

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, February 28, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 45 students Grade 11 standing of the St. John's High School. These students are under the direction of Dr. Derksen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

We also have 20 students of the St. Boniface College who are the hosts of the College of St. Jean (Edmonton). These students are under the direction of Mr. Fabas. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

And as my guests, we have 85 students, Grades 9, 10 and 11 standing, from Beaver Bræ High School, from Kenora, Ontario. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gainer and Mr. Burke.

And a futher 15 students of Grades 7 and 9 standing of the Hugh John Macdonald School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Thiessen. This school is located in the constituency of Winnipeg Centre.

And we have 23 students of Grades 7 to 9 standing of the Louis Riel School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Morris and Mr. Laterelle. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation & Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, fiscal year ending March 31, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other reports or ministerial statements? Introduction of Bills; Questions? The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of privilege. It arises from the debate on February 26th, appearing in Hansard at Pages 842 and 843 during the remarks made by the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, who I - yes is in the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I said at Page 843 that when Hansard was printed, which I've now got, and if the Hansard contained the remarks that were considered to be offensive and unparliamentary, I said that perhaps I will withdraw the statement that he is telling a lie and I will simply say that he is a stranger to the truth. Mr. Speaker, having seen Hansard, I do withdraw the statement and substitute it by saying that he is a stranger to the truth. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go further --(Interjections)-- Mr. Speaker, I would be quite willing to withdraw the substitution, the fact that I say he is a stranger to the truth, I'm quite willing to withdraw that if he will withdraw as the second part of the privilege that was raised that evening, if he will withdraw or make a clear statement that he now understands that the Liberal Party in its resolution was not casting aspersions or characterizing the Chief Electoral Officer of Manitoba. But for the record, unless the member has something further to say, I will replace the statement as I have indicated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, and I rise because I was the one who raised the point of order at the time when he stated not once but more than once that the Member for St. Matthews lied. I point out to you that on Page 841, the Member for St. Matthews said, and I quote: "I think that the suggestion of an Independent Electoral Commission is an overreaction and it implies an aspersion against the Chief Electoral

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . Officer which I don't think is warranted. The implication that he is not independent, the Chief Electoral Officer is a servant of the House, he is not a servant of the government."

Mr. Speaker, just for the future, it seems to me we should establish the fact that any member may draw any conclusion that he deems advisable out of words or actions or resolutions presented by any other member. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews made it clear that because of a certain wording in a resolution presented by the Liberal Party, he drew the conclusion that it reflected, that it implied an aspersion against the Chief Electoral Officer in that the word "independent" was used. Now it's very well for the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party to say that he is now going to bargain for whether or not he will withdraw the term "stranger for the truth" - "stranger of the truth" - but he has suggested if the Member for St. Matthews withdraws a conclusion to which he came, then he will withdraw the accusation of the Member for St. Matthews being a stranger of the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to - firstly, I see nowhere in the record his statement that he would examine Hansard and would withdraw the statement of the lie if he found that, but if he said it, that's fine. What I want to point out is that doing it in the qualified way he did, he accomplished nothing but withdrawing a word and not following what I believe is the general intent of the rules of the House.

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

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, answering the Honourable Minister for Finance, it is exactly found on Page 843, the last three lines, that I said that I would examine Hansard and make the substitution that I have just made. That that is my position, period. There is no question of parliamentary or unparliamentary language in stating that if the Member from St. Matthews remains adamant in his position that I am perfectly free to characterize what he said as making him a stranger to the truth, which is what I do. But, Mr. Speaker, I have read the full debate on this resolution in Hansard, and I've read the resolution, and there was no means whereby any reasonable man could have derived the conclusion that there was an aspersion cast on the Chief Electoral Officer; and it was because of that, Mr. Speaker, I urged him as a member of this Chamber, having given him my word and the word of the Liberal Party that there is no aspersion intended or meant, I ask him now to withdraw that remark. And the onus is on him, he doesn't have to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair is in a very difficult position. I'm supposed to rule on something where there is no ruling necessary, because it's straight matter of differences of opinion in my opinion. Question period. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition)(River Heights): Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Education in his capacity as Chairman of the Management Committee - of Cabinet. I want . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance state his point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe it was established only within the last week that members of Cabinet are not called upon to speak in any capacity other than the position which they hold in Cabinet, which in the case of the Minister of Education, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition well knows, is the Minister of Education, he said it himself. That is the capacity in which he will respond.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Minister of Education is appointed by Order-in-Council as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee, and therefore holds an official title as Chairman of the Cabinet Committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: On the point of order, I should clarify what I said. As the Chairman of the Management Committee, he is chairman of a sub-committee of Cabinet; decisions which are made by that sub-committee are like decisions of the Cabinet, matters which are not accountable to anyone other than Cabinet itself. Therefore my suggestion is that questions should be directed either to the First Minister dealing with Cabinet matters or to the Minister responsible, and then the answer can come from whoever is most knowledgeable within Cabinet, but not accountable to the House as a position held within Cabinet. I believe I'm right in that

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . position, I don't think it's really terribly important, it's just that it shouldn't be repeated again and again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I will ask a question to the Acting Premier. I wonder if he can indicate whether persons who are employed by contract have their appointments approved by the Management Committee of Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it is my recollection that contracts are approved by Cabinet at a certain level but I think that's a question we can take under notice and give a proper response to.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I then have another question to ask the Acting Premier. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government is considering the creation of a provincial price review board?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it can well be said that we've been considering that problem for quite a while and if and when any further decision is to be made on that matter it will be made public.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the government can indicate whether it would be the government's position or whether it would not be the government's position that a price review board would have a dampening effect on the inflationary spiral with respect to the cost of living?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that exactly is the question that all of us must consider. I have no doubt that our mere decision to create a board, a commission to review bread prices had an effect on the resultant increase in price of bread; but on the other hand if it becomes broad it may well be useless and therefore it has to be carefully considered and timed in a proper way.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Acting Premier can indicate whether it's likely that the government will act in this matter fairly soon?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I just said that the timing is important as a mere suggestion of predicting what we might do in itself might destroy the effectiveness of it.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Does the government not feel that with the rising cost of food and cost of prices and services that the time is not important now?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the government has been deeply concerned with this, not just as of now, but as of some time back - it has been happening for quite a while and it is a matter of deep concern. The question of course of what a provincial government can do is also a matter of deep concern and we are considering the entire problem day to day.

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

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Autopac. Will he explain why individual Manitobans are required to pay at least 50 percent of their Autopac premiums, 50 percent by today February 28th, while fleet operators of rented cars may buy their insurance with only 25 percent down as opposed to 50 percent down for individuals?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the honourable member is correct insofar as the basic insurance is concerned, but I'll take the question as notice.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he can also explain why individual Manitobans are required to pay off the balance of their premium within 90 days, but fleet owners of rented cars have a nine month period in which to pay off their Autopac premiums.

MR. URUSKI: I will get the information and provide it to the honourable member.

MR. ASPER: Well, perhaps the Minister may need to get this information as well. I'm relating to the answer he gave yesterday or the day before in the House when he indicated the deferral fee of \$3.00 was a service fee. Can he explain why individual Manitobans are paying that service fee for deferring their Autopac premiums at a cost of 24 to 77 percent of the premium when the time payment plan for fleet operators of rented cars are charged only approximately 12 percent of the premium?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've answered the question with respect to individual motorists. Now I've indicated when I first answered the question that I'm not sure that the honourable member is correct insofar as the basic insurance is concerned, but I've taken the question

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) . . . as notice and I'll provide him the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if it wouldn't be more propitious if members would give notice to Ministers and they could get answers. It would be a courtesy that could be extended. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister when he replies to the other questions, could he indicate to the House whether he's intending to introduce changes to the legislation to put individual Manitoba Autopac customers on the same basis as the fleet owners are in respect to deferrals of premiums? That there be no distinction. That both have the same rights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, any matter of changes would be a matter of policy and would be announced, but I've taken all his questions as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK(Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister of Labour can provide the House with an updated report on the progress of negotiations to avert the police strike in the City of Winnipeg and are there any new developments that would indicate we will not have a strike or a partial strike?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, one of the foundations of the Labour Relations Act of the Province of Manitoba as adopted by this Assembly basically is that parties of goodwill to a collective agreement will use every effort that they can to resolve their differences. I'm convinced that the Police Association is a responsible organization. I believe that the Winnipeg Council is a responsible organization and I believe that being responsible they will, without compulsion, arrive at a satisfactory conclusion to their differences.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have the discussions to date between the department and the City of Winnipeg included an offer from the province to contribute financially in order to bring a settlement?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not made any offer to contribute financially to the City of Winnipeg, the Police Association, any more than we would any other organization under the Labour Relations Act of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. PATRICK: Supplementary. Can the Minister provide to the House any specific contingency plans that the Provincial Government has made to the city in the event that there is a strike?

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to that is no, Mr. Speaker. I indicated the other day that we are interested and concerned with likelihoods but unlike my honourable friends opposite, the Minister of Labour and the government is not panicking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Honourable the Minister of Labour on this same subject. Can the Minister confirm that there has been no communication from the conciliation officers since the police took their vote last Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that the conciliation officer of the Department of Labour is available at all times. When the two parties want the benefit of his expertise he is available, the Minister is available, but we believe in not compulsion but negotiation between the parties concerned and that is the basic of the labour law in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Honourable Minister. I thank him for his lecture, I remind him that he informed the House he was mistaken earlier in the week in his estimate.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SHERMAN: Can the Minister assure the House that the two sides are in negotiation and are meeting at the present time or have plans to do so before this weekend?

MR. PAULLEY: The only answer to that I can give, Mr. Speaker, as I did just a couple of moments ago, I believe that the two parties to the agreement are responsible people. --(Interjection)-- Of course you didn't ask me, but you tried to veil your question in order to subterfuge the whole situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. Does the government have any intentions of formally meeting with municipal officials of the communities that will be directly affected or concerned by the Garrison Diversion, and does it plan to include them in the assessment of the information that may come from the monitoring process that is being set up?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the number of municipal authorities that could conceivably be affected is very great, and if any of them wish to meet with us we would certainly be pleased to do so. We have heard from some of them. Their interests will be taken into consideration in any assessments that are made. As to how they will be involved in that process of consideration, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to say at the moment. I would make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba represents every municipal area in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the government have any intention to hold public hearings concerning the Garrison Diversion in order to provide a forum for citizens to express their views and to provide independent basis of information on this problem?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Environmental Council did hold a meeting at which the subject was aired. The great impetus as we see it, and we haven't heard anything to the contrary with regard to Manitoba input, is that the Manitoba people are very concerned that there be no pollution of Manitoba waters and they want us to take every step to protect that situation. That goes without saying, we do not require a public hearing to be told that, the Government of Manitoba is well aware. If there are issues in which informational meetings will be of value to us, and it is indicated as such, Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared to consider them.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Does the government intend to rely solely on studies prepared by other jurisdictions or other government, or does it intend to commission its own independent assessment or impact of the Garrison River Diversion and present that information in a public way?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the studies that we have now which were prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation in the United States already gives sufficient indication for Manitobans to be concerned with the impact of that particular project and require the Government of Manitoba to take every possible step to see to it that the predicted problems do not arise. Our own environmental people will also be assessing the information that is available to them at the United States level, at the national level and at the provincial level. And I undertake, Mr. Speaker, that no information that is obtained in that way, which we receive voluntarily from any ecologist or scientist or non lay person, from within the province will be made public information. We have no intention, nor do I take it, does the United States have any intention of not revealing to the public all of the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, a question to the same minister. Surely, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister not undertake or indicate to us fairly soon what specific kind of studies he in his department is undertaking in this matter; that we are not just relying on volunteer information that might come to the government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the studies which the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba have relied on in pursuing their position are the studies which I made available to the House and they have essentially been done by the Bureau of Reclamation in the United States. The Government of Canada and of Manitoba have been prepared to rely on their study in asking that the United States first of all not proceed with the project, and following receipt of the note from the United States State Department, which the Minister of External Affairs described as very satisfactory, and which I made reservations about because I don't know how they propose to do it, which says that there will be no violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty as between Canada and the United States, those studies have been sufficient for us to take the position vis-à-vis the project.

