

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 7, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills

I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the galleries where we have 100 students of Grade 9 standing of the Louis Riel School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lecuyer, Mr. Frechette, Mrs. Brunet, Mrs. Toupin, Miss Dorge and Miss Gaborieau. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, the other day there was an announcement contained in the Winnipeg Free Press and Tribune to the effect that the Civil Service of Manitoba after having completed negotiations were going to be awarded a seven percent increase in their wages. My question would be directed to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Is this a correct statement?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, negotiations have been proceeding satisfactorily and I would hope to be able to make an announcement within a few days.

MR. PAULLEY: May I then address a supplementary question either to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary or to the Attorney-General. Is it true that the employees of the Manitoba Liquor Commission Board have only been offered an increase of five percent in their wages by the Chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Commission?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I have no direct knowledge of the negotiations being carried on by the Commission with its employees. They are outside of the inner service. I'll endeavour to find out what the situation is on those negotiations.

MR. PAULLEY: May I offer a supplemental question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Does he think it would be fair for part of the civil service under the direction of the Provincial Secretary to be awarded a seven percent increase, if this is arrived at, and those of the Manitoba Liquor Commission only offered an increase of five percent?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question is hypothetical. The negotiations however are quite separate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that there has been a judgment brought down yesterday with respect to the vote taken on the Marketing Board and Mr. Justice Hunt has indicated there had been some alleged irregularities in the count of that vote, I was wondering what action the government intends to take with respect to that.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the judgment referred to by the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains. I have asked the Manitoba Marketing Board to make further recommendations to me. I don't anticipate taking any action at this time until I have these recommendations from the Manitoba Marketing Board on the matter.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplemental question on this matter. Would the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture consider authorizing a second vote in view of the judgment on the matter of marketing boards?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party is probably aware, or should be aware, of the statute which limits a second vote being held on the question for a two-year period. This is part of the reason for the action taken on behalf of these growers to declare this vote null and void. These are all some of the considerations that I have to take into care in arriving at a judgment. I trust to the good offices of the Manitoba Marketing Board to assist me in arriving at these judgments.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might interrupt proceedings for just a moment and apologize to the House. I overlooked one group of school children and I'm sure you would like me to recognize them. There are 28 students of Grade 5 standing from the Queenston School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hughes. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today too.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the reply of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and I think basically he is correct, but I want to ask my honourable friend, in order that fairness may be accorded to those concerned with marketing boards, will the Minister consider, if the decision as arrived at is under the regulations, changing the regulations; if not, if it's under statute, will the Minister consider bringing in a change in the statute at this session in order to give to those concerned in the market producing boards an opportunity of establishing what they desired in the vote that was taken recently.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all my considerations of judgments are based on fair treatment to the producers concerned. I would have to check specifically, but it is my understanding that if it were desirable to make a change of the kind that he suggests that this could possibly be done by regulation. My understanding is that this limitation is under the regulations of The Natural Products Marketing Act, in which case I'm empowered to do that if I am so advised.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has he an answer for the question I posed to him yesterday?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from St. George asked whether it was correct that the Information Service Branch has been negotiating to establish direct lines from their offices to all radio stations in Metropolitan Winnipeg. The answer is no.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer several questions asked by the honourable members. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on Friday asked the cost of composing the "Spirit of '70" song. The cost was \$800.00. There were no royalties; the province owns the song outright.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead asked whether the new fabric mill to be constructed in Selkirk was contingent on whether there was or was not availability of soft water in the town. The answer is no.

The Honourable Member from Gladstone yesterday asked a question, or made reference to a Manitoba Business Journal, October or November issue - I'm not sure of exactly when - referred to an article on the Manitoba Development Fund where mention was made of several loans of the Fund. I've checked with the department officials and the officials of the Manitoba Development Fund and this information was not supplied from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In the course of answering the questions you had taken as notice you forgot to reply to the one I asked you last week, where I had asked if your department had supplied any information to either newspapers regarding Churchill Forest Products for the enclosure you had placed -- or the supplement you had placed in the newspapers.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice again. I'll get that information. I'm sorry I haven't it.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Did the Information Services Branch have any consultations with the radio stations with respect to direct lines from the Information Services Branch?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Member for St. George: are you referring to the individual radio stations?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I asked if the Information Services Branch had had any consultations with the radio stations in Metro Winnipeg to set up a direct line from the Information Services Branch.

