjection)— They're all true. They're all true.—

A MEMBER: You wouldn't speak of them outside the House ...

MR. GUTTORMSON: I wouldn't eh? —(Interjection)— Get up. Get up behind your desk.

MR. FROESE : I would support the honourable member in having the statement withdrawn because I certainly never made a statement of that type, and when he accuses the Opposition on this side, he said "All members", and he included me as well, so I would ask that he withdraw it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to deal with the personalities involved, but I will withdraw it if it's necessary, but the statements were made.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, he said, "but the statements were made." That's no withdrawal. Either the Minister withdraws or doesn't withdraw. If he doesn't withdraw, then let him point the finger to whom or about whom he speaks.

MR. SPIVAK: I withdraw the remarks.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I asked this Minister a question regarding the head of the department, the Director of Information, and he hasn't answered my question yet.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I really intended to answer that question. Unfortunately, I wanted to find out particulars and the details of the new director to try to indicate his background to you. I may say that the Director who was appointed was well-qualified for his position. While I do not have the details in front of me in terms of his background, I can say ...

MR. GUTTORMSON: How about the person who was running the department before?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, he received a promotion as well, and I would like — as I've already indicated, there in fact was a reorganization of the department based on a study of the other departments across Canada, and in turn was based on the book, "The Government Explains," which I've already referred to, for giving us a basis for the re-structure of the department. The individual who was selected — and unfortunately as I say I can't seem to find his exact details to read it to you to be accurate — I can indicate, had a background — at the time he was appointed he was the Associate Editor of the Financial Post. Prior to that time he had been the Public Relations Officer for the Royal Canadian Air Force and in turn he had a background in radio and in newspaper, having worked at both CJOB and the Winnipeg Free Press as well in Winnipeg. On the basis of his talent, his experience in the Information Section, and on the basis of his present position and the responsible position as an Associate Editor of the Financial Post, he was selected.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What was the experience of the man that ran the department almost single-handed for years and did a very good job?

MR. SPIVAK: I'm well aware of the individual's abilities and I'm also aware of his capabilities, and I was very happy for him that he received a promotion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, since when is a man who's demoted from running a department a promotion? Now, who's he trying to kid? Mr. Donogh was head of the Information Services Branch and then you bring another man in over to run it. Are you going to tell me this is a promotion for Mr. Donogh?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Information Branch today is not the Information Branch of what it was before.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You're not kidding, but, Mr. Chairman, they're not doing anything different. We're getting the same news releases but —(interjection)— and they need all these men to write them? Mr. Donogh did it almost single-handedly before and now they're bringing in all this high-priced help to do what? Sit in the galleries while we're in debate here and take notes for the Minister? Since when?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, maybe I could help my honourable friend the Minister out.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Minister — I raised a number of questions in regard to the Summit Conference. This is our last chance to talk about it, and also questions about savings and duplications and so on. I think he originally seemed to indicate he might answer those questions. I wonder whether he would answer some of the other comments other than the Member for St. George.

MR. SPIVAK: I'll answer.

April 22, 1968

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, was my honourable friend the Minister looking for a special Information Bulletin dated June 12, 1967, in which

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHOEMAKER: You weren't? Well this has to do with the whole reorganization of Information Services. Is this the one you were looking for -- the Honourable Member for St. George was probably looking for it.

But when I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my honourable friend a specific question: Does he believe that the Federal Government is using the Information Services Branch for political purposes, because if he doesn't then he should get up and say that he is not included in the Conservative Party that thinks along these lines.

A recent front page story in the Tribune, January 20, 1968, says: "The Conservatives believe much of this paper and money is being used to improve and promote the image and work of the Liberal Government at the expense of the taxpayers." And it says - and I'm using this to support my honourable friend's point of view - "Between October 18th and December 7th" - that's quite a long period - "a group including George Hees, Walter Dinsdale, Douglas Harkness and Eric Nielson, asked questions about the Information Services of more than 10 government departments over a period of two months." They related to the period 1964 to 1967 and the questions they asked — I don't suppose I'm getting anybody's attention but yours, Mr. Chairman — but the questions that the Conservative Party asked of the Liberal Government in Ottawa are exactly the same as we are asking of you now — exactly. They wanted to know what individuals were employed from time to time in the Information or Public Relations Services of the department; how many press releases were prepared; what newspaper advertising space; radio and television had been purchased, and for what purpose and at what cost. And then they end up by saying, as I quoted before "the Conservative Party believe much of the paper and money is being used to improve and promote the image and work of the Liberal Government at the expense of the taxpayers." Eric Nielson cites Indian Affairs Minister Arthur Laing as one of the worst offenders. He has kept all Mr. Laing's press releases over the last three years and says they have averaged about half a dozen a week, and they go on and on.

Now I wonder if my honourable friend could drag out some of the Information Service releases from Ottawa and say, "now here is what we specifically mean when we say promoting a Party," so that we will be able to comprehend the question that he's putting now, because if he Mr. Chairman, could say, "Now here is a dozen propaganda sheets from the Liberal Government in Ottawa and we believe that this is promoting the Liberal Government in Ottawa," let us have some. If you can't get them now, kindly write to your friend and dear colleagues, George Hees, Walter Dinsdale, Doug Harkness and Eric Nielson, write to them and have them supply you with some of the propaganda sheets that they refer to. Let's get something specific here.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Certainly.