We are now saying, you say there will be no - to the United States - you say there will be

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . no violation of the Treaty - show us; show us how you intend to deal with the problems which have already been identified. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, if there is need to identify further problems -- and we have been, Mr. Speaker, satisfied with the identification of problems that has been done by the Bureau of Reclamation, because they have given sophistication to the fears that were presented by the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba -- if there are any further studies necessary they will be done.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question on another subject to the same Minister. Is the Minister, or anybody, or has his department been made aware of any changes in the original boundary figures of those jurisdictions which come under the aegis of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation? My specific question being, is he aware of any particular area or region that were included in that original Freshwater Fish Marketing Board jurisdiction that has opted out in recent time?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, reserving the definition of "recent", my recollection is that part of Ontario withdrew from that original agreement, but again I'm going to rely from memory, I hope it doesn't get me into trouble. I would say that that occurred at least nine months ago; so just so you know what the meaning of recent is.

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake to perphas research that more accurately and either give it to me privately . . .

MR. GREEN: I'll give it to the House, Mr. Speaker, or to the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the other day the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question in respect to the Crime Analysis Laboratory in Winnipeg. I have information from the Chief Coroner in respect to this question. He indicates first that the press reports could in fact indicate or interpret his suggestion that there should be an RCMP Crime Laboratory located in Winnipeg. He points out that there is already a Crime Detection Laboratory in Winnipeg which covers sections of hair and fibres, alcohol estimations, serology, firearms and ballistics. His recommendation is that there be, and it is verified in the transcript of the inquest in the matter involved, that there be a toxology section added to the already existing laboratory in Winnipeg as soon as it was feasible to do so; and I'm further advised that such a section is presently in the books and is being planned for by the RCMP.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Acting First Minister, the Minister of Finance. Can he indicate whether the Government Task Force assigned to examining the Kierans Report has made any recommendations or has any reports?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the final report, but I believe that it's in the process of being completed. I'm informed that the report is completed. I still haven't seen the final copy of it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister if their recommendations have implications for the budget for this year?

MR. CHERNIACK: I would think that that would be a matter that the honourable member could wait a bit to find out. There is reference in the Throne Speech.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might ask the government if they could some time soon supply us with a copy of the Task Force Report.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it was an in-House report; it was not indicated that it would be published, but there will be a report by the Minister in regards to that in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Autopac. Did the Provincial Government issue a directive to the City of Winnipeg to increase the amounts of salt and sand used on the streets during the winter season to cut down automobile mishaps and the cost of Autopac?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I wish that would have been the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to come back to the Minister of Mines and

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . Natural Resources on the Garrison project. When he states that the government is prepared to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, I'd like to preface it by his statement he just made, Mr. Speaker. When the Minister says that he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . everything to assure that the predicted problems that arise . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'm about to ask the question, Mr. Speaker. Does this government contingency plan include - I will ask the question if the members will permit - does the government in its contingency plan therefore, or is it prepared to include a halting of the diversion project if the information and evidence warrants?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba indicated to the Government of North Dakota, in the presence of the Government of Canada, which is by protocol the initiating government here, that we reserve the right to take every position that is now available to us.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister please expand that statement to demonstrate his - "every position available to you", does that include halting diversion projects?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to indicate, much as the Honourable Minister may wish to expand, that this is a question period and may take an hour for him to expand. The Honourable Minister will be brief I hope.

MR. GREEN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that what I am trying to indicate to the honourable member is that the Government of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: What I'm trying to indicate, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada have not compromised any position now available. When the honourable member says, shall I expand on that and determine what is available, I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, that that is a question which cannot be answered on Orders of the Day, and the very answering of it is a compromise of the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba's position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: May I ask the Minister this. Does the Government of Manitoba have the power to stop the diversion if necessary?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that would be best be answered by political scientists.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and it's relating to Garrison Dam, but I wonder if he's in a position to indicate to the House whether the government has considered the implications for Manitoba of the uncertainty of the consequences of the Garrison Dam with respect to the industrial development in the areas in which it will be affected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are various problem areas involved with the consequences that we are presently aware of. We have attempted to deal with this matter in such a way as to make the American Government and the State of North Dakota concerned with what they are doing to the extent that they will either not have these consequences result or do everything possible for the purpose of ameliorating or reversing them. We feel that we are on the right track in that connection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. A supplementary question to the Minister. Would he not say at the present time that the uncertainty relating to the Garrison Dam and the information supplied in the way that he supplied it, and I accept what he is saying to be the correct analysis of it, will have a detrimental effect for the industrial developments in that area of southwest Manitoba?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I could not make that as a positive statement. For instance, one of the consequences is that there will be much greater flows in the Souris River. That will have a negative effect on certain areas, it will have a positive effect on other areas. The fact that the Souris flow will have a greater salt content we see as having no possible advantages. As far as industrial development is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it has not been brought to my attention that anything vis-a-vis industrial development is involved seriously by either the state of uncertainty or for any other reason.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, another question of the Minister . . . because he mentioned the fact of the salt content, and the question was asked before whether compensation would be offered to the municipalities or the towns that are affected, in the event that the salt content will affect industrial development, or the salt content in water could affect industrial development . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question now becomes hypothetical.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, if the government, will the government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member rephrase his question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'll phrase the question as best I can, Mr. Speaker, but I think the intent is understood by the Minister and he's prepared to answer it, and I think it is in the public interest that it be answered. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister's going to be in a position to indicate whether the government will be prepared to offer compensation under certain circumstances with respect to the problems of salt content and industrial development in those situations in which there is a specific industrial project.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe an affirmative answer to that question would compromise the position of Manitoba, vis-a-vis, trying to avoid the salt content in the first place.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Does the Public Schools Finance Board set the sale price for obsolete school buildings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker, the only role or the extent to which the Department of Education or any of its boards or commissions are involved in the sale of school buildings which are the property of the school division by the way, is granting approval or not granting approval to the sale.

MR. MARION: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is it a fact that in the Mariapolis situation the Division Board had set a value of \$5,000 on the obsolete building yet the Public Schools Finance Board recommended a 20,000-dollar selling price?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder. That was a statement more than a question. I don't know how one can answer a statement . . .

MR. MARION: Well, is that the case, Mr. Speaker, if you want me to rephrase it. Was it a fact that the Public Schools Finance Board requested a selling price of \$20,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm happy the honourable member can ask a question. The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, it may or may not be a fact. I would imagine that in fact I know that the Public Schools Finance Board would be concerned about any indebtedness that there may be against a school building by way of debentures, and of that of course the Public Schools Finance Board would give the school division notice. And this fact certainly a school division will take into account in determining what a realistic and a fair price would be in asking for a school building of which they wish to dispose.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could then advise if there is a role played presently by the Public Schools Finance Board in the sale of buildings. I understand and appreciate that a school division owns the building, but I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. MARION: Well, the question is: Would the Minister advise this House if the Public Schools Finance Board is making recommendations to school divisions with respect to the sale of obsolete school buildings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm not quite sure which question the honourable member wishes me to answer. The answer to the first question is, yes there is a role. The answer to the second question is yes and no.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister reporting for and responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Is the MDC as principal owner doing anything about the strike of mill and bush workers at the Columbia Forest Products plant in Sprague?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would expect that the MDC at the present time is engaged in free collective bargaining.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister himself had any contact with the union and with the strikers?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that some people from Sprague, and it may include some employees, have arranged for an appointment with me on Monday. But so that there be no misunderstanding about this meeting, I have not refused it because they are people who have asked to come in. I will not interfere with the free collective bargaining process as between the receiver and the employees; I will talk to the men because I want them to understand our position but I don't want them to misunderstand what the meeting is about.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Can the Minister confirm that the free collective bargaining process he talks about is actually going on. Is there collective bargaining going on at the present time?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I regard a withdrawal of service and a refusal of an employer to pay wages as demanded by the employees as part of the free collective bargaining process.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question's to the Acting First Minister. Is it the government's intention to keep the Urban Affairs Department as it is presently structured as a separate department, or is it the government's intention to amalgamate this important department with the Department of Municipal Affairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I expect that it shouldn't be too long, like a few years yet before the honourable member realizes that questions of policy are not matters that are dealt with in this . . .

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order - the point of order being that the government, or the records should show that the government does not have to answer a question of policy, but that there is nothing wrong with the question being asked, and the Opposition is entitled to ask the question.

Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, Is it the government's intention to retain the Department of Health and Social Development in its present structure or is the government planning to split it into two departments in view of the heavy workload and staff requirements?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the same answer as to the last question.

MR. ASPER: Has the government received the resignation of a Deputy Minister in one of its departments and is it planning to make a change in the deputy ministry of a department of government?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would not participate in a fishing expedition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

A MEMBER: Oh! He doesn't like that.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'll be more specific so the Minister can restrain his comments. Has the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce tendered his resignation or indicated his intention to leave the government?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, certainly not to me, and the Minister involved and the Premier are absent, but the honourable member should know the intentions of the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce if he wants to make them known to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. It relates to the school tax rebate. Is it still possible for qualified people to apply for and receive the rebate for years prior to 1973, assuming that they may or may not have already filed their income tax statement?

Mr. Speaker, I think I'd better ask the question again. Is it still possible for qualified

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . people who did not receive their rebate prior to 1973 to apply for it and qualify for it yet, for years prior to 1973?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, the honourable member is speaking of people who were in non-unitary school divisions and who were receiving the \$50.00 rebate? No. --(Interjection)-- Well then, anybody who is entitled to a rebate as of two years ago and possibly did not apply for it, could they still apply for it? The answer is yes.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, is there any problem with the fact that they may have filed their income tax and settled that but did not apply for their school tax rebate at that time?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, we're talking about people who apply for two different tax years; if that's the case then one should not affect the other. But now the question is becoming a little too technical for me and if the honourable member could give me either publicly or privately a specific problem I will certainly undertake to give him a specific answer.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can just indicate publicly what it is, because there's more than one case, where it's a senior citizen who suddenly realized that they probably qualified for a rebate in 1972 but have just discovered it now and wonder if they can apply for it.