MR. SPIVAK: To the radio stations?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: The answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): May I direct a question to the House Leader. Is it still the intention of government to convene a meeting of the Committee on Statutory Regulations during this session?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, when the material on the regulations is ready. It is not as yet ready.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could the Honourable Minister indicate when it will be ready and the nature of the material? I thought it was all ready and before us.

MR. LYON: No. The prime purpose of the Statutory Orders Committee is to review regulations. The requirement, one of the requirements that we have had over the years is a review of these regulations by the staff of the Legislative Counsel in order to assist the members of the committee to review the regulations. That material to assist the committee is not as yet ready. With respect to other matters that have previously been before that committee, there is still required, and there will be on the Order Paper I think shortly, a resolution consigning those matters to the Statutory Orders Committee for consideration.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then may I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it the intention then to present that resolution during this session in sufficient time that a meeting may be called to deal with the matters referred, not the regulations that have been passed?

MR. LYON: The resolution will be presented in due course, yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a subsequent question to direct to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Did anyone in the Information Services Branch have consultations with any officials in the Manitoba Telephone System about the possibility of establishing direct lines to the different radio stations?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and thank him for the information he gave me regarding the song. Was there a contest held in Manitoba for the purpose of preparing this song?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Were there any consultations this morning, or since the sitting of last evening, between the Manitoba Government, MMS or/and the Manitoba Medical Association in respect of provision of Medicare services to the people of Manitoba?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Honourable the First Minister indicate as to whether or not consultations or negotiations will take place within the next day or two in respect of this important matter?

MR. WEIR: No, I'm not at liberty to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I understood him to say that the government did not supply the information that I referred to in the October-November issue of Manitoba Business Journal, but my question is: if the government did not supply the information then it is quite evident that the Manitoba Development Fund did supply the information, because the whole ten-page article lists Mr. Grose, the Chairman of the Board - the whole story is written by it - and it lists 31 different companies who have borrowed money from the Fund. Now my question is: who did supply the information then? The heading of the article says, "The Manitoba Development Fund - is this the coming way to attract industry and expand business? You bet it is." The question is: who gave the information to the Manitoba Business Journal?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the Honourable Member for Gladstone ask the editors of the publication.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) Honourable Minister of Urban and Municipal Affairs. On April 22 I had Order No. 34 passed requesting certain information about the activities of the Boundaries Commission. When can I expect the Order to be tabled?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress): Shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to request a correction in Hansard of last Friday afternoon on Page 1627, the twelfth line. The remarks attributed to the Honourable Member for Roblin are the remarks that were made by myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. On Thursday of last week I asked him about a news report in which one of the judges in Manitoba had censured the Department of the Attorney-General for conduct entirely contrary to the principles of Canadian justice. My honourable friend said that the matter was under study, that they had obtained a transcript in the department and he would have a report to make shortly. Is he in a position now to inform the House on this most serious charge?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to have some information on that matter today. It is not yet available; possibly it will be here tomorrow. There were other transcripts that had to be obtained.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the First Minister a question. Have the MMS or MMA made any representation to the First Minister with regard to any specific proposals that they might have in mind?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, many of the discussions that have been held with MMS have been related to proposals. That's a very indefinite type of question that I think can not bring a very definite reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. Can the First Minister tell us, if the word "proposal" is too vague, can he tell us whether they have come up with any conclusive proposals or has he come to any conclusions based on those proposals?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if that subject has not been reasonably well discussed. The First Minister would appear to me to have been rather emphatic in his earlier replies and I wonder if it would be to any advantage to pursue it any further.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by Your Honour, may I respectfully suggest that this is one of the most important issues before the people of Manitoba and I would suggest that any member, in all deference to Your Honour, that any member of this Assembly has the right to ask of the First Minister or the Minister of Health or any other Minister of the Crown any question pertaining to this most important matter. . .