MR. SPIVAK: Is it your intention to write the Prime Minister that the Information Service should be reviewed, and further that it should be abolished by the Federal Government?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I didn't get the question at all.

MR. SPIVAK: Is it your intention to write the Prime Minister and inform him of your views that the Information Service should be abolished, the Federal Government Information Service should be abolished.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I will do it in consideration of the fact that my honourable friend supplies me with several sheets. —(Interjection)— Well, this is a deal. I'm saying in consideration of you supplying me with a number of Federal Information Service Bulletins pointing specifically and stating that this we believe is nothing but political propaganda to glorify the Liberal Party. Now if you do that, then I will write to the Prime Minister of Canada.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not the one that made the remarks that two wrongs do not make a right, or that in fact if the Federal Government do it, that they should in fact abolish it. I'm suggesting that if in fact the honourable member feels that way, that I would like to know whether he intends to write the Prime Minister with reference to the Federal Information Service Branch. I might say that I have had my time running the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Information Service Branch here, and while we study the provincial, we did not study the Federal. I'm not qualified to make any comments one way or the other, but I'll gladly review the situation and in time possibly be able to communicate my thoughts to the Honourable Member from Gladstone, not that it'll make any difference in any case.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)..

To the Honourable Member for Elmwood, may I say with reference to the Business Summit Conference, we've already debated this issue. I've given you my opinion; I see no reason on this particular aspect to debate it again. I've indicated to you that insofar as I'm concerned the Summit Conference accomplished its basic objective, that this is a long-term rather than a short-term result, but coincidentally with it I hope to be in a position very soon to announce an industry which I think would not have come here, in spite of the basic philosophical arguments that will develop between the Honourable Member for Lakeside and myself, but an industry that would not have come here had we not held the conference and some individual there notified the department of the possibility of this industry coming to Manitoba.

... Continued on next page.

April 22, 1968

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate his own estimate of the cost of this conference, because I believe as other members do, that it was quite expensive and I suggest that it would be fifty to a hundred thousand. Would he care to venture a guess, or a more accurate figure if he doesn't think our figures are accurate?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker. I might say that I've requested from my department the various Orders for Returns that have been requested, and I was told that one was completed and I was able to get one in file today. I'll file this as soon as I have it available.

MR. SHOEMAKER: ...Mr. Chairman, of my honourable friend. I did make two recommendations the other day and he has not commented on them. But what does he think of this proposition that I made about an hour ago, to make an effort to turn out information services bulletins that are so good in effect that they deserve public promotion. You know what that one is.

The other one is, has my honourable friend given consideration to the fact of turning this whole field of Information Services over to Dalton Camp or some other Conservative, I suppose it would have to be, Conservative advertising firm. I believe that if the newspaper stories are correct that this government has already hired ...

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Sure.

MR. SPIVAK: Would you suggest that we take recommendation No. 2?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon?

MR. SPIVAK: Would you suggest that we take under advisement -- would you recommend your second suggestion?

MR. SHOEMAKER: If it proves -- here's what I'm trying to point out. If Dalton H. Camp and Associates are experts in this field, and they must be because I understand that the Government of Manitoba, whether it's my honourable friend's department or not, has turned over to Dalton Camp and Associates an advertising program that will cost in the neighbourhood of three quarters of a million dollars. -- (Interjection) -- When? Well, this article is dated January 27, 1968. "Camp Agency Hired," it says.

MR. LYON: my honourable friend he's talking - Mr. Chairman, I realize we're probably both out of order because we're talking about estimates of another department - but perhaps he would permit the question. Does he believe everything he reads in the paper, even including the Neepawa paper, which he half writes, I'm told?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, all I expect my honourable friend to do is to deny that the government has placed a contract with Dalton Camp. There are several stories ...

MR. LYON: It was wrong and it was corrected, I think a day or two later by the Deputy Minister, but my honourable friend obviously wouldn't read that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Then I take it that Dalton Camp will not receive any dollars at all in 1968.

MR. LYON: You certainly take that wrongly. He won't receive them, no, but the advertising will be placed through him. But that has nothing to do with this matter. Your figure is wrong as usual, that's all I am trying to tell you in a nutshell.

MR. SHOEMAKER: My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and your promoter for leadership of the Party, asked me a question. What was my evaluation of Dalton Camp and Associates as writers of propaganda, or words to this effect.

MR. SPIVAK: That was not the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, you were asking me whether or not I would ...

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order. The question simply was - the honourable member made a recommendation in which he suggested that Dalton Camp should be used, and I just indicated to him whether he was serious about that recommendation, or whether he really wanted us to take that under advisement.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I would certainly ask you to take it under advisement if you think they can do a better job for less money, certainly - certainly take it. What we are trying to do in the Opposition is to have a better job done for less, and if my honourable friend feels that Dalton Camp can do the job better for less money, by all means give it to Dalton Camp. By all means give it to them. Now I'm not in a position to assess Dalton Camp's qualities to the same extent that you can, so I hope that you will take it under advisement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What is the cost of the radio equipment that has been installed

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) upstairs?