MR. CHERNIACK: I see. Mr. Speaker, then I assume that this person referred to, in spite of our very extensive advertising and pleas for people to file their return, did not realize that a return was to be filed at all and did not make a return. Certainly that person would be entitled and is almost obligated to make an income tax return which hadn't been made before, and could make the return. If on the other hand a return was made and the claim was not made in the return, then the person would have to file an amended return, which I believe is still acceptable.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps I could ask a final supplementary. There is no cutoff year then that is contemplated at this time, whether it's '72 or '71?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, none that I am aware of, and I really don't think there are any; but my answering this question will prompt my staff to inform me if I'm incorrect, in which case I will certainly report to the House.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Premier. I wonder if he could indicate to this House whether or not - I believe Assistant Deputy or the Associate Deputy Minister for the Department of Corporate and Consumer Affairs, Mr. Kenneth Goldstein has indicated his intention to resign or has resigned and is leaving government service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, there are frequent changes in the Civil Service, from the lowest to the highest classifications. I am not aware of a specific answer to the question of the honourable member, and therefore I'm not in a position to respond.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for MDC going back to the issue of CFL. Could the Minister confirm to this House whether the Manitoba Development Corporation has in fact withdrawn all financial support from Columbia Forest Industries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, did the honourable member say Simplot first - it's Columbia Forest Industries? Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the running account of that particular concern is continuously in deficit and has to be paid, and unfortunately for all of us is at present being paid by the people of Manitoba through the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister inform the House, or undertake to inform the House, whether the Manitoba Development Corporation withdrew financial support for the wood gathering and pulp gathering activities of Columbia Forest Industries prior to the strike being called?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice but wish to indicate that I'm not certain what support it had to those activities except through the sawmill operations. In other words, to finance a sawmill to purchase the wood that was being produced by, or being harvested by people in the area, and the fact is that the Development Corporation was involved in continuing to finance this deficit. It may be that part of the activities were reduced in order to try to reduce the deficit, and therefore I'll take the honourable member's question as notice.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Before we proceed I should like to indicate in the loge to my right we have a guest - a former member of this House, Mr. Gordon Fines. On behalf of the members I welcome you here.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation - I'm not sure in what capacity - but can the Minister indicate whether or not the hockey sweaters that are to be worn by the Golden Boys on Saturday evening, are the remaining inventory from St. Jean Sportswear?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm or deny this.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, then to the same Minister. Can he indicate to the House whether there is any political significance or conclusions to be drawn by the fact that two days ago in the hockey practice he was seen to be wearing Commie Red underwear, but this morning was found to be wearing Tory blue underwear.

A MEMBER: More green showed than any other colour.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, being the opportunist that I am, I keep prepared for all contingencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Could he inform this House what kind of investigation, or study or assessment, his Parks Branch undertook in the development of campsites, the environmental consequences of the development of campsites in the Whiteshell, other than holding discussions with the Department of Mines, Resources, and Environmental Management.

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

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to relate this to this House at this time. I can take the question as notice and attempt to give honourable members a more detailed report during my estimates.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have you proceed with the adjourned debates on Second Reading of Government Bills and introduction of bills if necessary, following which we will be asking for the Supply Motion to be called.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 7. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this bill I feel is one of the most important bills that we have before us at this particular sitting of the Legislature to this date, and I say so because it will affect the lives of some 12,000 people who are employed by the government, not only in their working part of their life but also in their home life, and I say so on the grounds that it's my opinion that this bill as it stands in its present form will have a demoralizing and a fracturing effect on our Civil Service, and I have seen legislation that has created a demoralizing effect on civil servants in the City of Winnipeg Act.

This particular Act which amalgamated all the municipalities and cities in our one city now, had a demoralizing effect on some 7,500 people, and it went right into their homes, and it is still going on. Now the people, or the government on the other side, would probably say, well the councillors created that demoralizing effect and the City of Winnipeg. What I am suggesting, Sir, is that it was the initial effect of throwing everybody together not knowing where their future was, that created this demoralizing effect. Sir, I cannot understand why a government would want to create a demoralizing effect in our Civil Service after 104 years of service that we have had. I really can't understand it.

The bill as it stands - we have no objections to employees seeking as candidates going and getting a leave of absence. We have no objection to this at all, and we have no objections to an employee applying for return if he should be unsuccessful; but we do have objections to a

BILL 7

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) basic principle. I must commend the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Attorney-General in the manner in which they talked on the bill, and we agree with them on some of their statements. I believe on - the Honourable Minister of Finance said "the principle to me sort of boils down to a very simple thing: should a civil servant be barred from participating in political affairs under certain limitations without endangering his job, excuse me, his job security?" Well we agree with the Honourable Minister of Finance; we don't feel that our Civil Service should be any different from any other person in our province but the Honourable Minister very expertly and smoothly skirted around what I feel is another major issue in this bill, a very major issue, which will create a demoralizing effect on our Civil Service, and that particular issue is the one that deals with the collection of finances by a candidate. One starts to wonder, you know, what devious means has this government proposed in this particular bill because on one hand in the principle dealing with candidates being able to come from our Civil Services, they have clearly indicated that it would be a proposed candidate, and one looks up in the dictionary what "proposed" means and it says "to intend".

Then later on in the bill it deals with the principle of collecting funds, but all of a sudden out of nowhere comes a statement which makes one wonder, you know, what are we getting to, and it says "that an individual will have the right to collect funds for a political party, or a federal party, provincial, or a candidate" and one starts to wonder why would they say "or a candidate"? Why wouldn't they say as a candidate? Then one starts to wonder, is this going to make the thing altogether different?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Bill is left with this basic principle that an individual can propose to be a candidate, go through the particular actions that he's going to be a candidate, and either become defeated or withdraw, then he can go out and become a political bagman. I suggest, Sir, that we have here potentially a political bagman's haven that could be created, and could you imagine what would happen to our Civil Service if this did happen? Could you really imagine because what would happen to a department if that person indicated that he was going to become a candidate, went through the actions, and then went out and became a bagman for the party. Just think about it. What we're asking the people of Manitoba to endorse is year round employment for political bagmen, and at the calling of an election they can go on their way, go through the motions of becoming a candidate - and being unsuccessful as a candidate - but now they can go on to the next principle, we can stay out and collect funds for the political party or a candidate.

Now we have no objections to a person seeking a candidacy and making that nomination and going on to become part of the election campaign and collecting funds for himself. We have nothing objectionable to that at all, but can you imagine, Sir, what consequence we would have at times of election. I understand that in the last election, the hallways were cleared and the executive assistants and other people were out campaigning hard, and at that time I presume under the present Act that this was not legal. Now I would suggest, Sir, that with this particular clause, or this principle in the Act, I would think now we'll have maybe 1,200 people out campaigning and, Sir, can you imagine what that would do to the civil servant who wants to be immune to this, or not be part of it?

Just think about this - you know, I looked at the old bill, I think it was Bill 55, and compared it to the new bill, Bill No. 7. There was one slight change and the slight change as I saw it was that they allowed 90 days after the election was made official that a person had to be back to work. Now one starts to think if, you know, this is going to be a political bagman's haven, and their particular jobs are going to be financed by the people of Manitoba for part of the year; they go through the role of being a candidate or propose to be a candidate, they don't make it, they go out and start to collect funds. Then as a reward if they do a good job and the government gets re-elected, and they are able to pay for the expenditures, they'll probably be off for a three month holiday. Just think about it - 90 days.

So what are we really getting at, Sir? What will happen when that particular person who went through the motions of proposing to be a candidate and doesn't make it but stays off and works politically and collects funds, and then is rehired back. What would you think, Sir, as a civil servant that when this person is hired back, and he might be a very qualified individual, it's quite possible that he is a very much qualified individual in his position, then all of a sudden there's an appointment comes up or a job; he applied for it and because of his

BILL 7

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) qualifications, he receives it. Now what would you think, if you were working beside him, Sir? Would you think that he got it on his merits, or would you think that he got it on his political involvement?

And I would suggest, Sir, that when this occurs, that our Civil Service will start to fracture, and there's two alternatives that are left for our civil servants - one is to get out, or to join the political party that's in power, Sir, I would hate to see that happen because we have had an excellent Civil Service and I don't think that this is right.

Sir, I would suggest that it's a political party rip-off that's being proposed here - year round employment for the bagmen on the citizens' money of Manitoba. Then one would think, well, you know, there's no concrete evidence to this fact - well I say that the potential lies there, that this could happen, and if the government does not want this to happen, then I suggest that this basic principle be amended in such a manner that it's the candidate collecting funds for himself, not a proposed individual out after he's gone through the particular motions of being a candidate and becoming a bagman, then let's make sure that does not occur.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, as my fellow colleague the Honourable Member from Roblin suggested the other day, let's ask the civil servants if they want it. Let's find out if they really want to have this lying over their heads, or these predicaments. Let's ask them - they work for us, and we have a labour thinking government on the other side and surely they must be interested in their civil servants - let's ask them if they want this type of operation in the Civil Service, and let's go for a referendum.

Mr. Speaker, we can support the principle of allowing the civil servant to seek a candidacy, getting his leave of absence; we can support the idea of the individual as a candidate having the same opportunity as any other candidate to collect funds. We can also support the idea of that candidate, if he is unsuccessful, to applying for return to work, but one can see where it could become a very touchy situation if a particular civil servant ran against say the Cabinet Minister in his particular department and should happen to lose to the Cabinet Minister, then I would think it would be quite an awkward situation for both parties to work for one another, and I would think in that instance that obviously a transfer or a location in another department would be most practical in the interest of both parties.

But, Sir, we cannot support this present legislation which one could almost call relating to that particular principle, political bagmen legislation. We cannot support this philosophy. It is wrong, and it's wrong to maintain people on staff prepared, waiting for elections, to go through the possible motions of becoming a candidate and going out and collecting money as a bagman and yet getting paid all year round with public money. We cannot support this philosophy. There will be rip-off, and it will be a rip-off that will ruin and scar the Civil Service for years to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Public Works wish to go?

HON. RUSSELL J. DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Well, Mr. Speaker, this is turning out to be the cause célèbre of this Legislature, this particular bill, and I would like to get some views on the - in Hansard.

I think that basically there are three possibilities before us. There is the prospect of all civil servants being eligible to participate in elections and in the electoral process, and the government is not putting forward that particular viewpoint. There is the position of the Opposition which appears to be that the civil servants as a block should be excluded from being involved in elections, or as candidates for elections, and then I think there is the government view, which is that some or most civil servants should be eligible to participate in elections as workers or candidates.

The problem with the first position, namely, that everyone should be eligible is this: that if people at the very top, namely the deputy ministers, and assistant deputy ministers, and directors, are involved, let us say actively and openly as candidates or workers in elections, I think this becomes an intolerable situation. If a deputy minister, for example, were to compete against his own Minister in an election, or against a colleague of his, or just as a candidate in a riding held by an opposition party, this I think would, given human nature and using common sense, it would put that man or that woman if there are any

BILL 7

(MR. DOERN cont'd) directors who are female or ADMs, it would put them in an intolerable position. Because when they went back to work they would be looking across the desk of course at somebody, let us say from another political party. I think that that in fact is the crux of the problem, and I'll deal with that later. So that if everyone is allowed to run you have that situation. I think the government in its wisdom has made certain that that particular view has not been put forward here.

If no one is allowed, which seems to be the standard position of members of the opposition, you are in effect, you are in effect, denying 12,000 people the opportunity of participating . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DOERN: And this of course is a democratic right of citizens and I think that it is . . .

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. DOERN: You do agree with that? You do agree with the possibility of anyone in the Civil Service with a few possible exceptions, from participating at election time as outlined in the bill, and therefore you are going to support the bill as is? --(Interjection)-- But not as candidates?--(Interjection)-- To run as candidates, but not to work?

