

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 14, 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 23 students, Grade 5 standing, of the Riverton Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Riddell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George, the Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

We also have 32 students, Grade 11 and 12 standing, of the St. Claude School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Chapman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

And we have 25 students of Grade 11 standing of the Sisler High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Tanchak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met for organization on Thursday, March 14, 1974 and appointed Mr. Walding as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills by the House be extended to the 18th day of April, 1974, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 25th day of April, 1974. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills by the House be extended to the 18th day of April, 1974, and that the time for presenting Private Bills to the House be extended to the 25th day of April, 1974.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Attorney-General.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the Fifteenth Annual Report of The Municipal Board for the year ending December 31, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, it's not really a report that I have to file but I'm sure members wouldn't mind if I announced that I'm asking the Clerk to distribute a new publication, which is really new only in the sense that it is a compendium of already issued information. This year we have published a booklet of financial statements of boards, commissions and government agencies of the province, which brings together all the reports of agencies and commissions that have already been filed in various places and which I'm sure all honourable members have wherever in their files, and we thought it worthwhile and I am causing to be distributed a booklet having all of them together so that there'll be one place henceforth where members and people interested will know that they'll be able to turn to find the statement of any of the boards, and that will be distributed this afternoon.

March 14, 1974

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I would have your indulgence, Sir, to raise a matter of privilege, and prior to doing that, Sir, to apologize to you, Sir, directly for any unruliness I may have caused in the Chamber the other evening. This is my first occasion to do so. I wish it clearly understood between you and me, Sir, that I will attempt to conduct myself in a manner more befitting an honourable member in this Chamber. I do apologize to you, Sir, for having caused you some undue difficulties in the Chamber the other evening.

As a matter of personal privilege, Sir, I leave that to members on the opposite side to decide as to whether or not very serious, unfair, unfounded, and untrue comments or remarks were thrown across to me. If they are prepared to live with them, well then I certainly have no difficulty in living with them, but I would suggest through you, Sir, that there was a grievous matter of personal privilege, an unjust and grievous accusation hurled at me, duly reported by the press which, Sir, I leave to you as to whether or not you thought that that did constitute a matter of personal privilege on my behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm almost inclined to say, "Who, me?" but I think that I know at whom the honourable member was directing his remarks. However, the Member for Swan River seems to be wanting to make a contribution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I suggest it was no joking matter and it should be treated with the seriousness in which it has been brought before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to soften my remarks to the same extent as was done by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I will not respond in the way I may have responded had he not spoken to you in the manner he did. So I will say only that I was possibly saved by the bell at ten o'clock from following in the lines of a manner which I think was indicated in the some twenty minutes preceding the ten o'clock when I rose to speak, and I'm glad that the bell, or the hour, stopped me from following in that line, at which time I was about to refer to an occasion when the honourable member - and he admits that he did - out in the country on some political platform, did refer to a Mr. Stothert as being the best man at my wedding, knowing full well that it was untrue, and he in this House mentioned that fact and said that he apologized to Mr. Stothert but he didn't think it was really necessary to do much more than that. And that is what I was about to refer to. No doubt my language was stronger and harsher than the occasion would have warranted, but those present may judge the reason for it, so that to the extent that I offended the honourable member, I withdraw the remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege. Although I was not present in the House, I did read the newspaper reports and the privileges of the House I think are involved to the extent that there were accusations made by members on the opposite side and I suggest to them that it ill behooves them to make those accusations to this side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossdale): Mr. Speaker, it ill behooves the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to rise on this point of privilege since he is the one who accused me of knowing of certain allegations of fraud before the summer of 1973, etc. and when asked to bring forward the basis upon which he made that accusation of me, indicated that he got it from some television newscast. Mr. Speaker, anyone who is prepared to abuse the privilege of other honourable members in that respect is hardly one to be called upon to add his words to a question of privilege that is being suitably resolved as is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: The First Minister has made statements that are not true and I would ask that he withdraw them. Mr. Speaker, there have been statements alleged by the Minister,

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . made by others, that I have referred to -- made by others, not made by me, and I think the First Minister should be in a position to at least recite the true facts by suggesting to the House that all I have done is place on record statements made by others. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to name them but I'm capable of naming them, and I would refer the Honourable Minister of Finance to one reporter who reports in this Legislature. He's well aware of who that is and he is quite capable of interviewing and dealing with that person himself. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the First Minister's statement is accurate and I would ask him to withdraw that statement. I did not make such a statement. I alluded to statements made by others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has confirmed that he has made reference to me based upon what others have said, and Mr. Speaker, it's a well-known rule and common courtesy of parliament that if someone is going to make serious allegations with respect to an honourable member, that he be prepared to take responsibility for that which he is alleging and not shove it off on saying "others said" or "it was reported in the press." When you try to find out what the root source of those allegations were, it seems as though that cannot be ascertained. But the Leader of the Opposition, on that vague kind of information, makes serious allegations about an honourable member opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the matter of privilege. There is the privileges of members of the House, there's also privileges of the House itself. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you're aware of the fact, that at the time referred to of the incidents of the other night, I was the Acting Leader of this House, and I want to appreciate very much the approach of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and also my colleague the Minister of Finance, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, as just an ordinary member of this House, that we accept the spirit in which the Honourable Member for Lakeside asked consideration of the matters that were under consideration or discussion at the time of adjournment at 10 o'clock.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that it was most inappropriate for the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to rise and make a contribution to the debate that was taking place at that time, when he acknowledges that he was not present in the House at the time and that he got his information through the press media. Now, Mr. Speaker, I've never known at any time in a matter of privilege, that a member who rises on a matter of privilege, being absent at the time, is capable of raising a matter of privilege. And also, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has a matter of privilege dealing with some alleged statements of the First Minister or anybody else, the lapse of time between that and now are such that it's inappropriate for the Leader of the Opposition to raise the same. And I would suggest, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that members of the House -- and now I am appealing, not in my position that I held the other night as Acting Leader of the House, but a member of this House, I would suggest that it would be well for all of us in this Assembly to accept the stance of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and that of the Minister of Finance, and get on with the business of governing Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture also? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: You know, as so often happens we pass each other in our arguments. I want to not leave on the public record, and in particular for the sake of the Minister of Finance, to indicate to him there was absolutely nothing that he said last night that caused me any particular offence or that would constitute a matter of privilege in my point of view. Absolutely none - the night before. The matter to which I allude is an entirely different matter and I just would want that placed on the record, and I leave that to the honourable members opposite, if they choose to live with that kind of, with that kind of a personal muckraking, then they can live with that.

MR. PAULLEY: Let's get on with the business of Manitoba.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

ORAL QUESTIONS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I gave a series of answers to the House, 36 in total I believe, to a number of questions put by the opposition, and I want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the third paragraph on page 1248, and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "Those are all of the responses that I have received from the department to the questions put by members opposite and, while I haven't had much time to discuss all of them with the department, let me assure honourable friends that I will make sure that I go over them again in an effort to determine whether there have been any errors or omissions, and if members want to put further questions I will be pleased to take those as notice and to further inform members opposite." Mr. Speaker, on that particular day I informed the House that the department advised me that South Indian Lake Co-operative was audited by Ernst, Ernst and Burch Findlay. I should have said, Mr. Speaker that those two firms assisted in the auditing proceedings that took place and that the certification was by the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Co-operatives. Will he now confirm that the firms only assisted in the reconstruction of certain information for an 11-month audit and not for a full year audit?

MR. USKIW: I believe that it was less than a year but I'll check that again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Co-operative Development will confirm that other than the departmental audit, which is now in the process of being attempted to be reconstructed by his own department, other than that there is no external audit of the Southern Indian Lake Co-op.

MR. USKIW: I believe that is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. In the light of his comments this morning in the Public Accounts Committee, has the Minister of Finance consulted with his Cabinet colleagues in the matter of directing the provincial auditors to examine the financial statements of the fishing co-ops?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I made a statement at the Committee and I stand by the statement I made.

MR. SPIVAK: To the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether the Minister will give an undertaking to the House that he will discuss this question with the Cabinet and indicate what direction the government proposes to give to the Provincial Auditor.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I will not change tradition by saying anything other than no.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General inform the House the reason for the delay with respect to the 26 charges laid against officials and companies. . . Churchill Forest Industries last June? Why the delay on action until the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, they were not delayed until the present time. The honourable member's relying upon press, some press reports in yesterday's Winnipeg Free Press. The first charge in fact was laid last June and there have been proceedings take place since that date. The proceedings that the honourable member is referring to were in fact interim proceedings dealing with interim applications in respect to certain proceedings which will be taking place within the State of New York but it is not correct to suggest that charges were laid last Friday or within the immediate past.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: For clarification. Did the Minister say that there was one charge made last June, or more than one? Last June.

MR. PAWLEY: No. The charges were laid at various times but commencing last June.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could the Minister explain the discrepancy reported in that it has been stated that there was \$92 million of MDC money loaned, yet the fraud charges speak of \$112 million.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the House that I have been advised by special legal counsel in respect to this entire matter, that it would not be in the interest at this point, the interest of Manitobans, that there be any publicity or any debate in respect to

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . this matter at this particular point, and I would hope that honourable members would, in the interests of Manitoba, keep that in mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking a private matter; it's widely known throughout North America, it's appeared in the New York papers and the Manitoba papers today, and so I would ask the question: What steps are being taken besides the prosecutions for criminal charges, what steps are being taken for the recovery for some or all the funds involved?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in respect to a suggested discrepancy insofar as the amounts are concerned, that is a matter of calculation and calculations indicate the amount that's referred to - 120 - some million - and certainly the courts at the appropriate time will deal with that as to whether that is the amount or not, so I do not think that is a matter that we ought to want to debate in this House. What other proceedings will take place will unfold with the events ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister's department had correspondence from the Federal Minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board stating that coarse grains will be dropped from the Wheat Board's jurisdiction in August?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the fact that my honourable friend has not been involved long in this Chamber, and when we have discussed that particular question on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, over the last two or three years, there has been an awful lot of discussion and communication over the last two or three years on that subject matter, and therefore the direction of the Government of Canada is fairly obvious.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Has the Minister's department undertaken to conduct a vote among the coarse grain producers in Manitoba asking these producers if they want to keep marketing coarse grains under the Federal Wheat Board?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the CFI Commission completed its report and given it to the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Attorney-General can inform the House whether the charges, the recent charges that have been laid, have been laid as a result of the report completed or in the process of being completed by the CFI Commission?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would refer to my answer, he will find that I did not agree that the charges laid were of immediate recent nature.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, then, I put the question to the Attorney-General. Were the charges laid discussed with the members of the CFI Inquiry Commission?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me return to the comments I made earlier, that the advice which I have received and which I intend to depend upon, is that we must attempt to avoid debate on matters such as that at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have some other questions for the Honourable Attorney-General. I wonder if the Attorney-General can advise and inform the House what stage extradition proceedings are at to bring individuals to trial, and have any orders been obtained. If so where, and what is being done to obtain such orders?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: That is the very type of question that I have no intention of answering.