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

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and I suggest that my honourable friend is quite within his rights -- (Interjection) -- the order? I was standing on a point of order and I reject the interference of my honourable friend the House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party would not take away from me my position and responsibility to adjudicate to the best of my ability.

MR. PAULLEY: With all due respect, Your Honour, may I respectfully suggest to you that the members of this Assembly also have a responsibility and my honourable colleague from Seven Oaks was only fulfilling that responsibility.

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

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if I might

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I am quite prepared to call the honourable members as and when it is necessary, and no one else in the House. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks may take the floor.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the First Minister tell this House what was the last proposal that he received from MMS or MMA?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker, I won't.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister. On April 1, I had an Order No. 29 with respect to the travels of Cabinet Ministers in Manitoba for the past year accepted by the House. I wonder when I can expect the information in this order.

MR. WEIR: Soon, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the information has been tabulated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may address a question of the Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: You are at liberty to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health can indicate to the House when the last time he met with representatives of the Manitoba Medical Association or the Manitoba Medical Service respecting Medicare in Manitoba.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Oh, Mr. Speaker, that was a long time ago when we were formulating Bill 67 or 68.

MR. PAULLEY: I take it from my honourable friend the Honourable Minister of Health that he has not held consultations with the Manitoba Medical Service or the Manitoba Medical Association since March of last year? Is this a correct interpretation of the answer of my honourable friend? . . . Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable the Minister of Health is in a position to answer my question as to when he, as Minister responsible for health of Manitoba, had consultations with these two bodies?

MR. SPEAKER: It is also his privilege to retain his seat if he so desires.

MR. PAULLEY: Then may I ask another question of my honourable friend. Has my honourable friend the Minister of Health undertaken any consideration of meeting with the Manitoba Medical Society or the Manitoba Medical Service Association respecting Medicare in Manitoba?

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Yesterday I directed a question to him with respect to the Portage Home for Mental Defectives. Could he give me an answer today?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker the answer is no, and at the present time all of our mental hospitals are burying people in the municipal cemeteries.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I didn't hear the Minister's reply.

MR. WITNEY: The answer is no, and at the present time we are burying all of our people from the - those that we do have and we don't have very many, Mr. Speaker - from the mental facilities in the Province of Manitoba, we are burying them in municipal cemeteries.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . no burials in the private cemetery since the Minister's statement last November. Is that correct?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Treasury. Until recently, air compressors for farm use was tax exempt from the sales tax. I understand the regulations have been changed and they are now taxable. Is there a reason for this?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): I'll take notice of the question; I think it requires a considered reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Has any member of the Cabinet participated with you in discussions with the MMS and the MMA regarding Medicare services?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at various times.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question. Could the Honourable Minister indicate what Ministers of the Cabinet have been involved in these discussions?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I wonder if the First Minister would answer this question. Why hasn't one of them been the Minister of Health?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say one of them wasn't the Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health said he never met with them since last year when they prepared Bill 68.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to my respected friend the Minister of Health. On June 12th last, according to a propaganda sheet that I have before me, a six-man board was set up - seven-man, pardon me - to run the Manitoba Medical Service Insurance Corporation -- (Interjection) -- six? It says seven at the top. Were they on the payroll and did they receive a full year's pay in 1967 or a half-year's pay in 1967 in consideration of the date of the propaganda sheet, dated June 12th, which says the board was set up.