A MEMBER: But trained by partisan civil servants. That still happens.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's not clear to me just whether or not a couple of spokesmen for the Conservative Party here are representing the views of their colleagues because some of them seem to take one position and some another.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DOERN: I think that the problem as I said is the line of demarcation as to where to draw the line and the bill as presented by the Minister of Labour has indicated that Deputy Ministers will be excluded as a class and that there may be others designated in regulation. And I think --(Interjection)-- well I'm trying to explain that if you'll bear with me - that the people at the very top, the top political decision makers or the top administrators who are heavily involved and heavily engaged in policy, if they are permitted to run, if they are permitted to run as candidates or be heavily involved then I think there's a practical problem. And the practical problem there is because of their visibility and their close involvement with the Ministers and with the administration there will tend to be a conflict. People farther down or people further down into the departments I think that same problem does not hold true. People below the directors level, people in the ASO categories or the lower field categories and so on, I don't think that there is any problem of any kind should they be involved.

The Leader of the Liberal Party seems to argue that the Civil Service should be neutral. He seems to believe that there is a clear distinction between policy and administration. He would seem to take the position that the government itself sets policy and the Civil Service implements that policy. Well, Mr. Speaker, that type of position and that kind of thinking was eloquently put forward by Woodrow Wilson in 1910 and I don't know whether that sort of viewpoint has any currency today, because political scientists who have examined the question have come to the conclusion that the Civil Service helps - is involved in making policy and in remaking policy. They always have been and they always will be. They're the group who advises the Ministers, the members of the administration, they supply us with research and then they are charged with implementing the decisions that are taken, and in the manner in which policy is implemented, in the manner in which it's carried out, the degree of enthusiasm, the degree of speed, the policy itself can in fact be changed or altered. The Civil Service is heavily involved in policy formation and implementation. In fact sometimes as a Minister when I think about the relation between political parties or parties in power and the Civil Service or the bureaucracy, the relation between the two, I sometimes think that at election time governments are elected in effect to keep an eye on the Civil Service and not the other way around, because of the strength and in effect the independence of the bureaucracies.

I also think, Mr. Speaker, that there are few enough political people who are involved in a large Civil Service. If you were to count the number of people who are political appointees out of the 12,000 members of the Manitoba Civil Service it is in effect a mere handful and I think it's important that the government of the day, whether it's the New

BILL 7

(MR. DOERN cont'd) Democratic Party of perhaps somewhere just before the year 2000 when the Conservative Party regains political office, whether it is their problem to get their ideas put forth, no matter who it is who's in power, they need --(Interjection)-- well that's true. I think the Member for Souris-Lansdowne will be about 90 at that time, 80 or 90, and he'll still be here. He's one of the bedrock Tories and as long as he's able he'll be sitting in this particular Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, one of the advantages of allowing civil servants to participate as candidates and to be involved in the political process is that there is a large number of people in the Civil Service who are highly knowledgeable about government, who are spending their entire time working with the problems of government, they know the system which is very difficult for an outsider to understand. They know the system, they know the problems and they are sometimes very politically aware and sensitive and attune, so it would really be an unfortunate thing if a large number of people who are professionally qualified and knowledgeable were in fact excluded. --(Interjection)-- Yes, yes. I would imagine that I could appeal to my Liberal friends, at least my Liberal friend representing his party here when I remind him of some of the people who, on the federal scene at least have gone from the Civil Service into the front line so to speak. And the two --(Interjection)-- well the Member for Morris says they've been disasters. I don't know if there has been a bigger disaster in one way than his Leader. His Leader was a very talented man but I think some people might argue that in the years in power in the early 60s in the federal level that those years were a disaster too. I would like to remind him of the Honourable Lester Pearson and of the Honourable Mitchell Sharp. I think both --(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: That's who I meant.

MR. DOERN: Oh you meant those two. Well I myself, Mr. Speaker, would have to disagree. I think that both of these men had considerable experience in the Civil Service that was very profitable in their political careers.

Another point that I would like to make is that civil servants today, and I think probably from the very beginning, have in fact been involved in election campaigns. If any of us who are familiar, and all of us are familiar with fighting elections and have for many years, know that people who are in fact members of the Civil Service have frequently made donations, in some cases helped canvass, in other cases helped write speeches or provide research materials to candidates and to political parties. This I suppose is undercover activity and perhaps legally wrong, or illegal, but it has been done, it has been a fact for a considerable period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that since civil servants are in fact involved in political decision-making, people especially in the higher echelon, since many of them are now involved with political parties, since as members of professional associations they are in effect members of a pressure group on government, that I would conclude that we should liberalize the existing laws. I hope that the Minister of Labour would when he speaks give us some comparative examples because I understand that other provinces do in fact have legislation similar to this or perhaps broader in scope than the kind that we are attempting to introduce.

I also think that there is undue fear on the part of the opposition, real or imagined, that this will politicize the Civil Service, that we will have in effect 12,000 people, I suppose 5 or 6,000 supporting the government, 5,000 supporting the Conservatives and 1,000 backing the Liberals, and that everywhere you go, in the coffee shops and in the offices and in the halls and on the lawns and so on, it will be one great debate, because of this legislation everybody will be taking positions at all times. Mr. Speaker, surely nothing could be further from the truth.

I would be quite surprised if more than maybe one percent of the Civil Service took active - well let's say took advantage of the existing legislation. Maybe even 10 percent to be on the safe side. No more than that. I really don't believe that even when people are given the opportunity suddenly everyone will take advantage, that all the candidates, everybody from the Civil Service will be running in an election or acting in an election or donating in a campaign. I think there will be involvement. I think there will be more involvement than at present. I think it will be honest involvement whereas nowadays I think some of it's done under cover. But surely not everyone will suddenly become political. The number of people in society who are politically interested and politically active is very small and I suppose that

BILL 7

(MR. DOERN cont'd) that kind of ratio will also be reflected in the Civil Service.

Just a final point or two, Mr. Speaker. I think that one point that has been made by the opposition that bears a second look by the government is in fact the question of fund raising. I think this is a point that I would like to hear more comment on from the Minister of Labour. We've heard varying accounts of this, I think the Minister of Finance made a very cogent argument when he said that if people raise funds on the basis of either threats or the promise of favour that that is illegal now, illegal in the future and always will be illegal. And that that sort of possibility is not in fact made possible through this legislation. That is always illegal. But nevertheless some of the arguments that have been made I think are fairly telling on that point and I think that the Minister will comment further and that there may be some consideration on the part of the government to modify or at least rethink and re-examine that particular portion of the bill.

Another point that I would like to make is under 44(6) of the legislation, Reinstatement of public servants. The point there is that a person should be reinstated to his position immediately, and I think that as a general principle that is sound, but there could be consideration given to the possibility of transfer. If a person is very high up and certain factors have been involved in a particular campaign it may be desirable to give that person the option of a transfer. I'm not saying everybody, I'm saying just in certain isolated --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. DOERN: Well after the hockey game I'm thinking of offering a transfer to my honourable friend, but I'll keep that until Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please.

MR. DOERN: I'm simply saying this, Mr. Speaker, that I believe in the principle of reinstatement, but I also think that perhaps the possibility of transfer could be pondered as well.

I think that I've tried to outline a number of points, the main one being that by supporting this legislation we are in fact giving rights to almost all of the 12,000 civil servants. I myself believe, as I have said, that those at the very top, at the very top, close to the Minister, namely the Deputies the Assistant Deputies and the Directors, possibly that group because of their close involvement with political decision-making, they not alone, but they in particular, their close relations with the Minister, their close relations with the government, would in fact present a problem and may in fact place themselves in some jeopardy and may in fact have difficulty in taking their previous positions if they were allowed to run as candidates against the very people that they are working with. I think the 99 percent of the Civil Service would not have that problem, so I regard this legislation as granting the right of political participation to 99-44/100 percent of the Civil Service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 18

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, again I wish the Minister had been in his chair. However I will proceed --(Interjection)-- yes, while it's a very short bill, it does concern me if the Minister is talking of places like Sprague, like CFI, and maybe San Antonio, Bissett, it's quite - but it might also, as I read the bill and interpret it, could it be that a provincial road today that's designated in an area where there's rail abandonment threatened, or will be in the near future, and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council designated this as an industrial road, later abandoned this title, and in that case it would go back to the municipality, the upkeep and the expense, and that is the very question I hope the Minister will read it in Hansard and when he closes debate, brings that out clearly and if it is not clear, it's not intended for this, for that area, then I think I could say that this party will give it its approval.

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

BILL 18

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 19

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 19. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have only a few remarks that I would like to make on the Crop Insurance Act. It's been a good Act. It was brought in by the Conservatives and it's been improved upon from time to time, and I think that was very necessary because the input into farming per acre has become higher and higher each year with the better fertilizers and seeds and sprays that we have, so I think that everything looks pretty well in the Act, but then in part II of the Act, it also deals with hail insurance, and nobody has said anything on that. They're talking about changing the way of settlement for claims in this proposed change, and I was wondering about people that have crop insurance claims that aren't settled, because I had a phone call from a person in my constituency. He's got a claim from 1971 that isn't settled and it's because of a difference in the percentage of damage that they have, and it's a difference in interpretation of that percentage between Manitoba Crop Insurance or in the hail section and other insurance companies and this hasn't been resolved. I was wondering now, since the Act is changed, will this apply to the people that have taken out hail insurance as well as the people that are taking out crop insurance? That's the only thing I have and I hope the Minister will reply to that.

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

BILLS NO. 9, 15

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): That's not my bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? Bill No. 15. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we have the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The remainder all stand?

BILL NO. 20

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 20.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 20, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, there are several amendments to this bill. I'll try to deal with some of these amendments as briefly as I can.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that is being proposed will provide a flat registration fee of \$5.00 per annum for any vehicle owned by a resident of a northern community. Now the problem is that most of these people up in the north really do not have any access to any of our PRs or PTHs, they only drive a few miles within their own vicinity and we feel that they should not be paying the same registration fees and insurance and everything else as other people that have access to many miles of PRs and PTHs. Now in many of these communities there are only a few miles I said of road available and it seems inequitable to charge residents of these communities the same registration fees paid by residents of the province having access to provincial highways. I would suggest that all registrations would however be restricted, authorizing operation on local roads only. Now this amendment would also enable Autopac to identify these vehicles and possibly provide for lower insurance premiums.

Also a provision is being proposed which will permit the registration of non-standard motor vehicles, such as golf carts, motorized vehicle chairs, which can not now be registered because they do not comply with all of the equipment provisions of the Act. The amendment would authorize the registration of such vehicles on a restricted basis, specifying the restrictions applicable on the registration card issued to the particular owner. The amendment requires a number of other amendments to the Act which would first of all provide a penalty for operating a motor vehicle in violation of conditions imposed, and also

BILL 20

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) exempt such vehicles from the prohibition from driving vehicles not equipped as required by the Act but subject to the conditions which are imposed.

Another amendment which would provide that in the event of death of an owner, the registration would not expire until 14 days later. At the present the registration expires immediately the ownership of the vehicle passes. Because of the coterminous feature of the registration of insurance, this can and of course does create a problem for relatives, especially if the vehicle is out of the province at the time of the owner's death.

Provisions enacted in 1971 prohibiting garages from effecting repairs to a vehicle which has sustained damage in excess of \$100.00 unless it displays a Damage Sticker issued by the police. Well these are being repealed. This legislation was enacted as an aid to the police in the detection of hit and run motorists, and I think that the honourable members can recall that particular debate. Unfortunately I must say, Mr. Speaker, that objectives were really not achieved as there is not a single instance on record where the Damage Sticker was of any material assistance to the police force in the identification or detection of a hit and run motorist. The police on the other hand have been put to a considerable amount of additional work, all to no practical purpose. It is proposed to consider alternatives, and this matter will be receiving the attention of officials from the Department of Highways as well as the Attorney-General, together with the various police forces in the Province of Manitoba.