MR. PATRICK: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Attorney-General able to inform the House whether extradition treaties exist with all jurisdictions involved or whether other arrangements have been made to facilitate to bring those people to trial?

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Has the Government of Manitoba given its support to the initiatives announced by the Federal Minister of Transport to change the National Transportation Act to compel the railways to act in the interest of western Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, while I have no jurisdiction as the Minister of Labour precisely now due to changes of Cabinet responsibility, I can assure my honourable friend that the Government of Manitoba are always interested in the destiny of the farmers of Western Canada.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I then wish to direct my supplementary question to the Minister who's responsible for transportation and

MR. PAULLEY: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, he's out of town at the present time looking after the affairs of Manitoba.

MR. PATRICK: I wish to direct this question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister or the First Minister advise the House as to the economic benefits for Manitoba resulting from the Federal Government's pledge to totally roll back the 35 percent freight rate increase for moving steel from Eastern Canada to Western Canada - to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks whether an evaluation will be made of the effect of an indicated intent on the part of the Government of Canada, the answer is yes.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Will the First Minister consider introducing a resolution expressing all-party support in the Manitoba Legislature for revealing by the railways of cost under operations, a move which would complement and hence an all-party support of this type of legislation in the House of Commons.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't see any difficulty in doing that, Mr. Speaker, largely because that has been the very subject matter of communiques issued by all four western provinces in recent days and a year ago, and I suspect by successive government of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister confirm that Mrs. Gwen Parker, Executive Secretary of the Women's Institute, has been relieved of her position as of March 31st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that that is the case but that is not a full-time position, that is a term part-time position that the honourable member is referring to.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, with that answer to the question that I posed then, can the Minister confirm that the position of Executive Secretary of the Women's Institute has now been eliminated?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Does the Minister have any plans to convey to officials in Ottawa the strenuous objection of many Manitoba taxpayers to a \$93, 000 grant to Kenneth Leishman and other convicts to establish an auto body repair shop here?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would think that the honourable member, being a former Member of Parliament, would want to convey his wishes, his views in respect to this, directly to Ottawa.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I do wish and intend to do that but I am asking whether the Attorney-General of the province has any plans to speak for many Manitoba taxpayers in this regard.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter, of course, that very clearly falls within the jurisdiction of Ottawa. We hear certain press reports and statements, that's all that I have heard. Certainly much more information than that which we have heard today would be required in order to make any representations.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake to consult with the leaders of the auto body repair industry here in Winnipeg and in Manitoba for their reaction to what

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . . . appears to be a fait accompli.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry state his point of order.

MR. SHERMAN: I heard the term "hypothetical" used in connection with that question but it did not come from the Chair, Sir, and I wonder whether you feel it was a hypothetical question or whether the Minister was prepared to answer.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that we all have sufficient problem from time to time managing our own affairs and business within our own areas of responsibility, and I know that is certainly true in my case. I have enough responsibility without wishing to venture forth and to look into areas which are the responsibility of the Federal Government. Now I certainly understand that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would like to tag the Provincial Government with the responsibility in respect to this particular grant, but I don't intend to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is the Minister considering placing emergency supplies of sand and sandbags in the towns of Winkler and Gretna, so that the residents in southern Manitoba can protect themselves from expected flooding from the Pembina River and the Dead Horse Creek?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Minister of Mines Resources and Environmental Management): Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for having previously given this matter to my attention. I can tell him that I have not been in the City for the past three days but his message has been relayed and I hope to have an answer for him shortly.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Will the Minister advise whether the bed shortage, which has again cropped up at the Misericordia Hospital, is a temporary situation or part of a recurring shortage that will continue until new programs are initiated to deal with the whole question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): The answer to both is yes.

MR. MARION: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Is this the only hospital now experiencing a bed shortage in the Winnipeg area or are there other hospitals in the rural and urban areas experiencing the same kind of shortage?

MR. MILLER: Probably.

MR. MARION: Can the Minister advise as to the situation with respect to hospital beds at the Selkirk General Hospital during the last week, and will he indicate whether there is a shortage of nursing home beds in that community which is aggravating that specific problem?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, again that's possible. I don't know in particular about this particular area and how it has been identified. It is possible that there may be a problem in Selkirk but if it is, it's of a temporary nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder when the Honourable Minister would present the next flood report into the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do have a verbal report that I received from my office just before coming into the House. The committee is meeting again on Thursday, March 21st, but I'll deal with the information that I have, which is not very definitive.

On the Red River, the situation has not changed from the last forecast. Overbank flows are expected between the floodway inlet and the International Boundary. In the United States the U. S. weather bureau has lowered its forecast of two weeks ago due to the favorable weather conditions during that period. I don't know what today's weather does to that. The Pembina River - it is anticipated that there will be overbank flows in the reach of the river between Walhalla and Neche. Have I got that right? The Assiniboine--knowing that people call Pierre,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . .South Dakota "Peer" instead of Pierre, I'm not accepting here your pronunciation. The Assiniboine River, due to the heavy snow accumulation in the Qu'Appelle basin, the headwaters and middle basin, it is expected that there will be overbank flows in the reach of the river between St. Lazare and Brandon. The Shellmouth Dam will be operated to control the flows from the upper headwaters.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, in answer to a previous question relative to the Shellmouth Dam, that these water installations generally are multi-purpose, and while it is true that they can be used for flood control when they are supposed to be used for conservation, the department during crisis water periods is under great pressure to use them for other than what they were originally installed for. For instance, the Red River Floodway, if it is used in a particular fashion, can reduce water levels south of St. Norbert, but that was not the reason for the installation and up until now, under both administrations, we have resisted that kind of change in utilization just because of a pressure period, and I warn honourable members that we may again have arguments as to what is supposed to be done with a water control works and we will try to maintain it on the basis for which the control works were installed. In case of the reservoir, it can be used for both and will be used in such a way as to try to maintain its multi-disciplinary function.

In the small and intermediate river basins along the waters' western escarpment, it is anticipated that there will be localized flooding in the areas between the International Boundary as far north as the Porcupine Hills where there is heavy snow accumulation. The extent of the amount of flooding will be related to the type of breakup in the area. The committee is to meet on March 21st to assess the situation at that time, and of course, Mr. Speaker, if any emergencies arise, the committee will not be prevented from meeting in the interim.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his comments and his attention to the matter, which is very . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, overnight there's been additional falls of snow and rain for several hours. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . .and I wonder now if the matter doesn't deserve attention on a daily basis rather than a weekly basis, and Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Minister if he would take a look at the Duck and Drake Rivers which went over their banks last year and include those in his report.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter is being looked at on a daily basis. It is the Flood Forecasting Committee which is meeting next Thursday, March 21st and my assumption is not that no attention is given in the interim.

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

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, but before I put my question may I have the latitude to say that I think the Minister expressed Manitoba's position quite aptly and quite well in Grand Forks in the last few days. I think Manitobans appreciate that.

My question to the Minister is - and it's a question which should have been directed to him but in his absence the Minister of Industry and Commerce took as notice, so I direct the question again to the Minister: With respect to Saunders Aircraft Company, is that company presently discussing or negotiating a multi-million dollar loan, a further multi-million dollar loan with MDC?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't resist in expressing my appreciation to the Honourable Member for his remarks relative to the Garrison, and I especially am happy because he does so in relation to a policy which has been maintained consistently throughout. The position I expressed in Grand Forks is exactly the position that was expressed to the government of North Dakota, the position which is expressed in our communiqué, the position that we took previously, and I welcome the House Leader of the Liberal Party indicating that he supports that position because I did not get that impression from some of the questions that have been asked by some of his colleagues.

Having buttered me up in that way, I have to tell the honourable member that I do not consider it appropriate to discuss every application for funding that is being made to the Manitoba Development Corporation. The Corporation will be before the Committee on Tuesday,

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . and the Saunders statement will be there and its projections, and the honourable member I'm sure will be able, from that meeting, to have the information that he likes. There is nothing secret about it and I will indicate that my impression is that Saunders is seeking additional funds, but having said that, I do not wish the answer to be an invitation for members of the House to ask about every application for funds that is before the Development Corporation, because that's not an appropriate subject for discussion.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement. I would ask him, would he ensure that the general manager or senior management people of every firm in which Manitoba has a majority equity position, will be brought before the Economic Development Committee for questioning?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't give that assurance but I can give him the assurance that the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation, who is the man with supervisory responsibility in each of these areas, will be there, and I am sure that the Chairman will have available to him such additional people as he needs in order to make intelligent answers to the honourable member's question.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: By way of clarification, did I understand the Minister to say that the management of Saunders Aircraft would be present?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I said that the Chairman of the Development Corporation will have with him such persons as he believes are necessary in order to be able to make intelligent answers to the honourable member's question.

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON: Then I would ask the Minister a final question. Would he ensure that the management of Misawa Homes Limited will be available for questioning?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows full well that he has the same answer to that question as I made to the last question.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can confirm or deny that Farley Mowat has made application to MDC for a loan to establish a publishing company in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: That, Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge is an incorrect rumour, as so many we have heard in recent days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour and is related to the questions on Saunders Aircraft. While Saunders is seeking additional funds, is Saunders also seeking additional manpower?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it has not been drawn directly to my attention. If the honourable member has information I would be pleased to receive it. And Mr. Speaker, if I may while I'm on my feet, the Honourable Member for Riel asked me a couple of questions yesterday pertaining to the University of Manitoba and the Association of the Faculties there. I have now the answers for my honourable friend to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that the application was filed on February 1st of last year, wherein the above association was seeking bargaining rights on behalf of some 1,100 professors and librarians at the University of Manitoba. Following the filing of the application, some approximately 600 affected employees filed objections to the application. The Board, that is the Labour Board has held four hearings to this date on the matter, and in the interim counsel acting on behalf of the objecting employees took the matter to the Court of Queen's Bench and latterly to the Court of Appeal.