MR. SPIVAK: I do not have that question but I certainly will get that information for the honourable member.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, when will I get the answer to that question?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I hope very soon. I do not have the information available but I hope that I will be in a position to get this information, and possibly I'll have it sent from above.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, are you hiring a TV editor when the House prorogues?

MR. SPIVAK: It is the intention to hire a TV editor, and not necessarily before the House prorogues.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When is the department moving in? After the House prorogues - upstairs?

MR. SPIVAK: The Department of Information Service, along with some other branches of the Department of Industry and Commerce, will be moving into the premises that are now available.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is it correct that they've been redecorated at a cost of several thousand dollars?

MR. SPIVAK: To the best of my knowledge, no. But I may be incorrect in this. The premises that were made available were the Civil Services premises that were operated on the third floor.

MR. GUTTORMSON: If the offices upstairs were good enough for the Civil Service Commission, why was it necessary to spend all that extra money for the Information Services Branch?

MR. SPIVAK: So far as I know there was no extra money spent. The department will be moving into the offices of the Civil Services Commission. The Civil Service was moved into another part of the building. These allocations came through the Department of Public Works in a conventional manner and a request for space accommodation to fill the requirements of the department branch.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, why is it necessary to buy a lot of expensive radio equipment when we've got a Press Gallery and men that are prepared to come down here every day to interview the Ministers on any policies they wish to announce? Why is it necessary for the government to have an Information Services Officer use the radio equipment and feed it to the radio stations thus providing -- doesn't provide the opportunity to question any policies. Why not let these people interview the Ministers on it instead of having it one way with the Information Service Branch?

MR. SPIVAK: Would the honourable member - permit a question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Do you know the cost of the radio - radio equipment? Do you know the cost of radio equipment?

MR. GUTTORMSON: No, I don't.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then why did you say it was expensive?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Why did I say it was expensive? Because I have some knowledge about what radio equipment is worth and it is very expensive.

MR. SPIVAK: May I ask what you would suggest would be expensive? What cost would be expensive?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, may I say that it's time possibly the Minister answered some questions instead of asking questions. He was asked a question about the cost of the radio equipment. He says he doesn't know. But he now asks the member does he think it's expensive? He's the man who bought it. My honourable friend ...

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not the one that used the word "expensive."

MR. MOLGAT: I've got the floor right now if you don't mind. Mr. Chairman, he's the man who proposed that this equipment be bought, presumably, if he's the Minister of that department. He's the Minister of that department and he's setting up this great new venture which he's launched into, and I suggest he ought to know. We find from other Ministers that -- you ask questions of that sort, they have the information there in their book; it's all there. Now this is just a new venture that the Minister has gone into and surely he ...

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that I have the information and I'm

April 22, 1968

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) not giving it to the House?

MR. MOLGAT: I'm not suggesting that you have the information. I'm suggesting that your colleagues are obviously better prepared than you are to answer questions. You like to answer questions by asking further questions, and I'm suggesting that the time has come for you to provide some answers.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, if the suggestion is that I have information that I'm not giving the House, that's incorrect. I may say that I did not anticipate that the question of radios would be asked nor how many pencils, nor how many pieces of paper nor how many other matters that are purely administrative matters within the necessary functioning of the department, would be asked. But I will get that information. The thing I did object to was the immediate conclusion by the Honourable Member for St. George that the matter was expensive. He doesn't know but he's prepared to use that adjective, and I suggest that this has been typical of the argument that's been advanced in connection with this aspect of government.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder in order to clarify this and make it more clear, could the Minister answer this question. Has his department purchased a television camera worth approximately \$4,000 within the last thirty days?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that answer but I will get that as soon as I can.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister was planning the Business Summit Conference, did he have a proposed budget? Did he have in mind a figure, an approximate cost for it, a working guideline, or did he just disregard financial considerations, throw the Conference and then is now waiting to find out what it did cost? Did he have a proposed budget?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, yes I did have a proposed budget, but I must suggest to the honourable member that the Business Summit Conference changed drastically as we saw the response that took place from the country, from the city, and from the out-of-town guests. Our budget was altered and changed drastically as a result of the individuals who were coming in and it was a result of an attempt to try and accomplish certain objectives, which were long-run objectives which appeared to be within sight as a result of the attendance and participation, not only of the individuals who were coming but of also the participants who were going to be taking part in the conference and the suggested topics that were going to be discussed.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what the original proposed budget that was then revised upward was?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to give this. I do not remember this exactly but I'm prepared to furnish the information to the honourable member.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I listened with some interest to some of the aspects that were discussed here this last hour or so, and when the Minister mentioned that other provinces were maintaining a department similar to what we are discussing here, Information Services, he mentioned British Columbia. On previous occasions I've advocated to the government that we should bring about news similar to what B.C. has, and I would appreciate having news of the kind that they do publish. If our government could publish some of the things that they can publish, I'd be only too happy to have the people of Manitoba know. I mentioned at that time interim provincial financial statements. I've asked for this type of information from the Treasurer of this province through an Order for Return, but I feel that such information should come out periodically and quarterly at least. And where could we have it with less cost than through this type of information that is going out already and which has already been established. This is where I would like to see information of this type go out.