An amendment is being proposed which will require that all new vehicles must bear the national safety mark. This is required by regulations made under the Motor Vehicles Safety Act of Canada, and which shows the date and the year of manufacture. This should be of some assistance to the public who buy vehicles, particularly imported vehicles, some of which are updated by dealers. There have been instances where a person has brought a vehicle represented to him as a current year's model, only to find out later that the vehicle in fact was two years old but has not been updated. The displaying of the national safety mark should enable the prospective purchaser to satisfy himself as to the year in which the vehicle was actually manufactured.

A number of amendments are being proposed consolidating all of the provisions relating to the suspension of licenses upon default of payment of fines in lieu of a jail sentence. Since the original legislation was enacted there have been a number of other amendments made to these provisions resulting in several contradictions and difficulty administering the legislation.

As presently worded the suspension comes into force immediately once default occurs and in short, suspensions where the fines are small, the suspension oftentimes runs out before it can be imposed. The amendment would provide for the registrar to suspend upon being notified that default has occurred, and suspension would commence as of the date of notice issued to that particular person.

We are also proposing legislation to change the proposal which would authorize the Motor Transport Board to regulate trucks having a gross weight in excess of 28,000 pounds, and which are registered as U-Drives. Some of these trucks are being used in the way that competes directly with established and licensed motor carriers without being subject to the same rules and conditions applicable to public carriers. The new legislation prohibits the leasing of such trucks unless the Board has issued a permit and imposed such conditions as the Board may deem necessary in the public interest. The applicant for the permit would be required to make certain disclosures on his application. These provisions do not apply to a lease or rental of a U-Drive truck by a licensed public carrier.

Under Schedule B all of these amendments relating to Schedule B, relate to provisions for prorating annual and quarterly registration fees on a 1/12 basis in the case of annual plates, and on a one-third basis in the case of quarterly plates; as at the present time a person pays a premium based on quarters, and where registrations are obtained in the latter part of a quarter the fee is paid for a period for which the applicant receives no benefit. Some of these amendments, particularly this one and the last one I mentioned, would alleviate people from paying on the registrations for the time that their vehicle is not being used.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 20

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can have the honourable members' attention because I wish to announce the meeting for Public Accounts on Tuesday at 10:00 o'clock; unless there's objection from any of the members here I would like it scheduled for that day. Tuesday at 2:00 o'clock, and I would like the clerk --(Interjection)-- 10:00 o'clock - to make the appropriate notices.

A MEMBER: . . . the opposition objects.

MR. GREEN: No, no, I discussed it with the House Leader of the Conservative party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

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

. continued on the next page

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7 (a). The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member has 23 minutes.

MR. GRAHAM: How much?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 23 minutes.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we left off last night I had just made reference to the various ag rep offices throughout the province and the operation of those offices and there is another field there that does concern me a great deal. This is the operation of the home economists, and I was wondering when the Minister is replying if he can tell us how many home economists will be no longer with the department or whether they will be transferred to another department with the phasing out program that apparently is taking place at the present time in the field of Home Economics. This field is very important in rural areas. They do a tremendous job and now we find where we have half a dozen presently, we will have maybe one or two when he goes into the regional program that they anticipate. This also makes one begin to ask questions, Mr. Chairman, whether this is part and parcel of the regional government concept that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has been talking about, whether it is just one more insidious way that government is forcing communities into a regional concept.

I know it is a concern in my areas, and I question the wisdom that the Minister is using if he is using his offices, the Home Economists and the Ag Rep Offices as a means of bringing about a regional form of government in rural Manitoba. I think that he would probably be making a very serious mistake if he is doing this.

Mr. Chairman, I will remember a committee or a commission that was set up several years ago that studied the concept of regional government and the response of the rural parts of Manitoba at that time indicated in no uncertain terms what the wishes of the people were.

Now we find the home economists in this province will be operating under a regional office concept, which I think could be probably just one step towards a regional form of government and it is a concern to me, and I am sure it's a concern to many in the province. Now if the Minister is doing this as part of that program, I think he is making a serious mistake.

Now, Mr. Chairman, from time to time, on almost a weekly basis, we get information from the government under the Information Services Branch and I noticed on an agricultural bulletin we received dated January 4th that the Minister of Agriculture at that time was going to, or announced that there would be assistance given to those who had problems with hay during the summer months. And that sheet was on January 4th where he announced his assistance program for transportation. Mr. Chairman, that seems a rather long time after the time when the farmer needed the help. Perhaps the program he had envisaged was in conjunction with the winter roads program of the north, I don't know, but surely we can get faster action. The hay problem existed in July and here we find in January that the Minister is announcing the assistance program, and I think that six months is a little too long to wait.

We now see evidence - reports came out this week cattle in the Province of Manitoba are showing signs of malnutrition. The farmers in July and August were asking for help to move the feed but it isn't till January that the Minister announces his program. Mr. Chairman, that's not good enough. The Minister had a chance to show that he was really interested in the agricultural problems. We waited for six months, and I think at that time he blew his chance to show the farmers that he was really on their side.

We now find another interesting situation where he is attempting to put the fluid milk producers and the industrial milk producers under one board and one policy - he says it's going to be an elected board. But I think that you're dealing with two different commodities really. I can foresee problems if the board is predominately loaded with industrial milk producers, I'm sure the fluid milk producers will be concerned. I don't see why the Minister is acting in this direction. I don't think he's acting in the interests of the fluid milk producers nor is he acting in the interests of the industrial milk producers. But perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it's part of a philosophy.

There are many in the Province of Manitoba who believe that the best interests of farmers can be achieved through collective action of commodity groups where those who are dealing with a specific item in agriculture act together in a common interest. We have seen other groups which feel that you have to have the umbrella-type of organization, and here I refer to the Farm Union movement, who feel that they can represent all aspects. But when you do that you find conflict of interest between one segment and another and an overall umbrella-

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd). . . type program I think does not tend to provide the best avenue for the promotion of the specific commodity involved. So I question the Minister on the advisability of proceeding with a one-board concept in the milk industry.

The Minister has made quite a show in the House so far dealing with the Japanese sale of hogs. But, Mr. Chairman, in all the dealings that have been recorded to date, and the whole question of the secrecy of the contract, he is dealing only with one company the Itho Company of Japan. Mr. Chairman, I don't believe they're the only company in Japan. In fact my information is that there's 25 to 35 companies who are quite capable and probably desirous of importing to the same extent that Itho. But when the Minister enters into a secret contract with one company, what happens to the other 25 or 35? They lose confidence in the operations that are carried on here in Manitoba. And I would be very surprised if the actions of this Minister, while they have been beneficial for one company as far as the signing of a contract, might very well have negated any possibility of other contracts with other companies in Japan. Mr. Chairman, when you put all your eggs in one basket you want to make sure that the basket has no holes in it.

We now find, Mr. Chairman, that the government has a new program on Crown land management which has caused some concern to some people, people who have felt that they have had a lease on Crown Land, and while they will be able to get a long term lease again they now find that while they may in the original case have been leasing because they did not have the sufficient capital to purchase, they now find that no longer will they be able to purchase. They are now committed to being a tenant. They have no hope of getting ownership, and I think that the Minister is probably leading us down the path towards that peasant relegation of the farmer. Mr. Chairman, I think the pride of ownership is probably the greatest single feature that drives a person into becoming a farmer. The fact that he ultimately hopes that he will be able to own his own farm to operate it as an independent business man is the single most important initiative that drives him on to become a successful farmer. But now we find that the Crown Land Management Program denies him that right, that he will be committed to a tenant relationship as long as he continues to deal with the government in a lease program.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago in this House we brought in amendments to the Farm Machinery Act. The Minister at that time said that this was probably the greatest step forward towards helping the farmer, and as the result, Mr. Chairman, the farm machinery problems in Manitoba today are worse than they were before that act came into effect. That kind of help the farmer doesn't need. And if the Minister is sincere and interested in helping the farmers of Manitoba, I think that he should withdraw that Act because the stipulations that he put in there have been nothing more than a penalty to the farmer. The warranty, the added costs of machinery, the stipulations that have been placed on emergency parts, have not proved to be effective and all they have done is added to the cost. And I would say to the Minister if he is still farming today, and I'm not too sure whether he is or not. . .

A MEMBER: He will be pretty soon though.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . if he goes down to his implement dealer and orders a part for his tractor today, that he will have more difficulty getting it today than he would before this Act was passed. It has denied the farmer access to parts; the situation is worse now than it was three years ago. So I say to you that if you were trying to help the farmer by passing that Act, that you blew it Sam, you blew it. Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister knows that too.

A MEMBER: I don't think so Harry.

MR. GRAHAM: I think that he is now becoming a little bit concerned. The day that this House opened, Mr. Chairman,

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. GRAHAM: . . . the Premier indicated that the Minister of Agriculture was probably the most capable one to succeed him - he didn't mention any other members on that side. But the actions that we have seen since that time and before that have not justified that confidence. And I know the Minister is concerned because now he no longer relies on the Government Information Service, he has now started again to put out his own Agriculture Department news. Maybe this is in his run for the leadership, I don't know, but I have in my hand the first one that's appeared again, the February 15th one. I don't know whether it's going to be a weekly one or not but he is now

A MEMBER: . . . the Minister is a fine fella.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. GRAHAM: . . . No it doesn't say that yet but we'll get that. So I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is a little bit concerned. He hasn't helped the farmer; in fact he has hurt the agricultural industry, mainly because he has failed to realize what the farmers of Manitoba really want.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture reported the other day about the orderly marketing of the Canadian Wheat Board. Now just two years ago, Mr. Chairman, it was extremely orderly. It was so orderly that we moved wheat from the combine to the bin, and that's where it stayed. It was only after considerable criticism of the Canadian Wheat Board that we saw the Canadian Wheat Board take action and actively start to promote Canadian grain. We have criticized the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Chairman, and we are completely justified in doing so. This however does not mean that we are opposed to the Canadian Wheat Board. This does mean that we are trying, or this does not mean that we are trying to undermine the Wheat Board as the Minister of Agriculture suggested, but this criticism certainly has done much to improve the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, many questions still are unanswered. First of all what is the Land Lease Program? And the land around my area is selling between 250 and 300 dollars an acre. Now how much will it cost to lease this land for five years? Now if a person were to purchase this land after five years, what would be the price of the land? What is this new freedom the Minister's stated that the Land Lease Program provided? I think, Mr. Chairman, that if a person is interested in going into farming and if he signs a lease with the government, this means that he is prepared to spend a lot of money in purchasing equipment for that land and he is entitled to know in advance what the situation is going to be five years or even ten years from the time that he is purchasing this land. I think it is grossly unfair that we have not received any report on just exactly what the Land Lease Program is.

What is the government doing to encourage vegetable production in Manitoba? What is the government doing to encourage greenhouse production? In all these areas we are importing most of our produce. I just checked the price of cucumbers in the store today, they're selling between 35 and 45 cents each. Now certainly we can produce a lot of this produce ourselves. There is no reason why all this produce has to be imported. The same thing with tomatoes, green peppers - I checked green peppers, they're selling at 86 cents a pound. Now here's a crop that can be grown very well in Manitoba - it is grown in some areas - but we have to do much to encourage the production of vegetables in Manitoba and I would like to see the government take just a little more action than what they have been doing. I notice that the university have some information available for anybody who's interested in greenhouse production but the government does not seem to be actively promoting this thing and I would think that this is an area where we are showing a lot of neglect.