MR. LYON: On a point of order. That is really not a suitable question for Orders of the Day. It deals with a matter that requires some advice for the Minister from his department. His estimates are before the House and the question, if it's worthwhile at all, can be asked during supply.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the point of order? We have a board that has been named, set up, to do exactly this, to negotiate with the MMA and MMS, and I think that this question is — the point is we want to know who's negotiating. We want the people to be represented. This is what we want to know. It's a deep dark secret.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour whether he has consulted, along with the First Minister, into the problems of MMS and MMA and Medicare in Manitoba?

MR. LYON: On a point of order, my honourable friend is asking about meetings of sub-committees or groups of the Executive Council. It's really not a matter — he could go along the whole front bench and he may, but I suggest that the questions are all out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the Honourable the First Minister informed the House that negotiations had been taking place between himself and members of the Cabinet, together with MMS and MMA. I think that it is quite within the rules of the House for the Assembly to be informed as to who are undertaking these consultations and negotiations, and the Honourable the First Minister refused this information. If the only way that we can elicit this information is by asking each individual member of the front bench whether they are involved, I suggest that it is within the rules of the House, and I want to re-direct my question to the Honourable Doctor of Chiropractic, the Minister of Labour, as to whether or not he, in concert with the First Minister, have been conducting negotiations with MMS and MMA respecting Medicare in Manitoba and — (Interjection) -- the Minister of Labour can refuse to answer if he likes without any interjections from the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to advise the House that..

A MEMBER: That you were not?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House the appointment of Dr. Peter Duncan Currie as the Seventh Chancellor of the University of Manitoba. I'm sure he's well-known to most members of the House. He is a prominent investment executive and former Chairman of the School Board. He begins a three-year term as Chancellor on June 1st of this year. He succeeds Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman who will retire from that office on the 31st of May, at his request, the end of his present term after serving for nine years. I'm sure all members of the House join me in extending on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba our sincere thanks for leadership and service in university life in this province that is I'm sure, a precedent in this province. We're all sorry to see him step down at his own request after this lengthy service, and, I'm sure, happy and wish Dr. Currie the very best in the coming years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he tell us how soon we can expect a reply to an Order for Return made by the Honourable Member for St. John's and myself?

MR. SPIVAK: Shortly, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize I had so many friends.

MR. JOHNSON: Don't get carried away.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, last Friday I stated clearly that - as clearly as I could anyway - that I favoured the resolution and the amendment so there's no point in repeating this again. I would like to make it quite clear at this time though that I do not feel that the question of education, that is the school board should be tampered with or should be covered with this resolution. I think the matter of education should remain separate, divorced from the municipal services.

Now, I read -- with your permission, your co-operation, Mr. Speaker, last Friday I read my proposed sub-amendment so the members know what I have in mind. It might be better at this time if I were to say what I don't want, to eliminate some of the things that I feel I'm not after in this sub-amendment.

First of all, I want to make it quite clear that I'm not talking about the ordinary municipal services such as zoning, raising and collection of taxes, transit system, water sanitation, control of mosquitoes, garbage, fire and police protection, and what have you. I don't say that some of these things shouldn't be looked into, but this sub-amendment doesn't cover this. St. Boniface would have to take its chance like the rest of the municipalities in regards to this. I certainly don't intend to build a wall around St. Boniface - mind you we'd like to see a retaining wall between Provencher and Norwood Bridge - but this resolution doesn't cover this at all. I'm not after a little Quebec and I'm not preaching separatism. I'm not even after a little Vatican, and so I hope we will wait awhile before the anti-French or anti-Catholic elements start uniting to defeat this awful resolution.

I think that if the members of this House tried to understand what I want to accomplish, I think that they will soon realize that all of us here can live with this sub-amendment. I think that we will do more than live with it, I think that it will work towards the national unity, towards promoting national unity here in our country and in our province, and I can assure everyone that none of us will be committing political suicide by voting in favour of this resolution. This is something that we're a little afraid of. It seems that we were lax in these matters. When there are 99.9 percent of the people of Manitoba that want something, then we give leadership.