I have a copy here of the B.C. News and it really has a lot of important news, and I would like to get this type of news from our periodical. I would like to read a couple of paragraphs here just so that members will know what is contained, and I'm quoting: "Honourable members will recall that the Provincial Home Acquisition Grant Act was passed at the 1967 Legislative Session, and a \$25 million fund therefore was established intended as a means of assisting British Columbia residents toward home ownership and to permanently locate in the community. The Act currently provides a maximum grant of \$500.00 for homes acquired between April 1, 1966, and March 31, 1968, increasing to \$525.00 for homes acquired during the twelve months from April 1, 1968. The plan has been eminently successful since its inception, providing to date over 25,000 of our citizens with a total of \$10 million toward the ownership of a home."

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

"However, with our rapidly growing population, the highest in the nation, the main problem is now not one of getting people into existing homes but rather encouraging new home construction. In recognition of this problem, the government proposes to seek approval to amend the Provincial Home Acquisition Grant Act to give complete emphasis to house construction and increase the grants to \$1,000 applicable to new homes." These are some of the items that are contained in this brochure and certainly there's complete and up-to-date information on the various departments and their activities, what they are doing.

Now in Manitoba I know some of the broadcasts that are made - farm broadcasts over CFAM - and they use some of that material quite frequently to the letter. Maybe this is because one of their newscasters is a former Conservative, defeated candidate, that this has some connection here; I don't know. But they're using it quite extensively, and if it's good I don't mind using it, but I feel that at the same time while we're giving out this service that we are actually subsidizing some of these radio stations in providing news media already written out for them. Whether this is good or not I do not want to debate at this particular point.

However, I feel that through some of the news media or the information that is going out that we are creating a false economic or an artificial economic climate. I have here a copy of the "Canada Month" magazine where there is an article by the Honourable Ernest C. Manning, Premier of Alberta, and I would like to read one paragraph. This has to do with economic development climate - and maybe I should read two paragraphs, and I quote: "To ensure an economic climate in which the private enterprise system is respected and is deserving of that respect, the government has resolved to take whatever steps are necessary to (a) prevent abuses which tend to bring private enterprise into disrepute; and (b) broaden the ownership bases of the private sector of the economy so that a maximum number of citizens possess a tangible equity."

And the second point: "The government will not support or pursue policies that tend to create an artificial economic climate or vulcanize the Canadian economy. The government believes in domestic free trade within Canada's boundaries, and regards the granting of special subsidies to industries to locate in areas where otherwise they would not locate, an expediency which ignores the realities of economics and geography and distorts sound resources development."

Mr. Chairman, I think we in Manitoba are building something like a false economy, especially an artificial one which can and will collapse if nothing more sounder is being developed, and I think this is partially achieved through this particular service that we are giving here. I would hope that when this is being expended now and more money is being spent, that real facts will be put into these papers and that it will be something that is going to be of value and something that will do real good, otherwise I am completely opposed to the expansion of this department together with the increased costs that we are supposed to spend under this item.

Then, too, I'm just wondering how much overlapping there is between this department here in this particular item and our Centennial expenses that we are having and for which we are allocating in our estimates. I note from the 1967 estimates that we allocated \$307,631; in 1968 we increased it to \$483,838; and this year it is increased further, almost doubled, \$855,038. Now just what this money is going for at this particular time I do not know and I don't think we need debate it here because this comes under another item in the estimates, but I'm just wondering whether there is not a certain amount of overlapping between these two departments and what can be done to rectify this.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would mind reading the headline of the information bulletin that he just read to the Committee.

MR. FROESE: Which one was it? The second one?

MR. SPIVAK: No, the first one.

MR. FROESE: I mentioned the "Canada Month" and the other one was the "British Columbia Government News."

MR. SPIVAK: ... read the headline to the members.

MR. FROESE: It says, "Dynamic Provincial Budget Benefits All Citizens." That's B.C.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, it's not my intention to delay this debate, it's been going on and on, but I just simply can't understand the attitude of

April 22, 1968

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd.) the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Either he's deliberately holding back things or he doesn't know them. He says he doesn't know them. Three questions in a row have been asked of him and I noted he's been looking up to Heaven, whether he's praying or looking up here for the answers I don't know, but there's been several runners coming down - three in the last ten minutes.

A question was asked to him: Did you have a budget for the Summit Conference last winter? He said he had it; he's forgot about it; he doesn't know what it is. Another question was asked: How much does it cost for radio equipment? If he knows he doesn't admit it. Another question was asked: How much did it cost to set up this Industry room upstairs? I know for a fact that one particular newspaper man told me he saw a bill for over \$6,000.00. He doesn't know about it, and if he doesn't know about these things he's no right being there. I know from looking at him as one businessman to another that he has the answers and let's hear them.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I do have the answers but I resent the remark by the honourable member because I did not have that information before. There is no intention of holding back any information from the House and I think it was most improper of him to suggest it. I do not know all the details and not all the details are in the book that's presented by my department officials. But I do have the information, and one of the reasons that the members of the department -- and this is all -- everyone knows they sit upstairs so that they can furnish the Minister with the information when requested. Now the information that was requested I do have and I will convey it. It's not only the information that was requested but there is some additional details so there'll be some explanation.

Now the radio equipment that's been purchased, the total amount - and this radio equipment did not include the equipment that the Honourable Member from St. George referred to - but the radio equipment, which would include the tapes and the tape machine, etc. involved, \$3,884.23. — (Interjection) — \$3,884.23. The Sony radios that the Honourable Member from St. George referred to cost \$55.00 each extra.