The Board also held a representation vote among the affected employees to determine whether or not the majority desired the matter to continue before the Board, and out of 1,143 affected employees a majority of those voting indicated they wished the matter to continue. Since that vote was held last November, the Board has held one week of hearings and the matter continues again on Monday next, March 18th through to March 22nd, and hopefully it will be resolved one way or another next week. I also understand, Mr. Speaker, for the information of my honourable friend, that there is the question of considering employees or personnel who may be exempt beyond the bounds of certification.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary related to the question I asked originally. Has Saunders filled the jobs for which it was recruiting in the United Kingdom?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would not be knowledgeable of that but I understand that Saunders is continuing operation.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Attorney-General in view of the absence of the Minister responsible for Autopac. Will the Minister inform this House who Autopac has refused to pay the \$2,500 claim by the trucker who damaged his vehicle on the winter road between Ilford and Oxford House?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm really glad that the honourable member asked that question because when I read the article this morning by Mr. Cleverley I was extremely distressed. I probably should not have been surprised that now we have reached a point in the history of Manitoba when matters pertaining to civil litigation and claims for damages are going to be adjudicated on the front page of the Winnipeg Free Press.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's comments and I would like to follow it up, though, with another appropriate question. Will the Minister advise whether truckers use these winter roads at their own peril or is there no government responsibility?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the rules of insurance and whether or not claims are to be paid pertain to the winter roads as well as any other road in Manitoba, and the same principles of law prevail, and one could go on and on with a discussion of the legal standards and levels of requirement here, but I don't think it would be the appropriate forum.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister who pioneered the Autopac legislation does the no-fault principle still apply?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to hear the Honourable Member for Roblin suddenly being interested in no-fault. It's the first time I've heard such an interest on his part in that concept. Certainly when we were introducing it in a partial form two or three years ago, he was not interested.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General too. Is it not a fact that the director, Mr. Dutton, of the Autopac did give the truckers assurance that they would be covered with insurance before they went out on the road?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that Mr. Dutton would give the truckers, if they had paid their insurance premium, assurance that they were covered with insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He's not in the House - I'll direct it to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources responsible for, and I'm sure that he's more familiar with the question I'm going to ask than the other Minister. Has the government done any studies or market analysis of selling homes produced by Misawa outside the province and in other countries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the considerations relative to the Misawa Homes would be ones which were investigated by the Manitoba Development Corporation and the private enterprise company, Misawa Homes (Japan) Limited, which produces I think 50,000 homes a year in Japan. Those considerations and the fact that Misawa Homes (Japan) Limited poured a million dollars into the Province of Manitoba vis-a-vis this home company, all of those considerations would have been examined by the Manitoba Development Corporation prior to their participation in this project. I cannot indicate whether there is a document which I can refer to as a study.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I know the Minister had some discussion recently with Japanese officials with respect to the Misawa. Will any of these homes be sold or marketed in Japan where there is a very strong demand?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am unaware that Misawa Homes has considered marketing homes that have been built in Manitoba in Japan. They are very very ingenious people, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know whether that has been given consideration.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the MDC already committed a further loan to Misawa Homes?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the words "another loan" have some problem in my mind. I indicated that in addition to the initial funding which was roughly one million to

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . Misawa (Japan) Limited and a roughly equivalent amount, although that's not exactly correct, Manitoba Development Corporation, there was an additional \$600, 000 advanced by the Manitoba Development Corporation which I advised my honourable friend of, and an equivalent guarantee has been received from Misawa Homes (Japan). Now the total of those two after the initial investment is a million dollars, but it would be \$500, 000 Development Corporation, \$500, 000 guarantee Misawa (Japan), and that came after a loan of \$600, 000, so our responsibility was reduced to that extent of the Japanese guarantee. That's my recollection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. Is the First Minister or the government actively supporting the Manitoba MPs in their struggle to have more maintenance work on the aircraft which has been promised to be done in Manitoba that we've heard about, and the struggle we've heard about the past two days going on between the unions in Montreal and our MPs trying to have it come to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there have been communications, both written and verbal, on a number of occasions with Ministers of the Federal Government with respect to the very same subject matter my honourable friend is referring to, namely, the possibility of the 727 model of aircraft being overhauled in Winnipeg. I might add that in addition to that we have had some research carried out and propose to follow up with additional presentation of argument and views to the Prime Minister within the very next few days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: To the First Minister. I wonder if he's in a position in connection with this matter to report the findings of the government, and whether it is the government's position that the information on which the decision to take the Air Canada overhaul base out of Winnipeg was based - that is Air Canada's information and the information on which the Federal Government made the decision was false.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I understand the Honourable Leader's question - the Leader of the Opposition. I have expressed my views with respect to the accuracy of the information that was given by Air Canada over a period of many years starting, I suppose, as far back at 1949, from which year there was a periodic recurring dribbling, or an occasional erosion of whatever Air Canada's present overhaul capacity, various administrative operations out of Winnipeg transferred to Montreal. I might add that in the communications which have been made to the federal authorities in the past, we have made reference to this and we have documented in a rather thorough way the entire case history of this matter, and are relating it to the 727 overhaul question in an attempt to obtain what we choose to call proportionality of treatment in Canada, and it's not only a case of Air Canada overhaul of 727 aircraft, it relates to the changes that took place in the mid-sixties with respect to other kinds of aircraft; it also has to do with the extent to which the Government of Canada is willing to put public funds into the development, support and development of De Havilland Aircraft in Toronto and Canadair in Montreal, but are not willing to put any in terms of future development of aircraft industry capability in Western Canada. All of this has been put to the federal authorities on a number of occasions over the past several years.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. Is it not the position of the government that the justification for part of the work being done is in fact the misrepresentation of the facts by Air Canada at the time the decision was to take the Air Canada overhaul base out of Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Clearly so, Mr. Speaker, and that was certainly expressed in very deliberate and succinct terms, concise terms. I can recall one example that was certainly stated on the record, was at a meeting of the Transport Committee of the House of Commons back in 1968 and '69, and we have continued to draw the fallacy of Air Canada statements to the attention of the federal authorities since.

A MEMBER: That's right, constantly.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my questions to the Honourable the Minister for Health. Has the Minister received a report, even preliminary, on the inventory of hospital beds and their use, and if not, does he anticipate receiving this kind of report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure it will be a report on the actual number of

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . beds, etc. There is an inventory of the total number of beds and services that is being developed in Health and that is being--it's a constant review. I don't think it will ever really come to an end. It will be updated constantly and it's being looked at constantly, so there's no study per se which I can suggest to the member is available at this time.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet I wonder if I might reply to a question that the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition put to me some time ago, and I'm sorry that it took so long to get the answer. It was regarding--I think your question was: "What is the relationship between The Pas Metis Development Corporation and the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation?" And the relationship of MHRC to The Pas Metis Development Corporation was that of a contractor. The corporation, that is The Pas Metis Development Corporation, supplied the labour for the construction of the units; the material was supplied by MHRC.

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

MR. MARION: A supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister intend to announce a specific program during the current Session of this House to deal with the over-all problem of hospital and nursing home bed shortages together with a timetable for the implementation of that program?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, certainly during the course of my Estimates these matters will be discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer with respect to The Pas Metis Development Corporation. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether the financial difficulties of the corporation have meant that the government and the people of Manitoba have lost money with respect to the work being undertaken.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. The corporation, The Pas Metis Development Corporation, that's the CDC, I believe it is - that's a federal body - and there was no provincial financing there. The materials supplied were of course used in the homes and are in the units now, and the homes are under construction and should be completed this spring.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the auditors of the MHRC are satisfied that the materials in fact have been handled as they were to be handled by the company, and that there are no indications of waste or misuse of materials.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate whether or not someone is or is not satisfied at this point in time. All I can report is that the homes are being constructed; that the MHRC is in the process of finishing them; that the people who were doing the constructing, some of them were originally employed by The Pas Metis Development Corporation. When they went out of business or they stopped operation many of the same people simply continued working on the houses to complete them for MHRC.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the Minister is in a position to account for the reason why The Pas Metis Development Corporation ceased business with MHRC when he indicated that it was only involved in the question of labour when he indicated further, when the Minister of Northern Affairs indicated further that there was a Northern Manpower program involved in financing the labour.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there are two components to this question. Northern Manpower was involved in the training of these people and as a matter of fact they must have been successful because some of these people are now working on the construction of these units. Insofar as why this particular group, The Pas Metis Development Corporation, went out of business, I don't know. I have to assume there was more involved than just the MHRC. This group was given funding by the CDC. I suppose they may have undertaken other projects perhaps under different conditions, and as a result this may have aggravated their situation. But as far as MHRC is concerned, their interest is solely in seeking labour, the labour content, from this particular corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable the Minister of Finance and it's basically for clarification, regarding the report that he tabled this afternoon. I'm wondering, are these the financial statements of the boards, commissions and agencies that the Provincial Auditor has audited or they're not--I'm looking for, like, the Film

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd). . . Classification Board and, say, the Manitoba Boxing and Wrestling Commission, and they're not included. I wonder could the Minister clarify?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the contents of this booklet are as shown on the front page and the index thereof.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, then for clarification, I asked the Honourable Minister of Finance where is the one of the Film Classification Board and the Manitoba Boxing and Wrestling Commission?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it's probably in the records of the Clerk where the original report would have been filed if it were one required to be filed under the legislation.

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

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary. While the Minister is looking into that would he also find out where the Law Reform Commission Report is, the Human Rights Commission etc., etc., etc., ?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the report that's being asked for now is nothing to do with financial statements, and what this is is the financial statements of boards and commissions. If the honourable member would look at the book he would know that it does not contain reports other than those that are financial.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you now proceed to the second readings of bills as they stand on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 7 and the amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I want to continue making some further comment on this particular piece of legislation which has, I think quite correctly, captured the attention of most members in this Chamber and one which we intend to deal with for some time yet. Because Mr. Speaker, it's one of these bills that the longer we examine it, the longer we study it, the more interesting the bill becomes, the more facets of the bill become known to us as individual members take the time to study the various clauses. Also, Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat disconcerting to us that we have a piece of legislation of this kind put before us with such general and disarming remarks made about it by the Minister introducing the bill, that one could indeed have been lulled to sleep by his general remarks and undoubtedly we could well have perhaps failed to grasp the significance of the bill, and might well indeed have allowed it to pass through this Chamber far too quickly.