Now what is the government doing to help Canada get its own sugar policy? Now this is the heart of the sugar problem in Canada, our friends the Liberals have asked for a probe into the sugar prices in Manitoba. Now before we can get anywhere as far as sugar is concerned we have to have our own Canadian policy, and I hope that our friends the Liberals are going to help us achieve this, because it is the Federal Liberal Party that is withholding this sugar policy. It is ridiculous that our price of sugar has to be determined by what the price of sugar is on the London daily market; is just absolutely ridiculous. Now the growers have been trying for many years to try to get our own Canadian policy, but so far they have been unsuccessful.

A MEMBER: Should try, Peter.

MR. BROWN: And I think that it is high time that this government starts putting some pressure on the Federal Government so that we can have our own sugar policy; then we can start negotiations from there.

Now, why is the price of sugar so high as what it is at the present time? Now the reason for that is there is a world shortage. For the last three years in succession production has been lower than consumption. This is world-wide; this is the reason why our sugar price is so high. The Caribbean countries at one time used to be our major supplier of sugar. At that time there were huge cane plantations which were producing the major sugar being consumed by the world, but these countries saw fit to distribute, take this land away from the big

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. BROWN cont'd). . . plantation owners, distribute it among their people, divide it up into four and five acre lots, and this is when your problem started arising. This worked well for about three years or so, but then the time came that fertilizer had to be put back into the land; people did not have money to fertilize the land; your production has decreased steadily since then to where it is about one-quarter now of what it used to be, and there is no way that these people have the resources, the financial resources to bring this land back into production again. This is part of the reason why there is a world-wide shortage. And if the crop in the coming year should be a poor crop for sugar you can expect to see much higher prices in sugar than what you do see at the present time.

The International Sugar Agreement, which ended at the end of the year, was not signed by Canada and Japan, therefore we have no international sugar agreement because Canada and Japan are the major importers of sugar in the world. The cane producing countries, they wanted an increase in the price of sugar; our Federal Government in their wisdom did not want to grant them this; therefore we are in the situation now where we have no international sugar agreement. We are in the situation where we have a shortage of sugar therefore the sky is the limit as far as sugar prices are concerned, and I'm sure that you will be seeing substantial increases in the near future.

Now, we would have been in trouble in Manitoba if sugar prices would not have gone up, for the simple reason that your grain prices have gone up and it was more economical, or you got more money for growing an acre of grain than what you did in producing sugar. But the sugar price has gone up and therefore the farmer is going to be in a better position.

The cost per acre to grow sugar beets is \$179.00 an acre, there is substantial cost there, and in addition to this you need between 30,000 to 40,000 dollar investment in equipment. Now this is the reason why we need some sort of stabilization both for the grower and for the consumer; this is why it is so important for us to get some kind of a Canadian policy, and I hope that the government is going to lend their support to the growers in trying to obtain this agreement from the Federal Government.

Now there are other areas of concern, Mr. Chairman. For one thing, why do we have to import butter from Ireland into Manitoba? Another area of concern, why do we have shortage of milk in Manitoba from time to time? It's not long ago when we had surpluses over here. What has gone wrong? Certainly we have to take steps that we can become self-sufficient in food requirements for the province.

For instance, the percentage of vegetable requirements within the province that are produced is I understand approximately five percent. This is a large area and where we can improve on. There is no reason why we have to continue importing all these things when we can grow them over here. This is the area in which I would like to see a lot more attention drawn to. If we want any stabilization of prices of any kind within the province, we will have to make an all out attempt to become more self-sufficient. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I have only two questions to put to the Minister, and I shall try to put them as clearly and concisely as possible. I believe they properly come under the first item, the Minister's Salary. My first question to the Minister is, for what reason, or what prompted him as the Minister of Agriculture to take the occasion of the Outlook Conference in Brandon on February 11th, to make an attack on his political opponents, and to abuse the privileges of his office by using public facilities and facilities paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, to single out for personal attack members of my group, colleagues of mine, notably the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

Mr. Chairman, not only was I astonished to hear the attack on these members and to have them spoken of in a derogatory fashion but I was charged for this privilege by the Department of Agriculture. I have in front of me here a receipt for One Dollar, and this is the payment of the course fees that I was taking that day; and it also says that I should save this receipt for income tax purposes. Mr. Chairman, I really question whether a dollar payment for admission to this Outlook Conference to hear the Minister who I had expected to tell me something about the outlook for agriculture in Manitoba, devote some of his time at least to a political attack.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. MCGILL cont'd)

Now, I have one other question, Mr. Chairman, and that relates to the activity of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture in the rapeseed marketing debate, and I would like to ask the Minister to explain why he as Minister of Agriculture had his department use their public offices and the public funds that support them to promote a political point of view in the matter of rapeseed marketing. And I, Mr. Chairman, would like to read just one example of the kind of radio announcements that were made, and it reads like this, and this is by the Manitoba Department of Agriculture. It says: "If you're a rapeseed producer you should know that only a small percentage of the producers of rapeseed have received better than average prices through marketing their crop on the open market." This according to the Manitoba Department of Agriculture is a statement of fact by the Minister. "The open market doesn't benefit all producers of rapeseed; experience with the Canadian Wheat Board pooling system has guaranteed that all producers receive at least the average price. We urge you to mark your ballot in favour of marketing rapeseed by the Canadian Wheat Board before the December 14th deadline."

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the two questions that I have placed to the Minister are not somewhat related, and in his answers perhaps we'll begin to understand how it is that in his mind he feels this kind of activity is justified. This ad is given as if this was clear, unequivocal and absolute truth and that as such there was no question about its validity; so therefore it was not political philosophy that was being promoted, but it was simply giving the farmers of Manitoba the truth. And if that is what the Minister has decided, then, Mr. Chairman, I think I would begin to understand how his reasoning accepts the use of his office as Minister, and also the privileges of the department and the use of public funds for these purposes. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to make a few remarks on the motion that we're debating before us and as I look at the document that we have, we're talking about the Minister's Salary, and as I look at the figures of 15,600, I just wonder how we can sit here in good conscience and take that to be a realistic figure. For the job that the Minister of Agriculture is doing for this province, I think that we should be ashamed to pay him so little for his services. (Applause) You know, I would probably be underestimating his value to the farmers of Manitoba when I say that we should at least double that salary, at the very least.

I haven't been here long enough yet to know how the rules of this House work and I don't know how I'm going to make a motion or something to get that figure increased up to a substantial amount, but if the Chairman can send me a little notice around here as to how I might do that when I've finished speaking, I'll certainly be happy to make that motion. But, you know, that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I wonder if the honourable member would - on a point of order - permit me to tell him. That he . . .

MR. USKIW: . . . am not going to take advantage of that offer. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, the honourable gentleman can only reduce his salary; only a Minister of the Crown can introduce a motion that increases the balance of ways and means. So, as much as he would like to do it, it's not possible for him to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: I thank the honourable member for Morris for that information, and I really do because I didn't know it. But now I'm going to talk to the Minister of Finance, you see - you know, you got me on the right track but I just want to make it clear to honourable members opposite that, you know, we really should be ashamed, we really should be ashamed for paying that type of salary for the type of work that this Minister is doing for the Province of Manitoba.

The honourable members opposite keep insinuating that on this side of the House we have the wrong leader, you know. Why they want to do that, I don't know. You know what I think of our leader, I've told you that before, But I just want to say to the honourable gentlemen opposite that I, too, think that you have the wrong leader on that side of the House, and I'm going to tell you who that guy is some day. Not today, but some day I'm going to tell you.

But the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell keeps saying a nice catch phrase that he has; he's almost as good at it as the Member from Roblin is in his saying, but not quite as

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd). . . good. But he kept saying "blew it"; I wonder how he spells "blew". You know, it interested me when he kept saying that because he never gave me the spelling and I just wondered how he spelled the "blew".

But I just wanted to say to the House that the agricultural program that we have before us here, when you take a glance at it, you have to realize that it's a very progressive, a very detailed program, and certainly worthy of the attention of the farmers of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, you know, I've probably said before that I work for the railway, but it's a rubber tired railway that I work for, the transportation, and you know, we just have a hard time holding farm boys in the city to work these days. They're going back to the farms and taking up farming and this is true. I could give you some names, but that's not necessary; I think you're all aware of that. The boys are not staying in the city like they were five and six years ago.

A MEMBER: Why not?

MR. PATTERSON: They're quitting their jobs in the city and they're going back farming because now they've got the opportunity to make a living, they got an opportunity to be of some success in the farming industry.

A MEMBER: That's why they're going back.

MR. PATTERSON: And they're certainly taking that opportunity and I'm sure that some of the programs and policies that have been developed under the present Minister of Agriculture are partly responsible for that, if not wholly responsible.

There's been some talk in the House here about a recent vote that the farm population took on a beef check-off. All I would want to say about that is that this was a form of democracy. The people had the choice of whether they wanted a beef check-off or not and it would seem to me that possibly under some other type of government they might not have had the choice of voting on a beef check-off. --(Interjection)-- Well, I didn't say that, they know for themselves what their policies are.

But the essence of the whole procedure was the democratic way in which it was handled, and the farmers brought the message home to the people that wanted the beef check-off that the farmers didn't want it, and now they're not going to have it, which is only right I should think.

Now when we look at the farm policy that we have here before us, it was mentioned that we shouldn't put all our eggs in one basket. Well, certainly when you look at this program here the eggs are not all in one basket. It is a very diversified program and a very diversified department and certainly the amount of money being expended in that department has increased substantially, so when you're increasing expenditures, you're bound to be bringing more services to the people that that department is servicing. So it appears to me that it is a very diversified agricultural policy for the Province of Manitoba, and I'm sure that the farmers are appreciative of that particular aspect of the program.

Now, there's some criticism of some of the programs emanating from the Agricultural Department and I can't see that there's all that much validity in the criticism, because the sewer and water program in the farming area is going along nicely and increasing and being well received by the farm population.

The stay-option is relatively new but that's becoming to be more accepted day in and day out.

There was some mention of criticism of the contract that we had with Japan to sell hogs to them. Well, I can think back 25 or 30 years ago and I would say that the farmers at that time in history would have been only too happy if we had had a contract with Japan to sell hogs to them. You know we used to lug the feed and the water for them and sell them for very little because we didn't have the world markets then that we have now, and I would certainly want to congratulate the Minister on that particular aspect of going world-wide and getting a solid market for a three-year period. And when you take a market over a long haul you have to be prepared to take some of the ups and downs that go with a long term contract, just the same as we do in the labour movement. But in the end it's usually beneficial to the people that are the receivers of the terms of the contract.

Now there's been quite a bit of talk from the members opposite about the conduct of the Minister and to me it doesn't ring true. I would think that his conduct is unquestionable. He stands up straight; he's not a tall man but he stands tall, and he speaks clear, and he speaks

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd). . . straightforward, and I don't get the impression that he's trying to mislead you or bewilder you --(Interjection)-- he's telling you the true story right from the heart, and that's where it counts. And to me the questioning of the conduct of the Minister doesn't seem to be justified, and when you have a look at his department and the programs that he's bringing out, well what can you say but good for the Minister. Now he either is a very capable Minister or else he has very capable assistants, but you always have to look to the head of the family when you're talking about a good department or a good household.