MR. GUTTORMSON: How many?

MR. SPIVAK: I don't know. This I do not know, but they cost \$55.00 each. Now on the TV cameras that the Honourable Member -- (Interjection) -- \$55.00 each. The TV camera that the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks asked for, there has been approximately \$10,000 worth of TV equipment that has been ordered. The individual cameras cost \$2,000. Many of them have accessories which would increase the estimate for each camera.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did the Minister say there was \$12,000 spent for TV equipment, 10 for a camera and \$2,000 ...

MR. SPIVAK: I'm sorry. There was approximately \$10,000. The question that was directed to me referred to the individual camera, and all I wanted to indicate was that in the \$10,000 would be the cost of the individual cameras and this cost would be \$2,000 plus the accessories.

MR. MILLER: I gather from that answer, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Information is then setting up its own television production department. Is that true?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, now since we have a news media, we have television and we've got radio, and now they're going into the news business. These gentlemen up here are prepared to interview Ministers at all times and yet they don't want the news media. They want to manufacture the news; they want to have their own man ask the pointed questions so they don't have to answer questions of the news media which is directed to them, and I think this is wrong.

MR. SPIVAK: That is not the purpose of the TV branch of the department. The purpose of the TV branch of the department is not to interview Ministers and not to in any way duplicate the work that is carried on by the news media, present news media. The purpose of the TV department is simply to be able to run five minute and ten minute documentaries on Manitoba to be made available to the people of Manitoba concerning a variety of items that they are interested in in which information from government should be communicated to them. It's our hope as well that some of these will also be used by the TV stations nationally for fill-ins on Manitoba, and will be in a position to supplement and complement the work of the Tourist Branch.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, further to this answer that was given, does the Minister not feel that the same purpose could have been achieved by utilizing the facilities of the

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) private firms that are in existence in Manitoba who have the equipment and who are having a difficult time in Manitoba getting by? Could they not have achieved the same goal by using the facilities now available?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, this was investigated and the cost would have been exceedingly high, much higher than the projections in our estimates. With reference to the question on the Sony radios, the answer is four.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that the purpose of the TV is not to interview Ministers, it will be for information. Could he tell me what the purpose of the radio editor and the radio operation is? Is it the same?

MR. SPIVAK: The purpose of the radio is to communicate information to the public.

MR. MOLGAT: In the same way as the TV - non-political?

MR. SPIVAK: There was no suggestion that it was political.

MR. MOLGAT: All right, but the Minister said that it's not to at all do the work that the people up in the gallery are supposed to do. Could he tell me then, and would he produce for the House, all of the radio material that has been given out by his department recently, because not too long ago, Mr. Chairman, I was driving away from this Legislature one evening about 6:00 o'clock and the news came on and the news reported Mr. So and so - Information Department, I think it was - Manitoba Government, and there was a report by an individual in the employ of my honourable friend reading directly in the news the events that had gone on that afternoon in this House, referring specifically to one of the bills that had been up for discussion. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister, is that the job of an information service? And is the government not in that case doing exactly the job that the people up in the gallery are here to do? The government is employing civil servants to report on what is going on in this House. Now is that not the job of the people who are in the Press Gallery?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think the Leader of the Opposition will recall what I just said. I indicated that insofar as the TV was concerned that this was not intended to be a duplication at all of the efforts of the press who do the TV interviewing of the Ministers. I did not suggest the same in the radio. He suggested it; I did not. The function of the radio department is to complement the activities of the press branch and to work out with the radio portion of the media the manner in which they would carry on this radio function. To the best of my knowledge, the manner in which the department has functioned has been to complement and not to duplicate the efforts of the radio branch of the news media.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, what's this business of "complementing"? What is it, when an employee of his department gets on radio news and reads off a news report of what went on in the Legislature this afternoon. How on earth is that complementing the work of the Press Gallery? That is saying the Press Gallery are not doing their work; or, Mr. Chairman, it is specifically and undoubtedly and unquestionably management of the news. That's exactly what it is and nothing else! I don't see how the Minister can get out of that one because that's exactly what goes on. I ask the Minister, will he make available copies of all the radio statements that have been made by his staff in that way?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'll make the information available, whatever information I have. I assume, and if I'm correct, I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that the radio tapes normally are re-used again and the copy on one tape may not be available on the other. But whatever I have I will make available. But I refute and I dispute the argument, management of news. I may say that the radio stations themselves are quite discriminatory in what they use. If they feel there is in fact management they will not use it. I have full faith in them, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition does.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Minister would like to manage the news if the radio stations will allow him. He will supply them with the material..

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I did not say that.