Mr. Speaker, successive speakers - I think of the speaker for Fort Garry, the Member for Fort Garry, I think of the Member from St. James particularly, I think of my friend and colleague the Member from Swan River - have brought different parts of this bill together, and perhaps the Member from Riel summed it up the best in terms of our position is that in **total** there is more bad than there is good, and we're talking about principle at second reading on this bill. And we certainly, even having had the privilege of hearing from the Minister of Labour at some length and having had the privilege of hearing some of his other colleagues at some length, have been given no indication, none whatsoever, that they are seriously prepared to acknowledge some of the serious failings of this bill that we believe are there. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have indicated their willingness to have this bill re-examined at committee stage; to have it--to possibly accept certain amendments, but, Mr. Speaker, that's a long way from satisfying us that the kind of amendments that the Honourable Minister of Labour is prepared to accept, indeed that the government is prepared to accept, would come anywhere near, would come anywhere near meeting some of the justifiable concerns that we have expressed in the debate of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think an interesting question that has to be asked is: where does this bill come from? You know, legislation comes through this Chamber in various different means. Usually it comes as a result of organized pressure from an organized group within our society. I think of the kind of legislation that, for instance, the Minister of Agriculture would introduce as a result of pressure from a farm group or organization; I think of the kind of legislation the Minister of Labour would and has introduced as a result of pressure from

March 14, 1974

BILL NO. 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . various groups such as organized labour, when they're dealing with labour legislation; I think of the kind of legislation that comes into this Chamber from other groups, professional groups, law societies, professional groups, doctors, medical groups, teachers. This kind of legislation comes to the attention, grievances are brought to the attention of the government, they're brought to the attention of a particular Minister, and if the government of the day sees that there is in fact an injustice or that a particular aspect of our society could be improved by bringing in legislation then the government of the day acts upon that kind of legislation.

Now there's of course also another . . . that legislation comes to us; political parties from time to time do take very specific positions on certain matters. These matters are well aired at the time of an election campaign. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, they become a central part of a political party's election platform. Perhaps the most notable one that would come to mind in recent times, the well known position this government took with respect to compulsory public government auto insurance. It was a question that they put fairly before the people of Manitoba, when the people of Manitoba elected them the people of Manitoba had every right to expect that the government move in this direction.

I'm only suggesting, Mr. Speaker, outlining different ways in which legislation is initiated and brought into this Chamber. I'm suggesting by and large it's borne as a result of the kind of things that a particular political party believes very strongly in, then when put in a position of power introduces into this Chamber. Most legislation I honestly suggest comes to us as a result of trying to correct or improve our general social well being in this province and the way this comes to our attention or to any government's attention, to any Minister's attention, is by the responsible representation by various groups that ask for this kind of legislation, whether it's labour, farm, professional or what have you.

So I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour who's introducing this bill, where does this particular bill come from or where is this particular bill initiated? Mr. Speaker, we've debated this bill for the last month in this Chamber, I've heard no great outcry one way or the other from the very people affected. We're told by the members opposite that the civil servants today are second-class citizens. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that I should get some mail either condemning me for a position that I have taken which is essentially one of concern the direction that this government is taking the civil service into, or one of praise. I would suspect that if the government or the Minister were receiving a great deal of mail or protests or laudatory remarks one way or the other on this subject matter, that they, Sir, would be - particularly if they were in favour of their position - would be read into the records from time to time to indicate the position or the kind of support this bill was being received - was received within the civil service.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that none of this has happened. I can at least honestly say that aside, aside from the anonymous conversations that I have had with civil servants who have asked me privately and earnestly to for heaven's sakes watch this bill, this is a bill that is taking the civil service into an area which most civil servants are not, when confronted with the actual facts, in agreement with.

I know the Honourable Minister of Labour has indicated to us the results of a poll or of a referendum on the subject matter, and really, Sir, one has to ask how that question matter was brought to the attention of the civil servants of this province in the first instance. We're aware that we have some activists within the Civil Service, and there's nothing wrong with that. We're also aware that they have since the debate in this Chamber pulled in their horns somewhat, because of indiscretion on their part they have realized that they have probably jeopardized their particular position or the position that they were promoting within the Civil Service. So that in itself I suspect has been a direct benefit as a result of our prolonging the debate on this issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is that this party, this government, never identified this matter, this freeing, this emancipation of the civil servants as being part and parcel of their long held doctrinaire belief of what has to and what has not to be done in government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the very reverse is true. This government had such a laissez-faire approach to this bill that last year when introduced they withdrew it, they withdrew it. So obviously if it was a question of a burning issue with any members opposite then the bill must have been even more important during the last time

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd) we sat, Sir, because after all we were just going into an election and we were going to make it possible for these same civil servants to become involved in the political process

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend would allow me to correct a statement that he's just made in reference to the position of the bill at the last session. I think the record would show, Mr. Speaker, and I trust my honourable friend will accept this, that the bill was not withdrawn, it died on the Order Paper, and I suggest that there is a difference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a technical difference and one that I accept. It was not withdrawn, it died on the Order Paper as the Minister has indicated. However, it certainly doesn't detract from my argument, in fact it probably strengthens it. If they're prepared to let this baby die, die a cruel and bitter death, that obviously again what I was saying is they weren't really that concerned with whether the Manitoba Civil Servants had these great additional powers that the Minister now subscribes that this bill will provide them with or whether they didn't. When faced with the opportunity of freeing the Manitoba civil servants from the bondage they have been placed in by 100 years of cruel, oppressive Liberal and Conservative governments, when having that opportunity, they chose to let the matter die.

So, Mr. Speaker, I only make the point because this is obvious that it's not a question that they approach with a kind of doctrinaire vision that they approach some other issues with and which they have in all fairness to them, served notice to the general public that it would be their intention to do should they have the reigns of government and the responsibility of government. No, Mr. Speaker, in fact their conduct in the last session raises the question considerably. The fact that they would prefer to let this matter be dropped, to let it, to use the Minister's term, just come to a natural death, that indicates to me a kind of, you know, a kind of basis, you know, deception involved, one that as far as the public of Manitoba is concerned, an uneasiness on their own part that the introduction of this kind of a bill would somehow not find favour, not find general acceptance by the public of Manitoba and for that reason of course the bill did not proceed any further last session.

Mr. Speaker, then you ask yourself why is the bill, why is the bill coming forward, why is the bill coming forward at this particular time? We've established, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not come to us in the usual manner that bills are initiated. There was no, to my knowledge, Sir, and the Minister has not indicated this, there was no tremendous pressure on the government by the very people affected to bring in this bill. None of us in opposition have ever received any amount of mail crying for these changes so you know, I just want to make - that's not how the bill was initiated.

Secondly, it's not a position that the government has long held as part and parcel of its political platform it's not something that they promised the people of Manitoba that they would do once elected. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I've just indicated previously they have gone to some ends to at least not draw attention to the people of Manitoba about this bill just prior to an election when that would have been the case had the bill proceeded in its normal way the last session.

Mr. Speaker, the question then can be surely asked, "Why is the bill before us?" Who benefits? And what is the real purpose of this bill? Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, I suggest it is here for a very real purpose, I suggested one of the purposes the last time I spoke on this particular bill, and despite the comments made at that time by the Honourable House Leader and his general approach that the government is simply just another employer of peoples, which I would take issue with and argue with, perhaps will if I have the time, let me indicate to you, Sir, that it is my belief, it is my belief that the government wishes to legalize what they are already doing in far too many instances - the politicization of the civil service is to be accelerated. Mr. Speaker, let me put this reasonable position before you, the "initial" advantages, and I underline the word initial because unfortunately, and this is what we and the members of the opposition have been trying to tell the government, there is no advantage in this bill to anybody. The people of Manitoba will be the losers and successive government will be the losers and certainly the civil servants will be the losers.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. ENNS: Because as I indicated to the Honourable the Minister I can predict the

March 14, 1974

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd) next significant clauses to be added to this bill. They will be the removal of the Security of Tenure clauses. I can predict that to him as sure as I have a reasonable opportunity of once being a member of some future administration, that obviously will be the next clauses, and I think the Civil Service people should be aware of that. Should be aware of that. This is the kind of ball game we're getting into.

So the first initial advantage of course goes to the government in power, because essentially what the bill does, or what it will do, enable, is to flush out and to allow the freer movement and to encourage the freer participation of the government supporters within the Civil Service. I don't say this you know, with any degree of hostility. It is a question of logic. It is a question of simple logic. Do you really mean to tell me, Sir, that you know the known Conservatives or the known Liberals in the Civil Service will feel as free, will feel as free to participate as the known NDP members of the party? The same argument could be made if there was a Conservative administration -- you know it's always easier to support the present than to fight against it, particularly if you're fighting your boss or your job promotions or your pay is at stake. So it doesn't . . .

A MEMBER: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Yes. The honourable member brought up the question of Security of Tenure. Judging by statements made by the Member for Fort Garry and his own leader, how much security of tenure do the present members of the Civil Service whom they have identified as NDPRs have in the event that they would be at some time the government of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: They have the security of tenure clauses that have taken years to build up into the Civil Service Act, that have taken successive governments and years and tradition to honour and to keep, and it is only on exceptional circumstances, only and usually, usually by mutual consent when a separation takes place. Mr. Chairman, that, however, is something that the Honourable Member from Wellington or St. Matthews, pardon me St. Matthews, is prepared to treat lightly and to see disappear from the Civil Service Act. --(Interjection)-- Well, Sir, he says that that is not his wish.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying before I was interrupted with the question that it is not an unnatural assumption to make and it could be made with respect to any party or any government that is in power. That this kind of encouragement for political activity on the part of the Civil Service would tend to favour or would tend to make that activity more pronounced with supporters of the government of the day than opposed. It's just a natural reaction on the part of the people. I say it would be the same if it were a Liberal administration or a Conservative administration or if it were an NDP, as it is now an NDP administration.