The Honourable Member from Lakeside when he gave his address on this particular department he left some insinuations that the NDP were sort of land grabbers. He said, how much do we want? Do we want a quarter of the land, half of the land or maybe all the land? You know, he didn't quite come around to the resolve of what he was talking about, he was making a lot of insinuations but I didn't get the impression that he was too sincere what he was talking about because you know governments buying land is not new. After the first World War the Federal Government purchased considerable amount of land to make it available for veterans. I'm sure you're all aware of DVA land banking, so to speak, for veterans. There was no complaint about that - It worked very well. And --(Interjection)-- but the Honourable Member for Lakeside says they've always done it. This is what I'm saying, too, but you gave the insinuation that we wanted to take over the whole thing in a slow process, and I don't think that is the policy of the present Minister, and I don't think that's the policy of the NDP Government. So with that thing out of the way at least now we have the Honourable Member for Lakeside agreeing with us on that particular point.

There was some mention of a tenant relationship the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell stated that that is not a good thing especially when it is the government who is the so-called mortgage holder, or the owner. Well, what's the alternative? It is to have a mortgage company or a finance company holding the property rights, and then you're a tenant to that type of a financial institution. So there isn't that much difference in the choices that we have, and I would just as soon have my elected representatives holding the title rights as I would maybe some big financier from New York City or Chicago, or some place like that. I would think that my own elected representatives would be more appreciative of my desires than what some big financier would be.

He also mentioned the Farm Machinery Act. Well I'm not too familiar with all of the ingredients of the Farm Machinery Act, but all that I can tell the honourable Minister is that in the last four years the primary production of farm machinery in this Province of Manitoba, mainly the City of Winnipeg, has increased in leaps and bounds. Back in '67, '68 we were shipping very little farm machinery out to the country because they just weren't producing it because the farmers weren't buying it. It just wasn't there. Now they can't produce it fast enough, so all of a sudden the farmers got a little cash in their pocket, and could it be from a result of four years of NDP policy that they have the cash in their pocket now to buy the farm machinery ?

I heard the Honourable Minister from the MDC talking about Versatile Farm Machinery, that's one farm machinery company that just came up in a ground swell and, you know, like he said we lost a real opportunity to become part owner in that particular enterprise. So how can you say that the farm machinery situation is so bad in Manitoba when the producers can't produce enough to satisfy the demands of the market. So I don't get too heavy on - I don't lean too heavily on the remarks of the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell in that regard, and I would suggest that maybe he hasn't been around - we've only been in session a few days - he hasn't had time to survey the situation in Winnipeg, but no doubt he will before the session ends.

There was mention made of a propaganda type of operation by the Minister of Agriculture. Well it's not propaganda it's information, and that's what this society is all about. Now if the department doesn't put it out then you would come screaming to us that we're trying to hide everything, we don't want to tell you anything, it's a big secret operation. But when we put the information out to you and lay it in front of you, then you accuse us of being propaganda. Now you can't have it both ways gentlemen. You're either going to take the information and be appreciative of the information, or else you're not going to get information, and we're not going to tell you anything. I suggest to the honourable member. . .

A MEMBER: Don't forget the Samcan Program.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

A MEMBER: Do you want me to tell them Sam?

MR. PATTERSON: . . . I dealt with that but I don't call it that type of a program. But the informational services coming out of the Agricultural Department is to the benefit of the farmer and if the farmer will only read, they don't have to buy the whole program, but at least read and be informed and be aware of the service that's available to them, because if you aren't aware of the service that's available to you, then you're paying for something that you are entitled to and not receiving. So I would certainly hope that the Minister keeps that particular part of his program up anyway.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland he mentioned the Canadian Wheat Board and the honourable Minister gave a good response on the Canadian Wheat Board the other day, and all I can say on that in my experience with the Wheat Board is the Wheat Board has always been the farmers' friend, and without the Canadian Wheat Board you wouldn't have the success in the farming industry that you do today. So anybody that is trying to scuttle the Canadian Wheat Board I would say is not a friend of the farmer, and I think the farmers are aware of that. And I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney would say Aye Aye to that.

He talked about, insinuating possibly that there's either a poor policy or no policy on vegetables and greenhouse products. Well you know the government of the day has only been in office for four years, and you can't change everything or bring about everything in four years, even though they tried very hard. Now the vegetable and green house products, true in Manitoba we grow the summer production and it is a relatively good product and fairly saleable, but in the wintertime for some reason or other, and I don't know why the women do it, but you put an imported product beside the Manitoba grown product on the shelf and the price could be the same, invariably the ladies will buy the imported product. Now from Southern California they are a nicer product. You know, this is a fact of the market I have found. So I think that the Minister has taken note of the comments of the Honourable Member from Rhineland and if there's going to be any type of policy developed on vegetables and greenhouses, I'm satisfied and confident that our present Minister of Agriculture will bring those about in due course.

Now the member also mentioned something about sugar. Well, you know, that's an odd coincidence that, you know, in the last two months or so we got a sugar shortage. You know a year and a half ago we had a meat shortage, six months or seven months ago we had an energy shortage. You know it just seems to be that the big industrialists, or whoever they are behind the scenes, get the price up to a certain level and then all of a sudden we haven't got any shortage any more. So I would question whether there's a shortage of sugar in the world at this particular time.

You know I think we're very susceptible to falling into the traps that the newspapers or the news media set up for us. They come screaming out with red headlines that there's a shortage and everybody goes and buys, and then what happens, so the price goes up. So I think we have to be aware of the traps that the free enterprise system sets up for us and we should not be too eager to get into those types of situations. I really can't believe that there's a sugar shortage in the world. Now in Manitoba, particular, how can anybody say there's a shortage of sugar in Manitoba when we grow enough beets in the Province of Manitoba to more than supply the Province of Manitoba. There's no way that we could have a sugar shortage in Manitoba. So once again I would question that, and I know the Ministers of the Crown have got that situation under surveillance and I'm hopeful it will be resolved.

The honourable member said something about butter and milk shortages, or policies, as if it was the responsibility of the provincial department. I can't relate that to the provincial department because the federal programs and federal policies have a lot to do with the supply of butter and milk in Manitoba and in Canada. So I don't think that we could lay all of, maybe none of the blame at the doorstep of the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. And what I am finding is that, if anything, under his policies and programs we have been expanding in that area. We probably got a bigger production of cheese in Manitoba at this particular time in history than we've ever had, and it seems to be a growing industry in Manitoba, so I would certainly think that he is on the right track in that area. Maybe he's not right up to scratch yet, but certainly along the right road.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd)

Now when the Minister of Agriculture stands up in this House and relates his programs and policies to the House I get the impression that he's just telling you like it is; he's not trying to bewilder you; he's not trying to mislead you, and he gives very straightforward answers. I thought that he rather nicely, but politely, put the Honourable Member for Lakeside in his place the other day. You know, he really did, and I know that's quite a job because that honourable member seems to have a fair amount of ability too. So - and he did it so nicely, and it just went over like as if it was - you know, they always say when you're telling the truth it's not hard to tell, and that's the impression I got of our Minister and -- where did my Honourable Member for Morris go? I need some more advice from him. I just wonder how I would go about this, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Agriculture of this government has certainly impressed me with his conduct, with his policies, with his programs, and I want to - I don't know if Mr. Speaker, is . . . Can I make a motion, Mr. Speaker?

A MEMBER: Go ahead.

MR. PATTERSON: Well I want to move, and I don't know who's going to second it but --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Emerson says he'll second my motion that our Minister of Agriculture be -- I don't know what the word is but he could be ordained with the -- and I would think he should be presented with the Captain, he should be made a Captain of the Order of the Buffalo Hunt of Manitoba for his good service to the Province of Manitoba, and I'm sure that the farmers appreciate that. --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order has just been raised.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister would be much happier to have his salary which is now the motion under discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Chairman, I was so taken with the remarks made by the next to be Minister of Agriculture because, you know, we've been wondering on this side, Mr. Chairman as to who would be next. We've suggested of course from time to time that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is moving upward and onward in that organization opposite, and that would of course mean that the slot would have to be filled and there seems to be some problem about that, although I'm sure the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose had some concern as to his ability and his rightful selection at that time; but I think we can now assume that any man that challenges the Honourable Member for Gladstone to a duel out on the hay fields, and any man that can speak so eloquently, and indeed shows the acumen of concerning himself about his future salary to such an extent, deserves some attention.

However, Mr. Chairman, that is --(Interjection)-- that's really not the reason why I get up to speak. I do however, Mr. Chairman, want to take the appropriate moment after that glowing tribute to the Minister of Agriculture by the Member for Crescentwood to remind the Minister that he has not spoken with such a forceful straightforward manner that the Member for Crescentwood has just suggested, and indeed point out to the Member for Crescentwood, if he will listen for the next few moments for my reasons for believing so.

I want to remind the Honourable Minister that when I last rose I asked him, I had two specific issues that were of concern to me, and I raise the question once more, although the Minister has had two or three occasions to rise and answer me, and one is the one that was raised by the Member for Crescentwood. Again, what is the long-term policy? What studies have the government taken with respect to the land lease program, and its implications?

MR. USKIW: . . . allow me to indicate to him that my time ran out on two occasions and I was not able to get to that point, but I will have another opportunity.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman I accept that answer from the Minister. Of course I could point out to the Minister that he chose to use his full time, his full time, to draw a red herring across the matters that were raised by honourable members opposite, chose to completely misrepresent the facts and this House, and more important, Sir, chose to use that time to fill the pages of Hansard with misrepresentations of the positions of the honourable members opposite here or on this side.

Mr. Chairman, so I raise the question once more only in the hope that the Minister will take time to indicate to us just precisely what the concerns of the government are in this regard, bearing in mind that the carrot that the department and the government now extends to constantly capital-hungry farmers is a pretty attractive one, and whether or not this

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . government has expressed or given any thought at all to the eventuality of a considerable amount - I'll put it that way if it meets the Honourable Member from Crescentwood's approval better - a considerable amount of the now privately owned family farms fall under the jurisdiction of the state.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you know I put that question in all seriousness. I think it's a question that a government that professes to dedicate a great deal of its agricultural program to the sustenance and the maintenance and the development and the growth of individual family owned farms, family owned farms, that has at the same time as one of its major programs an Act - indeed a very delectable carrot - that takes away that word "ownership" out of the family farm concept - takes that word out of it. Now Mr. Chairman I just raise that question because in the deluge of words that we get from the Minister of Agriculture, and he has to this extent not indicated to us any long-term goals that the government may have in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, then let me also remind the Honourable Minister, and take a few moments off to refute, you know, and to show just how deliberately the Minister is attempting to confuse the issues at hand.

I must admit, Mr. Chairman, that on the other occasion that I rose on speaking to the Minister's salary, the estimates that are now under consideration, that I did indeed bait the Honourable Minister to a certain extent. I too, you know put a bait out, I didn't really expect, or at least, Mr. Chairman, charitably put, perhaps I hoped that it would not be seized at with such vigor. Mr. Chairman, I reiterated statements that the Minister has made outside of this House, in front of the news media at meetings, such as referred to by the Honourable Member from Brandon - meetings sponsored at public expense by the way and quite correctly brought out by the Member from Brandon. I referred to specific newspaper accounts and I heard no objection to those accounts being misrepresented as to what the Minister actually said. But I did want him to repeat those things in this House, so that they would be forever printed in to the public record of this Legislature.