MR. DOERN: If the Minister is going to get his department into radio and television to complement the present media, have they considered consolidating all their publications into a daily newspaper?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, this is not the University and we do not have to produce The Manitoban.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, there is no reason at all for radio equipment to be installed at all. Is he suggesting that the people in the radio stations, the news people and the different radio stations can't read for themselves? This is what he's implying. I suggest

April 22, 1968

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) to you, Mr. Chairman, this just shows you the gross waste of the taxpayers' dollars the way this man is running the department, buying expensive equipment. He says it isn't expensive - three or four thousand dollars - that's not expensive to him. Well, I suggest it is. He suggests another item here - \$10,000 for TV. I suggest that's a waste of the taxpayers' money. He can tax people for school books, he can tax in every way, children's clothing - he'll deny it but I know for certain sizes children are paying taxes on their clothing - and yet he can squander the money like this. I think it's a travesty of justice and it should be stopped and stopped fast.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't intended to get into the debate and I'm going to be very brief, but I'm sure my honourable friend from St. George will permit me to make this comment because it did come to my personal attention in the course of some discussions I was having with radio broadcasters of Manitoba last year that they were concerned at that time about the lack of availability, as they expressed it to me, the lack of availability for radio stations such as Dauphin, Flin Flon, Thompson, Altona, the out-of-town stations primarily, of getting taped material from the government.

Now I don't know what follow-through took place - I'm frank to admit that to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman - I don't know what the follow-through was, but I do remember in the course of conversations with them that particularly the out-of-town stations were quite clear on their suggestions that it would be most helpful if they could get the taped announcements of Ministers' statements about programs, particularly programs that affected their area, and I can only make the presumption, not having personal knowledge of it, I can only make the presumption that some of the radio equipment that is being utilized by the Information Branch is being utilized for what I consider to be, and I think he would himself consider to be, a very worthwhile purpose in ensuring that radio stations outside of the Greater Winnipeg area, because even though I'm a member for this area, Manitoba doesn't begin or end with the environment of Metro Winnipeg, so the people outside of the Winnipeg area can have access on the same basis to news as the radio stations in the City of Winnipeg.

I know my honourable friend can say right away, well they have recourse to Canadian Press and so on, but the way, as I understand it now, the way that news is reported so rapidly by the radio stations, they like to have the rapid fire voice account, on tape if possible, of the different statements that are made from time to time.

Now I don't know that that is going to dissuade my honourable friend from his view at all; probably it won't but I merely interject that as one thought that has been expressed to me by out-of-town radio stations as to how the government service might be helpful to them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement made by the Attorney-General, I don't doubt for a moment what he says is true, that there may be some requests for it. If this is the case his defence doesn't hold water, because if the radio stations in the rural parts of Manitoba wish to have this information, it's just as cheap to send the statement and news story as it is to send the tape, and an awful lot less expensive. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if they want to provide the radio stations with information the release can be mailed just as they have to mail the tapes. The average station has their own announcer and they can read it themselves. I suggest to you that this can be done. You do not have to have radio equipment with the Information Services announcer to read it. Every station has competent announcers; they can read it themselves. I suggest to you -- here's a release. There's no reason why a release such as this can't be sent to the radio station and their announcer read it. Why do you have to have equipment and an announcer here read it and then mail it. I suggest to you this is absolutely nonsense. They do not have to send tapes; they can send the release and they can read it themselves. It would avoid an awful lot of money at the taxpayers' expense.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, a dangerous precedent is involved here. If the government is going to send out all kinds of television tapes and they're going to send out radio clips and things like this, this surely is going a little further than simply sending out press releases. In other words, they're making it convenient; they're sort of underwriting an economic cost. This certainly paves the way or prepares the way for the kind of management of the news that nobody wants to see. If they're going to have tapes and clips sent out as a convenience of the government for the advantage of the government, for the advantage of these private radio stations, it seems to me that they should look at this very carefully because it would seem that they are going to get the government line and in a sense the opposition isn't going to have the

April 22, 1968

1209

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) same right unless they're going to throw open their radio and television equipment to us as well so that we can make similar statements as well. It seems to me a very dangerous precedent.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Honourable ...

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, just a brief question of the Attorney-General. Does he really believe that a civil servant should give tape recordings or voice recordings for radio purposes of the proceedings of the Legislature?

MR. LYON: I was reporting, Mr. Chairman, merely on what had come to me from the radio broadcasters of rural Manitoba who did tell me quite clearly that they felt that a taped service which they could either pick up by way of telephone, or whatever the most rapid way is, would be extremely beneficial to them. I think in one instance the example was used that they didn't like to have to listen to one of the radio stations, which will remain nameless, in order to pick up the voice clips from Winnipeg to find out what the news was. Their point was that they couldn't afford to have people stationed in Winnipeg, and if they had clips, voice clips, tape clips, or whatever, available to them it would be most helpful indeed in bringing faster news service to their listeners in their particular area.

And he's coming back, I suppose, to say on the unrelated question, which I didn't rise on, is it proper for news service people to report on proceedings in the House. I think, particularly where government programs are being announced, I see nothing improper whatsoever, any more than it would be improper for the same person to make such a report on the same item if the House were not in session. It's an item of news that is to be reported. There are a great number of news media in Manitoba who do not have the benefit of daily occupancy and use of the Press Gallery. We're fortunate indeed that the Press Gallery is as full as it is, but there are many publications and other news media in Manitoba who can not afford to have people in the Press Gallery to get first-hand reports. They rely, I am told, on many of the news releases that are sent out by the Information Service. That's the purpose of the operation.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's); Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the Attorney-General has entered into this debate to lend his experience and knowledge on the subject such as he has imparted to us, and I'm therefore bound to challenge him on the question of the feasibility of government getting involved in the news service to give the kind of information he described. I am under the impression that the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, who has just entered this Chamber to grace us with his presence, makes a practice on behalf of the Dauphin radio station of sending in a report, and I think that that is a very commendable thing.