We are dealing with an NDP administration and we are dealing with a government that has shown a particular bent on exerting pressure on the Civil Service in political terms and obviously, Sir, tends to maximize that particular ability that they have. They have done so, Mr. Speaker, in this bill as has been pointed out by other speakers, in a way that alarms us, that concerns us. In the very area of - if there's a question of Civil Service promotion or demotion, or decrease in pay or something like that involved because the question of his merits are in doubt, what does the bill provide for? Not for an appeal to a "reasonably" independent group - and I use the term reasonably because I think we've gone around the circle on the question of how independent can any group be, but no we don't have the appeal mechanism written in the bill that it would apply to the Civil Service Commission or perhaps some outside body, the Minister, the political person maintains the firm control for this kind of appeal mechanism. Precisely where there is an argument of the kind that should not be resolved where the question of politics comes into, the question of whether a man or woman has been wrongly refused a promotion, when a man or woman's merits or qualifications for a job are in question, these judgments will not be made by something that we could call independent, but by the political person involved, namely the Minister. Mr. Speaker, that simply is not acceptable. The Minister has given us no indication in his remarks, nor have any of the other colleagues given us any remarks that he refuses, that he would indicate that this was one of the areas that he would be prepared to consider. Mr. Speaker, if anything we should

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd) be taxing ourselves to the problem of strengthening the independent nature of the Civil Service Commission as such, we should be examining the actual structure of the Civil Service Commissioner's role, and we should be dedicating our energies to trying to maintain a greater degree of independency within the Civil Service, not destroy it, not to destroy it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Minister of Labour who has, after all, served in this House perhaps longer, indeed longer than anybody else, but has subsequently had the opportunity of working with civil servants longer than anyone else in this House, he has worked with civil servants appointed by Liberal administrations, appointed by Conservative administrations, and now he's working with civil servants appointed by the New Democratic Party government administration. He, Sir, among the few, has probably had greater experience in this field with respect to the kind of Civil Service and the capacity, the ability of the Service to respond to requests for help, requests for information, and in general the kind of conduct that was possible between civil servants, opposition MLAs, government MLAs and what have you.

Sir, he hasn't recited to us, aside from maybe a very personal relatively minor matter, the question involved in employment of somebody within his family, but certainly he has made no case and no issue that the manner and way in which the reasonably independent Civil Service Commission organized and ran a show for the Civil Service of the Province of Manitoba, was unjust or was unfair. He's made no particular case in that regard. He attempts to make out a case, Sir, that the civil servants are a particularly aggrieved group within our society; that their rights are being trampled on, that they lack something that the rest of us enjoy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think even he would agree that we live in a pretty, pretty free country, pretty free province, and I would suspect, Sir, that if any group of Manitobans was being trampled on, being oppressed, and their rights withdrawn, that we would not have too much difficulty in hearing from them; that there would have been letters to our newspapers; there would have been, honest or otherwise, there would have been letters to our individual MLAs, there would have been an organized attempt made on the part of these oppressed people to have these rights restored. In fact, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, put in the manner the Minister of Labour likes to put it, that that might well have been one of the first cases dealt with by our Civil Rights or Human Rights Commission, in terms of correcting some long, long-held grievances by a group of people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of this is nonsense. We're really, really reasonably close if we believe, if we take at face value what we're saying in this Chamber. If we really only want to facilitate and make it a little clearer on what basis political civil servants can become actively involved in politics and not be unduly penalized, which they should not be, then let's address ourselves to those particular sections; let's worry about the particular sections as they apply to the necessary leave of absence the Civil Service should take. Let's apply ourselves to the necessary mechanism that has to be built in there, protective mechanisms that have to be built in there, that in the event the civil servant returns back to his job that he is not and will not arbitrarily be treated in any vindictive manner by a government of the day. And, Mr. Speaker, I point out to you all the more reason, all the more reason not to have clauses in there such as this, that the appeal section will be handled pretty well by the political person involved, 13 (a) if I'm not mistaken: "Where an unsuccessful candidate for a position is an employee who is of the opinion that the appointment of another person to the position was based on matters other than merit, that employee may, in writing, appeal to the Minister, who shall appoint a person to inquire into and investigate the matter and submit a report thereon to the Minister, who, after receiving the report, shall decide the appeal." The Minister shall decide the appeal, "and the Minister's decision thereon is final."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the area that we should be worrying about, making sure that a person's rights aren't trampled on. If a person wants to run for a particular political party, and he runs, and maybe he is unsuccessful and wants to come back, and can come back and should be able to come back, to his same employment, but he may face a vindictive Minister, Sir. And what does the Act say? The Act says he has to face that vindictive Minister. There is nobody else to appeal to.

March 14, 1974

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Well now, Mr. Speaker, surely then we're talking at cross purposes. Either the fellows opposite aren't being so really straightforward with us on this matter, that that is not their only concern. I suspect that their concern has a great deal to do, a great deal to do with the kind of broadening of the political activity on the part of civil servants generally, whereby they can have the ag reps and the social workers and the health nurses as they make their rounds throughout the country or hand our their welfare cheques, be in the same position to hand out political propaganda and political appeal notices for a particular political party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we really have two debates going on in this Chamber and we're not always meeting each other's arguments head on. I think we have, Sir, indicated that there is a great deal of concern in several passages. I've raised only this particular one. The one that was raised by the Member for St. James I think specifically, the one soliciting funds, I think the Honourable Member for Charleswood also raised it, is equally difficult for us to accept and to live with.

Mr. Speaker, you know, there is, in an open society, in a democratic society, sufficient difficulty to deal with this problem of how political parties are funded, how funds are solicited. Mr. Speaker, you know, we may be addressing ourselves to the question of whether or not they should be funded privately at all, or whether we should not be moving into the field of public financing of all political parties to take away that grey area of concern.

Mr. Speaker, I don't advocate that. I'm just suggesting some of the questions that have been raised on this matter, have they been raised -- why are they being raised? When there are those proponents usually from the opposite side, those Proponents who suggest that future political parties or future elections should be publicly financed, they do so, to somehow because they feel that there's inequity to some extent, it leads, it can lead to a degree of corruption from time to time with the question of soliciting of funds, compromising of one's principles, of one's positions. Mr. Speaker, to some extent there is of course some validity in these arguments, and we have for that very reason -- virtually any government, both on the federal scene and the Provincial scene, have strengthened year by year; we've made different attempts to draw different regulations, to improve the manner and way, to curtail the manner and way in which funding of political parties is carried on. Fuller disclosure; definite limitations as to how, limitations as to how much in amounts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing here? We are now asking that highway engineer who in his daily job, you know, has to come out there with his ruler or his spike and inspect the performance of a contractor who just got the contract, a half a million dollar contract, from the government to build a road, and it's largely based on his daily checks as to if the contract calls for a six-inch lift of coarse gravel followed by a two-inch lift of fine sand and then to be finished with a three-inch topping of blacktop, something like that. It's largely his daily checks that will determine whether or not the contractor will be paid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why place that engineer in that kind of position or the contractor in that kind of position where, if at election time and the contractor is having some difficulty in making ends meet on this particular job, he could sure make ends meet if instead of a 5-inch lift, you know, or 6-inch lift, the 4-inch lift would be passed by a civil servant. And if \$1,000 or \$2,000 helps making that possible to the right political party, then, Sir, I suggest that we are not doing a service, we are doing a tremendous disservice; we are going backwards in an attempt to clean up and to improve the funding practices of this or any other political process.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know, these are the kind of specific sections of the bill that we take exception to, the Minister has not addressed himself to at all in his response. He claims that his purpose in introducing the bill is essentially the only one which we agree that there is no argument about, namely that civil servants should be able to offer themselves for public office. And we also agree that if there is a question, if there is some question or some unfairness in how this is possible, then that should be attended to and looked after in this bill. But, Mr. Speaker, we really believe that we cannot as a responsible opposition allow this bill to pass in this manner and take our chances. We think, Sir, that this bill should be withdrawn, and if this Minister wants to accept some degree of consensus of this House, he should re-introduce a bill that would contain at least some of the concerns expressed by the members of the opposition.

BILL 7

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, is this not the kind of a matter that should be dealt with to some extent by consensus of this Chamber? Is there any advantage to be had to make this a highly partisan kind of a position? And I ask honourable members opposite, recognizing that, you know, we live in a democratic process, that just, Sir, as we choose and we elect you, Sir, as our steward and as our Speaker, you Sir, you would know, in fact you would not accept the position if a significant portion of the House refused to support you and voted against you at the time of your nomination to that position, Sir. Your capacity and your capability of government this Chamber rests on a general acceptance on the part of all of us, even though that is sometimes somewhat camouflaged, but the recognition, I want to assure you, is there on all of us of your stewardship of this Chamber, as it has to be.

Now, Sir, I suggest that not unlike a major change in the Civil Service legislation of this province, a Civil Service that at one time or other, maybe a Conservative administration, a Liberal administration, or a New Democratic Party administration as it is now, we'll live with and we'll deal with and we'll require the mutual co-operation of; that surely this is the kind of a bill on which there should be attempted to reach a degree of consensus within this Chamber before forcing it, before ramming it any further.

Mr. Speaker, to date we have received no indication from the Honourable Minister, from the honourable members of the government, that they are in fact prepared to consider some of the serious objections that we have raised, and for this reason, Sir, we can't see this bill proceeding any further. We also see it, Sir, as our responsibility, you know, to await -- and we are hearing more and more people, have more and more people coming to us expressing their concern about this bill. By the very nature of the bill, by the very nature of the persons, they do so of course in privacy, but nonetheless there is in my judgment no question that the civil servants of this Province of Manitoba would make an earnest repeal and soundly reject the bill in its present form, knowing now what some of the implications of that bill are.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

. . . cont'd on next page

March 14, 1974

BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, we've listened to considerable debate on this bill and, you know, it really doesn't surprise me that the members of the Conservative Party have taken the position that they have taken. It's been historical that they dig in their heels and strengthen their backs, flex their muscles, whenever we talk about progressive moves in society. Now why they do this is hard to reason sometimes, but it just seems that that always happens. And I just wonder if they shouldn't consider removing the word "Progressive" from the title of their party and just call them the plain Conservative Party, which would be to me a more clear definition of what they really stand for because it seems to me that the progressiveness of the Progressive Conservative Party has disappeared, been allowed to diminish in recent years, and as I stated the other day, Mr. Speaker, it's my opinion that they're the forces of reaction and they have been, will continue to be, and it seems that they are determined to support that position.

It has been my experience that they've opposed unions over the years. You can read in history where they opposed the institution of public education. They opposed Medicare. Anything that is of a progressive nature that would benefit the people as a whole, the whole society, they always seem to oppose it, but in this particular bill, Bill No. 7, I seem to get the impression that they are afraid of something. They seem to be afraid of the Civil Service - they don't want the Civil Service to become first class citizens like the rest of us, they seem to think all of a sudden that if the Civil Service get the right that the rest of us have, that all of a sudden the fortunes of the Conservative Party will further deteriorate in the Province of Manitoba, and I can't share their concern in that regard because the Civil Service of Manitoba has been a good organization, a good bunch of people working in the service, and I don't think they would take that type of attitude that is being implied by the speakers from the opposite side of the House.

Now the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he seems to take a different slant in his debates on this particular bill. He starts out with great gusto of what it's all about and how he intends to deal with the question, and he seems to end up apologizing for his particular position on the bill. He sort of weakens as he goes along, and I can appreciate his position because he really hasn't impressed me to be the real type of hard-line Conservative that some of the other members have expressed themselves to be.