I remember not so long ago, a few years ago, introducing a resolution - in fact it was a Bill - recommending that French become a teaching language. I remember at the time that the then First Minister - who is not in his seat as usual this afternoon - did not speak on this, did not take part in the debate at all, although, as now, it was before an election and he was speaking in Quebec on these things, on national unity, but he did not take part in this at all. And I remember that the Minister of Education, the same Minister that we have now, did not take part in the debate at all. But after one of the parties decided to bring this as a platform of the party, well surprisingly there was no more political suicide. The government brought in this question of French as a teaching language and it passed 54 to 0 - 54 to 0 - and the year before this it was going to be political suicide. The then Premier, of course, used that motion to go to Quebec and to say that his main platform, if he was elected the federal leader of his country, was to work for national unity. This is good; so you can see how things change, Mr. Speaker. So I would suggest to the members that there is no more danger here at all, in fact there's probably less danger. I do hope that all the Leaders of the different parties will decide to make this a free vote.

I have read the resolution; I've told you what I don't want; and I guess some of you are getting impatient - some of the members are getting impatient I should say - maybe they would like to know what I want with this resolution. If the initial resolution is accepted, and the amendment and the sub-amendment, I would like to see a committee that would be set up to see exactly what would be needed to project this - I got my resolution (d) - the historic cultural and linguistic nature of St. Boniface and of Manitoba - and of Western Canada I should say. Now this committee would study the B and B Report, the recommendation of the B & B Report, which I hope somebody will do anyway, and bring in proper recommendations. This, to my way of looking at it, Mr. Speaker, would be the time to bring in this kind of legislation

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) and so on that would take into consideration the recommendation of the B & B Report, and I think that as long as this is achieved, if this historic cultural and linguistic nature of St. Boniface is protected, I think that we'd be on the right track.

Now if, as I said first of all, we passed the resolution and the amendment, well before going to the people of Manitoba with this referendum they would receive all the information and it would be taken for granted -- it would be assured that the recommendation of this committee would be accepted if the referendum carried. Now I feel that -- and of course if the referendum is not accepted and if only the motion is accepted, well then -- the government before bringing in legislation would study the recommendation of this committee.

For instance, I don't intend to start doing the work of this committee at this time but I think I would be wise to give you an example, to give you an idea of what I want. I would like to see St. Boniface remain as a city. Now before that scares anybody, because we've talked about total amalgamation, I would say that maybe the borders would remain where they are now of the city and this city would have very limited powers and responsibility, and the powers and responsibility will be all in the field of historic, cultural and linguistic nature. This is all that I'm asking for. I think that they would probably promote bilingualism and I think that it would, for certain things, keep the French names on the streets and maybe erect other bilingual signs and so on, to make a model of St. Boniface, a model that the rest of Manitoba and Canada can look to.

I think that St. Boniface should retain a Mayor, not certainly at the same salary that he receives now -- I don't care if he doesn't get any salary at all. One of the requirements would be for this Mayor to be bilingual and it would be more of an honorific ceremonial post, and when you have somebody, some visitors in this province, in this part of Canada, when we are dealing with matters such as this of culture, French culture, or that when we want to bring out the fact that Canada is a bilingual country and so on, and when we have these visitors come in to this, instead of having somebody that doesn't know the language we would have the Mayor of St. Boniface that would welcome them. I think that this is done, I understand -- I tried to get some information -- in a part of London. I think that the City of London, there's a part of London that is affected like this but I didn't have enough information to start explaining this or using this as an example.

But I want to make it quite clear that this post would be mostly an honorific post but it would deal, and certainly the duties and the power of the Mayor would be in the nature of promoting this biculturalism -- bilingualism, -- because I don't really believe in biculture, I believe in multicultural -- but to promote multicultural also.

I think that there should be a small council and that council would more or less do the work of a committee that would do this kind of work also. Then they would -- I think that this committee, as I said before, would be promoting national unity, bilingualism, and I think it would help the French-speaking people of Manitoba who certainly want to be fluent in English -- I'm sure of that, they've said that many times -- but they would like to keep their French language; they would like to improve it; they would like their children to speak correctly and they are worried of losing this.