MR. McLEAN: A slanted report.

MR. CHERNIACK: Pardon?

MR. McLEAN: Slanted report.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I don't blame him if it is a slanted report because it is one which he makes at the invitation of whatever newspaper carries his favour, or on the other hand, wishes to expose itself to his type of slanted report, and that is something for which the newspaper or possibly the Honourable Minister pays.

MR. McLEAN: No.

MR. CHERNIACK: No. Well, then he doesn't pay for it, so it's at the invitation

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, neither do they pay me.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, I'm sure of that. I'm sure of that. It is sufficient for the Honourable the Provincial Secretary to have this opportunity to give this report - and again I don't question for a moment that that report would be impartial - but I do question very much the government's creation of a news service which does give reports which could be slanted, which have the possibility of being misused, and the government of course should be most particular to make sure that this is not possible. If the government wish to make available to out-of-town newspapers information, then possibly they should make sure that it is done by maybe the subscription for these agencies in the Canadian Press or any other type of news-gathering media, that they could do it. I would rather see that than to see this coming out of government services.

I would really like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General whether he does not recognize the danger involved in having a government department select the type of information, the type of news material that would be disseminated from this building to public stations,

April 22, 1968

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) to the radio stations he speaks of, and whether he does not recognize the danger involved. I have on my desk something I haven't looked at yet, that is a news service, and I see one-thumbing over a page - reporting a speech made by the Honourable J. B. Carroll to the Conference on Indian and Metis. This is not a statement of government policy, as far as I can read it. It was not a statement to the people as to what the actions of his department are. Instead of that, it was a calling on Ottawa to call a conference to discuss certain things. This is news, but certainly I have yet to see a statement made by any member on this side of the House in regard to calling a conference or dealing with Indian and Metis. I believe that my Leader had something to say about the Indian and Metis problem. I'm sure that many members on this side of the House have dealt with it. I have yet to see a report emanating from this department reporting on what was said either in this House or outside of the House on any question which is reported as being a Minister's statement.

Now I took particular interest and note of what was said by the Provincial Treasurer on the Budget Address. Now he contributed to the debate, he presented the budget, he made statements in support of the budget. I'm under the impression that there have been people in this House who rose to speak after he did who disagreed both with his interpretations and with his actions. Was this reported by the government service?

MR. SPIVAK: It's not supposed to be.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well now, the Minister of Industry and Commerce says it's not supposed to be, and I think that's right because those are his orders. It's not supposed to be, because if it were a statement of straight reportage then it should report what is being said by all. It should not be - I don't want to use the word "slanted" - it should not be even an objective report of what was said by government because in itself it becomes selected to that extent. So that when we have a report by a Minister such as the Minister of Welfare who spoke to a conference of Indian and Metis, this really gives to him a personalized service on his attitude to the problem of Indian and Metis situation as it was spelled out by him to others. It quotes him verbatim, and if radio reports are given then why shouldn't they have excerpts by the Minister himself on that? This is the thing that bothers me so much, and which I do invite the Attorney-General to speak on, as I see he's anxious to do, to indicate to us the misuse that he might see in this type of service.

MR. PAULLEY: Here comes that book again.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I would really recommend that those who've spoken read the book, "The Government Explains", and recognize that in reorganizing the Branch, the Information Service Branch — (Interjection) — Yes, that's right. So far you haven't passed over that thin line. And I must say that in explanation for the debate that's just taken place that this department, or this branch of the department, has been reorganized by viewing first of all what was happening in other Information Service Branches throughout the country, that is in Canada, and by looking at this book, "The Government Explains", which explains the British system. There's one point on Page 191 and I'd like to read it to the Honourable Member for St. John's. "Press releases should be, and usually are, purely factual, although the Press would not expect Ministerial press releases actually to make points for the Opposition."

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, this subject is taking a long time. That's the kind of factual statement that could be printed, I suppose, in the Information Services. Nobody would say it was subjective.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that I will have to agree that it should take a long time because I think that this is probably one of the most basic denials of the democratic process that this government has participated in, and we dealt with it to some extent last year. I see that the Attorney-General is wincing, and I think he should wince because despite everything that's been said, it becomes quite apparent that it has not got through to him that what his Party is doing - and maybe if it did get through to him they would change, so I'll make one last effort - what his Party is doing - and it's not the Progressive-Conservative Party alone that has done this, it's a fault that anybody could fall heir to - but what they are doing, and unmistakably doing, is they are using public taxation to sell their program, and the way which they are doing it is unmistakable. They admit that they are doing it. The Attorney-General gets up and says, "Well, people want this. Some news media don't have the facilities and therefore we're helping them." I think probably he thinks he is doing good and that's why they continue to do it.

But, Mr. Chairman, if that were correct, if we had to improve the facilities for seeing to it that the media were able to get information from the House, I would go along with you.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) If maybe \$270,000, or whatever figure we're talking about -- (Interjection) -- 148 - I thought we were taking it down by that - well maybe \$148,000 or even \$200,000, if that were the amount, and if what the Minister said they were going to do is put facilities in here which would make it possible for these radio people that they're talking about to get instantaneous news wherever they may be in the Province of Manitoba, that they could even listen to everything that's going on here, listen to the Ministers' speeches and listen to the Member for Lakeside's speeches and the Leader of the Opposition's speeches or the speeches of any member of this side of the House, if that's what they were trying to do, then, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that they might find support from various sides of the House if they were trying to disseminate information in that way.