You will recall in the last election that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry more or less ran on his own hook. He rejected the support of the GGG which was the super Conservative power in the last election and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry said, No 'thank you, I don't need that kind of support, and he went out on his own hook and he proved to the Conservative Party that he didn't need that kind of super power to get elected. He done it on his own hook, and I give him full credit for that. So I would think that he is some kind of an independent Conservative and this is the tenor that I take from his speeches on this bill also. So I wouldn't be too prone to put him in the same bag as some of the other speakers that have been speaking on Bill 7. And I just wonder if when he's talking about this, when the Conservatives talk about this in their caucus if they consult the Member for Fort Garry as to what his real position on Bill 7 is or does he just go merrily along on his own little way and try to do the best that he can on a particular problem.

I also noticed the the Member for Fort Garry was somewhat disturbed about the position of his caucus on the advertisement on the Mineral Tax in The Co-operator. It was quite evident that he didn't know about that particular Act. So I just wonder what the consultation is within the Conservative caucus in regard to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. Is he sort of left out in the cold and not told what's going on in his own caucus, because to anyone sitting on this side, and I'm sure many other members also, could notice his surprise and reaction when that ad was made public in this House. So I would say that possibly he doesn't fit in the Conservative caucus too well and this is why I get the impression that he's more or less speaking on his own, taking his own independent stand and hopefully that he can accomplish something in that way.

There has been a couple of speakers on the opposite side accusing us of being follow the leader type - somebody just more or less raises their hand and we all follow in line and run along like little sheep. Well that may be an impression that the members of the Conservative Party get but when you have a party or any organization you have to have a leader

BILL NO. 7

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) in order to be effective and I think it's safe to say that in the New Democratic Party we have a very capable leader. His stature is such in the politics of Manitoba that it can't seriously be questioned; his ability has been proven time and time again; his integrity is without question and just his political know how is something to behold and something to watch as to how he keeps going on at the pace that he does and bringing the policies of the government to the people of Manitoba. But when you get the inference that the members of this party are just follow the leader types well that certainly is not quite true in that sense because they give a different connotation of what follow the leader is and what really takes place. But when you look at the Conservative Party it's true that they don't follow their leader because it just seems quite apparent that they don't quite know who the leader is of the ..

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): . . . Mr. Chairman, I was simply going to ask the honourable member if he could indicate what particular piece of legislation or what item he's speaking on. I understand that the subject before the House right now is Bill No. 7. He hasn't come near it in the last ten minutes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point is well taken. I was just going to call the honourable member's attention to the fact that we're on Bill No. 7, amendments to the Civil Service Act. The honourable member.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was just looking at the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Roblin the other night and it seemed to me that he travelled along a winding road to get to Bill 7 and I was just more or less following in his footsteps, and that's the way that you arrive at a discussion in this Chamber --(Interjection)-- Well, the Honourable Member for Roblin, he's a -- I will say one thing about him, he's a topnotch defenceman anyway, and he does get around to the point of discussing Bill 7 as he goes along through his discourse. But he was talking about follow the leader and that's particularly what I was commenting on at this time, Mr. Speaker, and when I was interrupted I was on the point of the Conservative leader and as I said that they haven't quite made their mind up who's leading them in the debate on Bill No. 7 and they just don't seem to have no particular direction on Bill 7. They seem to be going at it, coming at it from all angles so I really can't see how they can accuse other people of not following the leader when they're not too good at it themselves. Especially when they don't know who the leader is. So when you have members running hither and yon and scattering all over the place I can understand the reason that they haven't really formed a solid policy or conclusion on Bill 7 up to this time.

They also mentioned that, you know, when we pound our desk on this side of the House that when one does it they all do it, it's just like a rhythm that they pick up, and all I would say on that point, Mr. Speaker, is that in any type of organization whether it be this House or unions or politics or whatever you have, if you aren't organized you aren't successful. So you have to have some type of organization in order to be successful, even if it comes down to desk pounding. I would think that in that sense that we made a fairly good contribution to the process of the House in that area. And I would suggest to the honourable members of the Conservative Party that maybe in their caucus sometime they should practice desk pounding a little bit to make it a little more effective.

But a number of the members opposite have talked about discrimination in Bill 7, if Bill 7 ever comes to pass. Now how they can read from Bill 7 how discrimination is going to occur is just beyond my comprehension because I can't really see that, and when you take an overview of the proposed amendments to Bill 7 it's just not there. There is no insinuation that discrimination will occur, can occur or should occur. It seems to me that the members of the Conservative Party are experts and I think they're fully qualified at reading between the lines. They can read between the lines, they can insinuate and they can really do a good job at it. I give them credit for that. --(Interjection)-- My honourable colleague from Radisson says, by innuendo. Well that may be so but that's his experience in the past four or five years in this House as to what he's learned. But just in the brief time that I've been here I find that the reading between the lines is more of a subject of debate rather than what is printed in black and white and I would seriously request the members of the Conservative Party to read the amendment in a realistic light and really see what it means. Don't look for boogymen or things that aren't there but just look at what the amendments are really trying to do, and I think this is where you have to really get down to the core of the debate.

March 14, 1974

BILL NO. 7

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd)

But in the debate on Bill 7 a number of times it has been mentioned that the old socialist philosophy keeps rearing its head and keeps coming back to haunt the socialist party. And there was considerable mention made of the Regina Manifesto as to what implications that has on the New Democratic Party of the day. Well you know it really all started back in Calgary, Alberta, that free enterprise province in --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Right, and that was Bob Edwards in the "Calgary Eyeopener" that was prominent in those days. So it really didn't start in Regina as they always try to give it the inference that it did. It started in Calgary and it just so happened that the next meeting was scheduled for Regina and that's where the blueprint of the CCF Party was drafted. And you know, just like all other documents and all other pieces of written material that come into society gets labelled with a name and it just happened that this was called the Regina Manifesto. But if the members opposite ever read the Regina Manifesto they would see that implicit in that document were things that were for the good of humanity, the good of Canadians at that particular time in history, and that was probably the only reason that that thing ever came to light in Canada was the fact that the people of western Canada in particular were suffering undue hardship. So the Regina Manifesto in all its connotations, the misconceptions that people take from it really was a good document, a progressive document and was designed to meet the needs of the people and help the people at that time. It arose out of the ashes of the depression and nobody should know it better than members of the Conservative Party because they were the governing party of the day and there were some pretty cruel things happened in history at that particular time.

There have been many other party slogans that just seem to stick with society and they don't mean the same horrible things that the Conservative Party seems to attach to the Regina Manifesto. We've had slogans like, "Do It Now" - there was nothing wrong with that slogan, everybody seemed to accept it in society. I can remember a slogan in this province that was "Grow to Beat the 70s". You know that wasn't a real bad slogan and people seemed to accept it as such and we didn't attach all kind of hairy ideas to it. And I'm sure that the members opposite remember the great slogan in the late 50s of "Follow John", that was one of the greatest slogans probably that ever went across this country. Also there was a slogan of "Trudeaumania" so I don't think that Bill 7 can be, you know, labelled with any kind of Regina Manifesto slogan or anything like that. Mr. Speaker, it just doesn't seem to fit on Bill 7.

They keep mentioning how we draft things in our conventions that seem to have all kinds of wild ideas and this is where ideas like Bill 7 come from. Well if you don't have conventions and don't develop some kind of party policy then I think that the Conservative conventions are not productive in that sense, because surely they have conventions and surely they develop some policy and ideas that their party could carry into government, if they ever get elected to government. I think this is what conventions are all about.

There's been quite a bit of talk on Bill 7 about the matter of civil servants resigning in order to run for political office. Well I can't really see the argument in that sense because it's been quite evident in the last few years that this government brought in legislation that allowed for city councillors to run for other jurisdictions of political office without resigning their seat, so if it's good enough for city councillors to be able to do that then I would think that civil servants of the province should have the same privilege, and I can't support the arguments in that nature.

And there's been - especially the Honourable Member for Roblin made a great lot of noise about the Executive Council having the almighty power to more or less do what they like, destroy the Civil Service and just fire people and hire people at will. Well I wouldn't think that that is a very valid argument because the Executive Council haven't that power and I don't see the new Act giving them that power. There are provisions in the Act that if a person is to be dismissed, it's there now and it probably will continue to be there and I would think that that's only proper and right. But in talking about this bill the idea of a socialist philosophy keeps coming at us from all angles and you'd think it was some kind of a big NDP plan to discredit or discriminate against the Civil Service. I would think that nothing further is from the truth.

We keep getting the indications that, the Honourable Member for Thompson the other day took objection to it, the expression of Sieg Heil, creeping socialism, we get the big hairy arms with the hammer and sickle around the Golden Boy, you know, and all of these type of

BILL NO. 7

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . signs and indications that socialism is a big bad thing. And all I would say in that regard, Mr. Chairman, is that the people who make those signs, give those kind of indications are hurting nobody really but themselves. The public have long forgot those type of reflections on politicians and they are now hep to the situation and for the members that continue in that manner they're certainly not improving their image with the public and only helping to discredit themselves.

The Honourable Member for Roblin in his discourse the other evening took issue once again, as some other members of the Conservative Party have, with the possibility that the Civil Service of Manitoba might one day end up in the Canadian Union of Public Employees. Well you know that really is a sad case when you get honourable members talking about that type of situation more or less limiting the civil servants to a freedom of choice. The freedom of choice of the union that they wish to represent them. I would think that the Conservative Party should be standing up on their feet and hailing the fact that the Civil Service has been approached by the Canadian Union of Public Employees, in order to determine if there is any desire for the Civil Service to change their bargaining unit.

The Canadian Union of Public Employees is one of the greatest Canadian organizations that we have in Canada today. It's coast to coast, it's a union that cannot be questioned on its principles, its motives and its organizational guide. It is one of the unions today that is leading the fight to bring reform to the Canadian Labour Congress, to bring more autonomy to Canadian unions, to the International sections of those unions that are operating in Canada. And I just can't understand why the members of the Conservative Party would want to discredit CUPE in that sense, because not all, I don't know what the percentage is, but not all of the locals or the units of the Canadian Union of Public Employees are affiliated to the New Democratic Party, and those that are affiliated do so by their own choice on a democratic vote. And I don't see how any member can question that procedure, because I'm sure that if the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers Association wished to support the Conservative party that's the decision of that organization, and I say good luck to them. That is their privilege and their prerogative and I would never question that. If they wish to do that, fine and dandy. And by the same token, if the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers Association wish to support the New Democratic Party I certainly wouldn't object to that. You know, this may surprise some people but that might not be too far off in the future. You know, the people in those organizations aren't all so reactionary as the inference I get from the honourable members of the Conservative Party in this House.