I did want him to say in this House, and to explain in some detail, his rather peculiar understanding of the word "democracy". You know - and I did hear him say that, and we all heard him say that in this Chamber, not once but several times, because, Mr. Chairman, future election hustings and future elections that are called you know, I may be charged from time to time with embroidering, or using a vivid imagination with respect to what I believe to be a position taken by any persons or governments or political opponents that I'm fighting but I do seek, I do attempt - and I will, Mr. Chairman, confess that I will attempt to do so more in the future - to be truthful in my presentations to the public when I deal in these matters. So I think it's very important, certainly it's very important for all of us on this side to understand this Minister's concept of democracy as it applies to the group that he's primarily responsible for - farmers. And for him to say in this Chamber that he accepts, he accepts a democratic vote only on the basis of who is to be elected --(Interjection)-- No, no, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says, oh nonsense! They are his very words. I can read them back to him again if the Minister really wants to have them read back to him. I can read them back to him, you know. And, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of history I should also tell him, of which the Minister is fully aware, fully aware. It was in 1964 when this House, this Chamber passed a resolution - it was of a compromising nature after the Shewman Commission brought in the voluntary Hog Marketing Commission - this Chamber passed a resolution largely at the insistence of the then Member from Brokenhead, the now First Minister, passed a resolution calling for - they reluctantly accepted the establishment of the voluntary Hog Marketing Commission - but this House demanded of any future Minister of Agriculture to - and I will just read the **RESOLVED** part of it; "That not earlier than 24 months, nor later than 36 months, following the coming into Force of Regulations of the Natural Products Marketing Act establishing a voluntary central marketing agency for hogs, there shall be a producers vote as to whether or not the producers." - 24 months from then or 36 months from then - "would prefer a hog marketing board or a continuance of the system then introduced." --(Interjection)-- That's true, Mr. Minister, and the Minister knows precisely why it wasn't held. I was the Minister of Agriculture at the time this resolution came into force. I polled, I asked, both the then Manitoba Farmers Union, the Manitoba Farm Bureau, two major farm organizations. I was advised, and supported, by the now Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber, who had this resolution in front of him. His party insisted that that be passed at that time, that there

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . shall be a vote 24 months to 36 months after the Conservative Administration put in a voluntary hog marketing commission, we were bound by resolution formally adopted in this House to have a vote.

Now Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is at that time, with the assistance of the members of the New Democratic Party and the assistance of the now Minister of Agriculture, by common consent and with the agreement of major farm organizations of the province, it was suggested to the then Minister of Agriculture, and I being that person at that particular time, that it would serve no useful purpose to have that vote, that there was a general, well not - I will not blow myself up as the Minister from time to time likes to do so on his own behalf, that there was total satisfaction with the voluntary system - far from it. There were many failings in that particular system. However it was believed, and the Minister cannot sit in his chair and say that I am distorting the truth, it was believed generally by most hog producers at that time, by the two major farm organizations at that time, and by obviously the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party, who sat in this Chamber in 1966, the fall of '66 when this resolution should have come into force, that the call for referendum, the call for vote, should not be held, should not be held.

Well Mr. Chairman, I just want to personally indicate to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture how deeply they felt at that time about the necessity of holding a vote, how deeply they felt as a compromise issue by the then government introducing the marketing structure that was then being introduced, they bound the government to have a vote. That's how strongly they felt about a vote back in 1964; that's how strongly the First Minister felt about having a vote on this particular issue.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood speaks about democracy. When he had the opportunity to either do as I did, carry on with a situation that was generally accepted by the hog producers - as I said, maybe not with total satisfaction - or indeed as he chose to do otherwise, to make a major change, to move into a producer controlled compulsory Hog Marketing Board, which he chose to do, which he chose to do, and it was certainly his right to do. But there was no attention paid to this resolution that his Party supported and adopted in this Chamber; there was no concern, there was no concern about an expression of democracy on the part of the hog producers. You see, Mr. Speaker, let's understand that this Minister has a peculiar understanding of when it's right to be democratic and when it's not right to be democratic. On the question of the beef check-off, firstly it was not something to the Minister's liking to begin with - and he also nods his head in agreement to that.

However he was bound with increasing pressure to allow this kind of an expression of opinion to take place among the beef growers. So after considerable two, three and four years in fact, I think it's fair to say that this move by a certain element within the stock growers has been on foot for six or seven years. Pressure was placed on the former Minister of Agriculture, in the other administration it was placed on me to a certain extent. It's been something that some members of the Stock Growers Association have been asking for five or six years. Finally, finally this Minister --(Interjection)-- well, the Minister now tells me that I'm not aware of what kind of representations were made to me when I was Minister of Agriculture, or what kind of representations were made to my colleague the Member from Arthur, what kind of representations were made to him. Now I recognize there were changes in approach, different plans were being offered; this plan was of a different nature than the one that was presented to us. I'm speaking, you know, in general terms. But the point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that this Minister never had his heart of particular concern in this matter. This is why he, for instance, has differentiated between whether or not he should feel compelled to take sides on the issue. He had no difficulty in taking sides on the issue on the rapeseed vote, which involved another group of growers asking for a referendum, but it was interesting, Mr. Chairman, that throughout this matter on the question of the beef check-off vote, the Department of Agriculture spent just as much money, just as much money, but in this case more money telling the people that we are not taking any sides in this issue, telling the people that we have no position in this issue, telling the people that we are merely the custodians of gathering in the votes and seeing that it is properly supervised. --(Interjection)-- I think that's correct though. It's hard and this is what I'm trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is trying to follow the devious mind of the Minister of Agriculture. How he can become so incensed that he can, you know, in my judgment, break

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) propriety and spend tax dollars, tax dollars to influence a vote on one question - rapeseed. You know, what is so sacrosanct about rapeseed that he is convinced ideologically to break precedent and spend tax dollars to try to influence a vote? A month or two months later we have a vote on a relatively, you know, not a major issue but whether or not the beef producers want a check-off or not. All of a sudden it becomes a very holy position to be in the centre and not take a position.

When it comes to something like the Hog Board of course, he didn't bother holding any vote at all. He didn't bother holding any vote at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, of course in introducing the Hog Board he was, he was firmly committed to allowing free elections to take place and to eventually have that board producer controlled. Now, Mr. Chairman - and I ask the --(Interjection)-- I ask particularly the member who just spoke last, just ask particularly the member who spoke last - I referred to this in the Throne Speech - as a person involved in organized labour, would he really accept a three year contract for his services, or for any people that he was acting for in a responsible manner as a union leader? Would he accept a three year contract from Burns or from Inco or from CNR, from CPR, without knowing the details of that contract? Would you walk into a negotiating table? Would you, as a union man, walk away from a negotiating table, sign an agreement, sign an agreement, and not know what you signed for? I ask the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, who shows some promise of being reasonably forthright of putting his cards on the table face up, I ask him in all honesty if he would for a moment condone that kind of an action? I also ask him he he would then, if he would then become somewhat exercised about this kind of a procedure and write to the Minister of Labour that this is nonsense? What am I supposed to tell my people? What am I supposed to tell my workers what we're working for? That he then gets a letter back from the Minister of Labour calling for his resignation; that the Department of Labour staff says this is things that should be held highly secret, what your returns are going to be for the next three years.

Furthermore, the Minister goes one step further, he then threatens the whole organized labour, if I'm using my analogy correctly. He threatens the whole body politic of organized labour, saying, "and furthermore if you guys elect the right kind of labour leaders, we are going to do away with elections in the labour movement from here on." That's precisely what he told the Board; that's precisely what he told the Hog producers of this province, when asked the specific question as to whether or not he would proceed with developing a fully - carrying on with a fully elected hog producers board. And his answer, "Well I'm afraid that will have to depend on who is elected."

Mr. Chairman, you know what bothers me even more is the kind of quiet acquiescence on the part of his colleagues. I note, Mr. Chairman, for instance the Minister of Finance, who had a great deal to do with the bringing through this Legislative Chamber some years ago a bill called Bill 36, I believe it was, with respect to the unification of the city.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps --(Interjection)-- Bill 36. I think perhaps he also understandably had some interest at least, and some hopes, because his party was running as a political entity in the ensuing elections for the 50 councillors, that his party, the New Democratic Party, would do well at those elections. The face of the matter is that his party did not do so well with - I make the exception of course of a member of his own family that did reasonably well. But the fact that his party did not do so well, I've not heard the Minister of Finance get excited about whether or not we could really proceed with carrying on, or whether we can allow the City of Winnipeg, the council, to operate on behalf of the people of Winnipeg because he disagrees with who the people elected. I haven't seen the Minister of Finance send letters demanding resignations from any councillor that may or may not have crossed words with the Minister of Finance, or indeed has crossed words with this government on policy matters. I suspect that the IGEC councillors want to run the city very differently than what the NDP councillors would want to run the city.

The Minister makes the argument that because he is afraid that some persons would get elected to that board, and they would run that board differently than he would like to see it run, that gives him some God-given right to suggest that democracy should come to an end. That gives him the right to call for letters of resignation, that gives him the right to threaten the producers that there may not be any further elections. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I'm given to understand that through the aegis of his chairman we may well have a situation where there

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) will be a petition presented to the Minister emanating from the Board that he is now satisfied he controls, that will do away with all elected board members on that board, and return it to a fully appointed commission type of a board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just want to - you know, I don't want to belabour this point. I'm satisfied, I'm happy that the Minister, you know, has put this on the public record. I think it's something that Manitoba farmers in all walks of life will take note of; certainly one that I will accept as a personal responsibility, to see that farmers, and farm organizations of whatever commodity group, are made fully aware of. But more important, Mr. Chairman, and the other part of the argument is how completely, how completely blinded the Minister is in the pursuit of what he thinks is right. He has based his whole vendetta against myself, against the Member from Morris, and indeed his whole argument in this controversy is based on the premise that we want to dismantle the Manitoba Hog Producers Board. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister - I have been quoting relatively from things the Minister has said, that he has not disputed; I've read passages out of the history of this question. I now ask him, I now challenge him to show me - and Mr. Chairman, I have been reasonably voluble on this subject; I have spoken inside of the House, outside of the House, in front of the TV media and I've run through an election on this question. I ask him whether he can on any given occasion find any word that will support the claim that he makes that I have any intentions at all or would in any way want to dismantle the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board that is now established.

Mr. Chairman, I ask him, I ask him, I ask him to support that statement, whether he has heard it from myself, whether he has heard it from the Member for Morris, or whether he has heard it from Don Cameron. Certainly we would want to run the board differently, and what's wrong with that? If we want to - if we hope to get elected as government next time around, and we will run the government differently, but that doesn't give anybody - at least, you know, anybody up to now, hasn't given anybody up to now the position from which to start doing away with free elections, with free elections.

Mr. Chairman, his whole position on this matter has been one of misrepresentation. He cannot find - and I ask him, ask his staff to spend the next two, three days in researching my speeches made in this Chamber in the last six or seven years, whether he can find one reference, one reference that would give him any ground, any reason to suggest that I would do anything to take away, dismantle, or destroy orderly marketing in Manitoba.

If our legislation, and I passed through as many producer boards - I've put into effect as many producer boards as he has done, as he has done. I have put in as many producer boards into effect as he has done. --(Interjection)-- No, the Chicken Board is operating, the Turkey Board is operating - before that, the Honey Board is operating --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly that was never a producer elected board, as the Minister knows full well; it was a board that was brought into being by action of government, for which I take responsibility for, not I, but the former Minister, George Hutton, had to take responsibility for. It was a situation when I arrived on the scene that in my judgment was non-satisfactory. I appointed the people; I could unappoint the people. --(Interjection)-- I could unappoint the people. That's a vastly different, vastly different, Mr. Chairman, than the position now facing the Minister with the Hog Board, who has promised, who has promised the hog people . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8 p. m. this evening.