But they can't do that. As much as they try, I have yet to see a person who can objectively put his position when he is engaged in a difficult dispute. Surely you must know that we think we are being objective and that we would put it in our way if we had the news media at our disposal. Surely that's not what a government should do.

And, Mr. Chairman, I want to make this point again, it's a fault which we attribute to this government, but it's a fault which other governments have fallen heir to. I'm told that the Government of Saskatchewan did it when the CCF were in office. If they did it, they were wrong. I certainly know, Mr. Chairman, when I was a candidate in the 1965 federal election, my honourable friends the members of the Liberal Party should well remember that for approximately seven weeks during the height of the campaign, and I'll never forget it, there were full-page ads week by week which purported to give information about the Canada Pension Plan, and they were nothing but political propaganda on the part of the Liberal Party paid for by my supporters. That's what made it so bad, and that's what they did. Mr. Chairman, when they did it they were wrong and I think that they should not have done it; and when this government does it it's wrong, and if we did it before we were wrong.

That's all this side of the House is saying, and we are trying to get that through to you, that at some point legislators have got to realize that this use of the media, this use of public funds to sell a political program is wrong, and the Party that recognizes this wrong and puts a stop to it should get the plaudits for it, and if this government wants to do it, then we'll congratulate them.

But let's stop it, let's at some point realize that it's wrong and stop it. I ask this government to be the leader, to be the leader, show leadership, recognize that you've done wrong. Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there can have been any greater display of the amount of political propaganda that is needed - I don't know that any government has gone as far as this government has gone and I'll admit I haven't looked at every record - what the Liberals did in 1965 was pretty terrible; they did it right during the process of an election campaign. If the Douglas government did it in Saskatchewan, then I'll admit they were wrong. But let this government admit it's wrong and stop it, for God's sake, stop.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, might I in the five minutes left, and I won't require that long, take up where the Honourable Member for Inkster left off. I agree with what he said, it's wrong; it's wrong for the reasons that he mentioned and I subscribe to the remarks that he made. But it's wrong for another reason as well - and this is the one you'd expect to appeal to me - it's wrong because it's a waste of money in addition. This job is being done by facilities that already exist, and not in the slanted way that these emanations from the government are bound to take. We are subjected here to a reasonably critical examination by the people of the press and other news media who pay us some attention - not too much at times it's true - but they pay us attention for what they think we deserve. They're doing this job anyway of putting out the news, and for the government to go and duplicate what they're doing is in my opinion indefensible, and the only justification that I think the government can offer is that they want to, as my honourable friend the Minister has admitted, to complement, to enlarge on what the other news media are doing, but when they come to the complementary material, to the enlarging of it, they invariably slant it and this, as the honourable member for Inkster has mentioned, is quite natural.

Now, how bad a duplication is it and how costly. Mr. Chairman, the amount that we're talking about here was \$73,000-odd in last year's estimates. It's approximately doubled now, a little more I think, approximately doubled, but if you go back a year further you will find that in the Public Accounts of a year ago, the year ending March 31, 1967, that it was only approximately half of last year's item. Yes, that's what the Public Accounts say: Information

April 22, 1968

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) Services, Page 150, \$39,000-odd -- and my honourable friend is warning me that something's not right about this. I agree with him, there's a whole lot not right about it, a tremendous amount. But here we have this service growing - what is it, Mr. Chairman - by geometrical progression, doubling from the year before last to last year, doubling again from last year to this year, and if my honourable friend stays in office very long he's going to have a duplication up here of the whole CBC by what we see developing here. My honourable friend is going into competition with them on the presentation of the news by radio, by television, and goodness knows what other method that he'll think of in addition to the leaflets that we already have.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in addition to the philosophical and moral arguments that have been used here by the Honourable Member for Inkster and others, there is undoubtedly this economical argument too. Surely we can get away from some of these duplications. I have talked many times in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, of the growing cost of government, the tendency towards big government, how departments and branches tend to increase, how the most of our ministers as well as senior civil servants tend to become empire builders, how programs that are put in with the best of motives in view, how they themselves grow just by the expansion of the services - not wrongly, they just grow because of more people taking advantage of the services.

But - and this is bad enough, and it's difficult - but the really bad thing I think is when you get duplication of services; duplication between government, federal and provincial; and between provincial ones and municipal governments. And here we have one of the rankest cases of duplication, apart altogether from the philosophical and moral arguments which I admit are even more important than the economic one, but dollars and cents-wise in my opinion this is wrong, and I would suggest that we should have a sub-amendment that would cut it down still further. In fact, if it went back to a dollar I would think that would be a reasonable amount. Let's see my honourable friend show the ability that he has displayed in attempting to defend this; let's see him get along on a much lesser amount of money. Well, a dollar would be a little too small to give my honourable friend free scope for his undoubted attainment, but the amendment that we have before us, surely, Mr. Chairman, we must all agree that that would be an improvement on the present situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30. I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.