I would say that probably the only thing that I can see in the department, in the services now, I could see that the Police Chief of St. Boniface probably could be designated as one of the deputy chiefs. I certainly would recommend that if this was done fairly soon, if we go ahead with total amalgamation, that we keep the same chief, but in the future there again one of the requirements would be that this person be bilingual, though I can't see anything in any of the other services.

Now I hesitate -- I don't want to say that St. Boniface has become the capital of French Canada because then you might believe that I'm talking about special status, that I'm talking about separatism and so on, and this is not what I want at all. But it would become the centre of French, or the French centre, not only of Manitoba but of all western Canada, and I think that certainly the other ethnic groups, all of them, would be welcome, they would live the same way in harmony as they've been doing in St. Boniface now, and I think that probably the City of St. Boniface has more different groups represented in the city than any other section of Manitoba. We have a Ukrainian group, a Polish group, Belgian, we have French, we have English, we have Jewish people, we have everything and they live and work together in harmony.

I think that this would be a good thing, not only protecting something but it would be

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) creative. I think that we're finally doing away with a lot of this prejudice and I think that we would be developing what we want for Canada. I'm sure that there would be — St. Boniface, as such, there would be no clash with the other municipalities. It would be governed, as I say, in all the services that they receive the same as any other municipalities, but that area and this aspect of Manitoba life would certainly live as a model for the rest of Canada, and I think that this is important.

I think that we have the chance to remind the Province of Quebec, the Province of Ontario and also the separatists, all the separatists from one side or the other, that it is possible to remain united — united, even if you don't keep everything uniform. I think that the people of Canada have matured and I think that they realize that we don't want separation, but something has to be done to recognize the rights of all the people of Manitoba. So these few words, Mr. Speaker, I hope will give you an idea of what I want. I don't intend to solve all the problems right now, but I think that a committee could very well do that and could come in with a recommendation acceptable to all the members of this House.

And with this few words of explanation, Sir, I would like to move, seconded by the honourable member for Assiniboia, that the motion be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: "And Be it Further Resolved that in the process of amalgamation, specific provision be made in keeping with the principles of Canadian unity for the protection of the historic, cultural and linguistic nature of St. Boniface."

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, I am wondering whether Your Honor would not consider whether or not this amendment to the amendment is in order at this time since it brings in other matter unrelated to the amendment itself. I suggest that possibly it ought to be brought after the present amendment either passes or fails, because it's a different subject matter and it may be difficult for someone to vote for this amendment to the amendment if the original amendment is not satisfactory.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on this same point of order, I look at it the other way, that this is the only way, with this protection, this is the only way that I could support the amendment and the resolution. I feel that it is completely in order and I think that it has to come now, because I certainly would be guided and a lot of other people I imagine would have to be guided by the way this sub-amendment is accepted or rejected. If it's accepted, I can go for the motion and the amendment; if not, I'd have no alternative but to vote against it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I respectfully suggest that you take a look at the amendment — or the sub-amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, bearing and note Page 116(9), Annotation 202 as contained in Beauchesne.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, there's no objection of course if you wish to take the matter under consideration, but I believe that the amendment is in order. It follows I think logically on the sub-amendment — or the amendment that was already proposed, and I think that the sub-amendment follows along in sequence and from my checking it it seems to me to be in order. However, I leave that to your good judgment.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I want to give you some further food for thought. Let us assume that I was in favor of my honourable friend's sub-amendment with regard to St. Boniface but was not in favor of the referendum. By passing the sub-amendment I could only vote on the amendment as amended, which would then put me in a position of voting against the sub-amendment because it amends the question of referendum. I think that the point that the Honourable Member for St. John's is making does not preclude the member for St. Boniface from rejecting the entire proposal if his sub-amendment is not included, but does it have to be included as part of the question of referendum. The way it is now put in it would appear that way.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if I may clarify this again on a point of order. It certainly isn't my intention on something such as this especially to try to trap anybody, and this is why I said in my speech that if the amendment, that is the amendment of my Leader is accepted, the people before voting would certainly have to know all this; and if it isn't, if the motion is accepted but not the amendment, well then the government would just take this into consideration when they would bring in legislation, because I feel that I would be the same way, I can not — I can accept both. I can understand and I think it would be easy for the people that believe such as the last speaker that if he wants to favor this, that he thinks he should but he definitely is against the referendum, I don't think that. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I acknowledge the several opinions, and in view of the remarks that