Now maybe some of the members of the Conservative Party should start attending some of the meetings again to really see what's happening in those organizations, because they're coming along the road to progress. I would ask the members of the Conservative Party to really think about it, search your conscience, and really ask yourself are you really being fair when you criticize the Civil Service for requesting the Canadian Union of Public Employees to consider some type of affiliation with that union. I think that is a very democratic process and I have been most disappointed with that argument coming from the Conservative Party. It should be no secret to the members of the Conservative Party that in the Canadian Union of Public Employees there are I would say just as many Conservative supporters as there are Liberal or New Democratic party supporters. So you really shouldn't be arguing about the Canadian Union of Public Employees because they're the real true Canadian union that we have in Canada. I don't doubt but what some of you know some of them and they're a fine bunch of fellows and they really try to do a good job. I can assure the civil servants of Manitoba that if they ever do choose to go with the Canadian Union of Public Employees that that union will do a job for them and they will be well satisfied with the service that they could get from that union.

As I said when I spoke on this bill before, I'm not all that familiar with the Manitoba Government Employees Association and they may be doing a good job, but from the inference that I get and the newspaper reports is that there has been some dissatisfaction with the MGEA. Now for whatever reason that is, that is an internal problem and only the MGEA can sort that out for themselves. But if they're in a mood to go to CUPE then that should be a decision of the civil servants of Manitoba and I don't think that our government or any other political body should have any interference in the desire of the employees to select the bargaining

BILL NO. 7

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) agent of their choice. So with that I would just ask the members of the Conservative party to think twice about making criticism in that particular area.

The Honourable Member for Swan River, he boasted in this House that the civil servants were quite prominent in getting him re-elected. Well I say good luck to him if that was the case because why shouldn't the civil service participate in the election of a member to this House if they so desire. I have no objection with that at all, and if the Honourable Member for Swan River has a group of Civil servants in that area that are prepared to support him and work for him and bring his political ambitions to a seat in this Legislature then good luck to him.

A MEMBER: Even if they are stupid, eh?

MR. PATTERSON: I just wonder when I listen to the members opposite debating Bill No. 7 if they've really, really, really, I mean really read what they're talking about. They seem to take the overview all the time that everything's not all right, that everything won't be all right and everything can't be all right as long as we got Bill 7 in front of us, and they seem to suspect the Honourable Minister of Labour of being a devious type of person that doesn't bring anything in that can be realistic. Now I would think that they should really read the amendments and not have their backroom advisors read the thing and give them all the kind of political connotations that make headlines in the newspapers and get the comments on TV and radio and that type of thing. But really read the amendments themselves and try to understand what the amendments will do. And the amendments that are listed before us, there may be an if or a but or and here that may be just not in the right place, and we'll get to that in Law Amendments, but the overview of the bill I don't think that they can give a realistic argument to that, and up to this time in the debate they certainly haven't been giving me the realistic argument as to why the bill shouldn't be passed, almost in its entirety. I would think that it's a fair bill, it's been laid out in fairly realistic terms and it would seem to do the job that the civil servants have been hoping that somebody would do for them in the political field.

Quite a few of the honourable members of the Conservative party insinuated that the amendment indicated in Bill 7 would give the government of the day the right to solicit bagmen out of the civil service. Well when you hear the honourable members opposite talk about bagmen, you know, they can really express that term in all its full righteousness because apparently they've been talking about that for many many years and they know how to say it, they know how to put it to the public and they can make it sound like something really awful when it really isn't. Because anybody that's been in politics knows that, and you can call him a bagman, but he's really a fund raiser and in that sense every politician has to have funds in order to operate an election. And every politician has to have fund raisers. So the connotation of bagmen, they really try to lay that on thick and make it look like that every civil servant in the Province of Manitoba, after Bill 7 is passed, will all of a sudden become the bagmen for the New Democratic Party. And I would think that nothing could be further from the truth. There are civil servants that wouldn't want to collect money for any political party even if they have a favorite in the political field. You know, the people in our society that want to be or have the ability to be fund raisers are few and far between in any party, so there's no difference there. I can't see the civil servants being any different than the general run of the average citizen in Manitoba.

They've talked about if Bill 7 ever becomes a reality that will the Civil Service be free people. Well I think the Civil Service are a pretty free Civil Service today and I can't see that Bill 7 will change them all that much except that in a couple of sections of the proposed amendment the civil servants will become free in the sense that they will have the same political rights as the rest of the citizens of Manitoba. And that means that on the day that the writ is issued there will be no change in the status of the civil servant. He will have his right to continue to participate if he was doing so before in support of the political party or the political candidate of his choice. I think that that is only a fair assumption to make that a person living in Manitoba in 1974 should be able to do and I can't argue with that particular clause of the bill.

I'm sure that the honourable members of the Conservative Party have the right to join or participate in organizations of their choice. I just wonder how many of them belong to the

BILL NO. 7

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) . . . National Farmers Union and I would have no objection to them participating in that organization or any other organization. In fact I would encourage the members of the Conservative Party that live in the rural areas to become members of the National Farmers Union because I think that, as I said before, it is only through organizations and through organizational strength that you can become a force in society and try to protect the things that are most beneficial to you. So if they aren't already members of the National Farmers Union then they should certainly seek out that organization and apply for their membership. I don't think, in my observation anyway, Mr. Speaker, that the National Farmers Union has become a political organization up to this time in history. They seem to be a very independent group, so if the National Farmers Union ever decide to become political then I would think it would be the members of that organization that would determine what their orientation would be in the political field and I would certainly hope that they would see their way clear to support the New Democratic Party because our party has been most favourable in bringing about improvements in the rural areas and I don't think we should be bashful in asking for their support because this is a political fact of life.

You know in looking at the debates, and especially the Honourable Member for Roblin, he talked about how the individual Civil Service would lose their right and all the rest of it if Bill 7 ever became a reality. Well I don't think that any party in the history of Canada can take more credit than what the New Democratic Party can in protecting the rights of individuals. We have championed the rights of individuals over the years and when we became government we have certainly brought in legislation that would support the rights of individuals, not only in the political field, in many other fields. This has been the philosophy of the CCF and the New Democratic party down over the years is to support the right of the individual, give the individual all the rights that society can allow him, and to me this is the real, the real nub of the amendment proposed in Bill 7, that the individual, the individual, and I think this is where the Conservative Party is missing the argument, they keep talking about the Civil Service as a whole. Well it's really not the Civil Service as a whole that you're talking about. You're talking about individuals in the Civil Service because there's no way that the whole Civil Service is going to support one party or the other. It's going to be individuals and the percentage of individuals will more than likely be small in comparison to the numbers of people in the Civil Service. Their numbers will be small that take the political party in our society. So Bill 7 will once again put forth the philosophy of the socialist movement in Canada, where the individual has the right to do what the rest of us have to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we don't want to pass Bill 7, if we really get down to the nitty-gritty of the thing and we say well I'm sorry civil service we can't pass Bill 7 the opposition has been overwhelming, there's been too much criticism, we haven't had any indication from the Civil Service that they want Bill 7 and all the rest of it, you know it just might be that the Civil Service might have a case to take to the Human Rights Commission. Because why should they be denied rights that the rest of us have, just because they work for the Civil Service.

Now you know when you become employed with the Civil Service I imagine you make out an application form for employment the same as we do for any other company and I just wonder if it states on that employment form that you can't participate in the political life of the province. If it does, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest that the Honourable Minister of Labour should have somebody look at that employment form and possibly refer it to the Human Rights Commission, because here we are denying people their human rights, if I assess the argument from the Conservative Party properly that, you know, we would be doing a terrible thing if we passed Bill 7. I say the opposite. I say we would be doing a terrible thing if we didn't pass Bill 7. And, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly hope that we can get this bill into committee and if there are any great amendments to come forward I'd be willing to listen to them but I'm rather satisfied with Bill 7 the way it is. I think it will give the Civil Service what they have been looking for for a long long time. And, Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that Bill 7 passes in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, If nobody else wants to speak I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek that debate be adjourned. MOTION presented and carried.

March 14, 1974

BILL NO. 7

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I assume the Committee is prepared to proceed further with Supplementary Supply, and I think the next item is Resolution 9. But before doing so, I'd like to take a moment if I may, to inform Committee that I am asking the Clerk to distribute material which was dealt with this morning in Public Accounts Committee. This material is a format for a department, the Department of Co-operative Development, which gives the Estimates of that department in the format that they would be if presented in accordance with the Ontario system, and another one in accordance with the Quebec system. And what we did in Public Accounts this morning was to review these two sets of presentations along with the traditional Manitoba set, in the expectation that when we moved to the Department of Co-operative Development, honourable members will have an opportunity to deal with the Estimates in accord with either our own method of presentation or the Quebec or the Ontario, and I hope that members will find it useful to review the different forms of presentation so that they will have an idea whether there's any advantage to doing it in the way it's being done in those other two provinces. It is more elaborate, more extensive, also more expensive, but the important thing for us to consider in due course will be whether there should be a change in the form of presentation of estimates and whether either of these or any combination or rearrangement of them would be useful. So that I hope honourable members will have an opportunity to look at them before we deal with the committee and with the department, and I believe that since there was a member present, at least one from each of the parties in the House, that they will be able to acquaint other members with the presentation form. May I therefore also offer, Mr. Chairman, that if any member wants to have any elaboration on the form itself, then I'm sure that we can provide that when we deal with the department itself. With that explanation for what is now being distributed, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplementary Estimates. Resolution 7. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$119,300 --(Interjection)-- We only got up to Resolution 6, Supplementary Estimates. --(Interjection)-- Resolution 7 -- pass. Resolution 8. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$9,900 for Attorney-General. (Passed)

Resolution No. 9. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$3,300 for Civil Service. (Passed)

Resolution No. 10. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$162,400 for Civil Service. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give an explanation as to the reason why these further sums are required for this particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 10. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The explanation, Mr. Chairman, is that the increase in the calculation base and deduction rate was effective January 1, 1973, and the additional increase on January 1, 1974, were not included in the original Estimates. These are the additions for that reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10 (Passed)

Resolution 11. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$415,000 for Colleges and Universities. (Passed)

Resolution 12. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$11,000 for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. (Passed)

Resolution 13. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$10,000 for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services. (Passed)

SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd)

Resolution 14. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$1,189,700 for Education. (Passed)

Resolution 15. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$22,000 for Finance. Pass? The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain this figure \$22,000. Is that the cost of administering the collection of tax on this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's the additional cost of the computer processing and forms relative to that tax.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 15 -- pass? (Passed)

Resolution 16. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$494,800 for Health and Social Development. Pass? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister could provide an explanation for this particular item, please, as to No. 16.

MR. CHERNIACK: The explanation given is that the arbitration award to the nurses' aides was not included in the original estimates - that's the item of \$74,800.00. The other, the \$420,000 is the transfer of expenditures related to maintenance of the Manitoba School for Retardates at Portage la Prairie, from the Department of Public Works to Department of Health and Social Development. It has been negotiated that the costs will be shareable with the Federal Government on the 50 percent basis through the Canada Assistance Plan, by transferring it into this item, and there would then be a corresponding reduction in the Department of Public Works.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was the question I was going to ask and the Minister explained it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 16--pass? (Passed)

Resolution 17: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$38,700 for Highways. Pass? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I should ask it on Highways, I think probably the proper place is under Northern Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Yes, I was wanting to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, on that Highways here, on Other Expenditure here, if he would explain.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this item of \$38,700, the explanation is that the payments for mileage and travel expenses was underestimated. It's just that simple an explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 17 -- pass? (Passed)

Resolution 18. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$61,600 for Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Pass? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Could the Minister provide an explanation for that item please?

MR. CHERNIACK: The item of \$61,600, explanation is that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has advised that it is requesting reimbursement for uncollectible fishermen's loans as per agreement with the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. That's some \$36,800. Then additional funds were required for the experimental fishery on the Saskatchewan River, as was approved previously by Management Committee \$24,800.00.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say, can he reaffirm that figure of uncollectible fishermen's loans, was that? How much money was it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: \$36,800.00. Resolution 18 -- pass? (Passed)

Resolution 19. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$6,500 for Municipal Affairs. Pass? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could explain that additional \$6,500.00?

March 14, 1974

SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. CHERNIACK: The explanation is that there were six staff man years were approved over the budget estimates prior -- that is that subsequent to the budget estimates there was some additional staff man years added. It must be towards the end of the period because it's only \$6,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 19 -- pass? (Passed)

Resolution 20. Can I just put the resolution and then recognize the honourable member? Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$37,200 for Northern Affairs. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had previously asked the Minister of Finance to give me an accounting of the moneys that have been spent in the year ending March 31, 1974 in the winter roads program in Northern Manitoba. When we were dealing with the Minister's Estimates he indicated at that time that the total expenditure was \$1,100,000 and I think those are ball park figures. As the same time, the appropriation last year that we voted in this House was \$540,000. He has spent over 100 percent more than that yet we find, when we come to Supplementary Estimates covering the same period of time, that there is no money there. Quite obviously he has taken it out of other account of Capital Supply or something of that nature.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the Member for Birtle-Russell had informed me earlier that he would be asking the question so that I'm able to give him the answer now rather than taking it as notice. He's quite right that the main estimates provided \$540,000. Now I inform him that on September 26, 1973 a special warrant was issued by Order-in-Council for \$580,000 giving a total authority of \$1,120,000, which is I guess the figure given by the Minister during his Estimates. I can just further inform the court that up to yesterday - I mean the committee . . .

A MEMBER: It's something similar.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, I'm being cross-examined--so I inform the committee that as of yesterday cash disbursements were just under \$700,000, but it is expected that the balance will be expended before the year end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 20 -- pass? (Passed)

Resolution 21. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$191,500 for Northern Affairs. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister provide us with a reconciliation of the figures of \$191,500 for air radio and technical division and I would ask him, does this include airfield -- no, it's down further I imagine. But I would like to know what that \$191,000.00?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the \$14,700 is due to unanticipated purchase of uniforms, training courses and travel beyond what has been budgeted. The 168.7 thousand dollars is for increased utilization, several accidents and increased prices. The \$8,100 is poor weather transportation problems and supply of material problems accounts for that increased need.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when he talks about \$168,000 for air operations, I would like to ask him if any of that money is a cost that can be attributed to the added cost of moving goods into northern Manitoba last year because the winter roads were not used?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not speculate, I've given the member all the information I have available to me. I think that we can make a note of that as a question and refer it to the Minister for elaboration if that will be acceptable, that's the only way I can deal with it.

MR. GRAHAM: I will accept that, but how would the Minister be able to inform the House and how we would be able to get a debate going on it if this is going to occur at a later time?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the answer could of course be given but the honourable member asks me how he could generate a debate on it. I don't know that I can help him and I believe that there are people on his side of the House more competent than I to tell him how to generate a debate. But I can do no more than ask the Minister to produce an answer in the normal course.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Member for Rock Lake that the committee rise?

SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

MOTION presented and lost.

MR. GRAHAM: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the committee is shall committee rise and report? All those in favour of the motion please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 19; Nays, 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: In the pause that we were given, I have already asked that an effort be made to get the answer to the honourable member, but apparently both the Minister and his Deputy are away. It does occur to me that we could stand this resolution aside and proceed and see whether the answer could be provided either later today or tomorrow - there is not that much pressure on this and that might be the answer that the honourable member might have received from members on his side if he asked them.

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

MR. GRAHAM: That's perfectly agreeable with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is getting that information if he would also attempt to determine if what proportion of that \$168,700 was generated during the period between May 24th and June 28th last year, of this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want that question please to be -- oh, no, I don't undertake to get that kind of information . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is it the will of the committee that this resolution stand? (Stand)

Resolution 22. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$100,000 for Northern Affairs. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. MCKENZIE: Can the Minister give us an explanation of the \$100,000 please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The information I have, Mr. Chairman, is that \$17,700 is a deficit incurred due to increased program activity; \$82,300 is due to carry-over of '72-'73 commitments into the '73-'74 year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 22 passed)

Resolution 23. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$76,000 for Public Works. Passed --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I think in all fairness to the taxpayers that we should have an explanation on that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the taxpayers I report that the information given is that the '73 - '74 estimates were based on the '72 - '73 estimates rather than the actual expenditures. Apparently in drawing the estimates last year, they went on the basis of previous year's estimates rather than the actual expenditures. The actual '72 - '73 postage expense was higher than the estimates and as a result the vote in the main supply of this current year was understated to this extent.

MR. MCKENZIE: A further question though. I can certainly accept the Honourable Minister's comments, but \$76,000 be out on postage. . . You know, I wonder - it's all postage.

MR. CHERNAICK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm so advised that this is increased volume of mail - and the Honourable the House Leader reminds me that this last year we've gone into increased franking from the members of the Legislature themselves. I don't know if that itself is the reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Would that include the meter money that was used by Jerry Fast to promote CUPE?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. (Resolution 23 passed).

Resolution 24 Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$10,500 for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. (Passed).

Resolution 25. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not

March 14, 1974

SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) . . . exceeding \$50,000 for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Passed -- The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I would appreciate an explanation of that item,

MR. CHERNIACK: What resolution is that? 25. \$50,000. The explanation is unforeseen cost increases for materials. I think nobody can question that there were increased costs but that's all the explanation I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 25 passed) Resolution 26. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$65,000 for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if the Minister would be able to give us an explanation of this particular item. It seems to me that in addition to what was already provided for under the main estimates we should have culture running out of our ears now with this additional \$65,000, and yet I don't feel it. I wonder if the Minister could explain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, there's no limit to the amount of culture that could be offered to all of us, I should think; however, some of us may be more anxious than others to open our ears for it. There are two specific unanticipated grants that were made, or to be made, to the Western Manitoba Centennial Auditorium which I believe is situated in Brandon of \$40,000 and the La Centre Culturale Franco Manitobaine, \$25,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 26 passed) Resolution 27: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$30,000 for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Passed -- The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I'd certainly appreciate an explanation, especially the part that's in brackets related to Lotteries Revenue - if the Honourable Minister would explain?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, yes Mr. Chairman - this grant was payment for Recreational facilities to the City of Winnipeg and it was done on the understanding that the \$30,000 will be repaid. It's an advance of a grant to the City of Winnipeg to be repaid out of Lottery Revenues in the following years, because it was thought that this would be a continuing one to the City of Winnipeg; it should not be just wiped out but brought back from that Lotteries in the future.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how much the total project of the City of Winnipeg was that the \$30,000 grant went to? The reason I ask that question I believe that under the Lotteries Act that no more than \$25,000 can go to any one project. Is that not correct? Or 25 percent?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm certainly not aware of that. No, I can't answer the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 27 passed) Resolution 28: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$50,000 for Urban Affairs. Passed -- the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that this does fall under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance in the field of taxation, and I would ask him what the transitional tax base equalization - could he explain that to us?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it so happens that I'm familiar with this particular item. Honourable members will recall that when we dealt with the City of Winnipeg Act, Bill 36, that it was recognized that in equalizing the assessment base for tax purposes, that there would be an impact and re-shuffle of tax burden based on what was not equal up to the time of the City of Winnipeg Act and in order to cushion the shock that might have occurred to some honourable citizens of the City of Winnipeg and the suburban areas, it was felt desirable to make a transitional payment to them for adjustment over a three-year period - and this payment was made to the individual taxpayers in those areas affected, not to the City of Winnipeg but through the City of Winnipeg where payments were made to the City to apply on individual tax bills, then this payment of \$50,000 is as a final adjustment for subsidies that were allowed on the tax roll changes during 1973.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, at the same time as the transitional tax was figured

SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . out, I believe the Minister had the actual tax rolls at his disposal and the transitional tax should have been figured out to the penny at that particular time, and I wonder why he wants an extra 50,000 now?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think that the person who did this calculation did a fantastic job to come within this amount, because we're dealing on a very large sum of money with all of the City of Winnipeg, the new City of Winnipeg tax rolls, and I'm sure it was an impossible and undesirable task to spend the time to figure in advance what would have to be done to the penny when the bills themselves went out; so that I don't apologize for the fact that I'm sure it wasn't done to that detail but rather done after it was known so that there wouldn't be a duplication of effort, and I think this is a pretty close calculation if they're only that much amount out. But after it was calculated then the City would actually know to the penny and bill us for that work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 28 passed) Resolution . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe that that would complete Supplementary except for Resolution 21. Mr. Chairman, am I not correct? I think we've completed all of Supplementary Supply in Committee except Resolution 21 and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the next item would be to deal with Capital Supply and also suggest in view of the - that we start at 8 o'clock. And I would again propose that we deal with Capital Supply, and if there are any particular questions that honourable members would want to delay for a day, then by all means - but we can cover quite a bit probably for the hour this evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.