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) have been made, it seems to me that I would be well advised to take this matter under advisement which I intend to do, and will report at the next appearance of the Order Paper.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, before we leave this question, would the Honourable Member from St. Boniface permit a question? Does the Honourable Member for St. Boniface propose that this St. Boniface council that he suggests would have the power to make any laws?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I tried to explain that. First of all, as I say, I don't intend to make the rules now, but I think that they would have powers as far as protecting the linguistic and the culture. This would be the main thing I think in regards to this, which would concern them and the French people only. I think that if they want to pass a law that they will change the name of a street and put a name of Louis Riel or anything like this, definitely I think they should have the right, but nothing else; no rights about financial matters or about any other services, and I went through all the services. This amendment is a principle. You can understand — I mean it's not up to me to make the laws. I'm sure that this amendment could be supported and still that you make sure that they'd be protected, that this council doesn't bring in any legislation or any laws as far as any municipal services are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virden and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland in amendment thereto standing in my name. I'd like to advise the House that I have considered the amendment of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I have noticed that it is in long hand and it lacks the normal terminology in its opening phases. This I am prepared to overlook, and go on to say that the substance of the amendment to the main motion is in my opinion acceptable and therefore in order.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would now like to say a few words in support of the motion because I think under our rules if I do not speak at this particular time we are not able to close debate on amendments, and therefore I take the opportunity of presenting some facts in support of the amendment as is proposed.

MR. LYON: because my memory is certainly not accurate on this point, as to whether or not my honourable friend did in fact speak before he presented the amendment or not. I really don't recall.

MR. FROESE: I spoke on the main motion before I presented the amendment.

MR. LYON: Well that being the case, I'm afraid my honourable friend would be debarred from speaking on the amendment, if — I have no recollection on the matter. I would have to refer to Your Honor.

MR. SPEAKER: That matter that the Honourable Leader of the House brought forward, it is my feelings that the honourable gentleman spoke to the main motion, and having completed his remarks he moved an amendment which I took under advisement and he never had an opportunity to follow up in that regard.

I am informed that it is true that the honourable gentleman did speak to the main motion, and that having presented his amendment, in doing so he is considered to have spoken. The amendment of course is before the House for other members to speak to if they so desire before I put the question. The Honourable Member for Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to just speak as usual very briefly on this amendment. I want to point out at the beginning that basically I agree with it. I think that the agricultural situation as it stands today, particularly in western Canada and in Manitoba, is in a most grave situation. We have had — fortunately enough last year we were blessed with a very good crop, which a great majority of it is still in the bins. The farmers are faced this spring with the operation of putting in a new crop which is very costly, particularly with fertilizer, and this is one of the points that many people are undecided. They've been unable to make up their mind whether they should spend more money for fertilizer to grow more grain, to build more granaries to store it.

I would like to point out that in many cases they have had to borrow money, go to the bank to borrow money in order to put this crop in the ground. They have a long summer's work ahead of them; this is very expensive; and the outlook I must say right now is extremely bright for another very successful crop this fall. In the area that I represent, I would think that it would be fair to say that at least half the wheat is in the ground now, and last year very

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd.) little work had begun at this time of the season.

So with the cost-price squeeze that the farmers are having this is bad enough, but the greatest worry facing the farmer today is is he going to be able to sell the produce that he's going to be able to grow? I would like to beg the Minister of Agriculture - if I may use those terms, it's not often I beg anybody - but I would like to see this resolution go to committee. I can't understand why the government, with the numbers of agricultural representatives they have, why they have turned down at least one or two amendments; why they will not let this go to committee; because I am sure that if it went to the Agricultural Committee we could have representatives here from the Farmers' Union, the MFAC, the United Grain Growers, the Manitoba Pool, the Wheat Board, and this thing could be aired. It's very important, and I really am an optimist in the agriculture world, because I believe that right now we are going through a trying situation, this is right, there's always been ups and downs in agriculture, but surely with half the world reportedly starving to death, grain, or the selling of grain, or enough money for farmers to operate should be the least of our worries.

I have one more suggestion to put forward. I'm not bringing in an amendment, but I'm going to suggest - and I would like to see this come to the Agricultural Committee. If in the fall there is another good crop and we have to look forward to this, what is the farmer today going to do if he is unable to market his grain? I have a suggestion that I have put forward before at one or two organizations. I would like to see a farmer, when he has completed his harvesting, be able to go to the elevator agents of his choice and say, I have 10,000 bushels of wheat - we'll use the figure of 10,000 bushels of wheat - I would like him to be able to sell at least somewhere between 50 and 75 percent of his crop to the Wheat Board right there and then, be able to get his money, be able to go back and pay his taxes, pay his fuel bill, all his expenses, so he would be able to sleep at nights and not be worrying about the next morning who was going to be the first man out trying to collect the money from him. This, to me, would be an extremely fair way. Some people will say, "Oh, but where's all the money going to come, where's all the money going to come from?" Well, if we go and build a lot of inland storage, this is going to cost a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, there is no argument at all that both the provincial governments and the federal governments are going to have to take a very very close look at this this fall unless something unforeseen turns up. So I request the Minister of Agriculture to please let this resolution, or some other amendment if it comes up, so that this particular thing can get to the floor of the Agricultural Committee.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly enter the debate on this resolution at this point perhaps to draw to the attention of the honourable members of the House that there have been some very good ideas come forward, that the resolution as presented by my colleague the Honourable Member from Virden, as it stands, seemed to generate in this House, and I can't really find a great deal of fault with many of the recommendations or the amendments thereto that have been attached to it.

I question the advisability of attaching it to this particular resolution. If we're to deal with the present amendment by the Honourable Member from Rhineland having to do with the construction of storage facilities, inland terminals, and so forth, a great deal of consideration has to precede this development. There has to be a pretty dramatic change in our transportation system that will make the economics of moving grain in larger volumes than we now presently handle. We talked in terms of tanker cars in our railway system to make the movement of wheat and grains possible from large terminals, prairie-centered elevators. At this particular point, this kind of development is still on the horizon. It's very difficult for us to deny the validity of some of the sentiments expressed in this amendment and I don't propose to do so. I can't help but remind the honourable member though that I have still some difficulty in reconciling with my own mind the storage capability and the sales capability as necessarily, you know, of bringing about an improved economic situation in terms of our grain crop.

But I'd like to come back to the main resolution as put by the Honourable Member from Virden. What he has expressed in this resolution - the Honourable Member for Virden - is simply a clear and worthwhile thought that the farmer is constantly being told by own people in the Department of Agriculture as well as other people in our society that he has to become more businesslike and he has to operate his farm in a businesslike way in order to get the best economic benefits from his farming venture. We know that particularly in these current years he is very often dealing with large amounts of outside capital, credit and what have you. He is

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) very often faced - when he is making arrangements for the use of capital or credit to meet specific deadlines and dates, the financial or business community expects payments to be made on specific dates and the sentiment behind the Honourable Member for Virden's resolution here is simply that it is then not in order that the farmer also have a firm date as to the payments received for goods that he's sold.

We're quite aware - we listened with interest to the fact that under the present arrangement, the pooling arrangement, as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell pointed out, these can vary. We have ourselves made investigations and contacts, as I know other members have, with members of the Wheat Board and the Board of Grain Commissioners who have indicated to us that at this particular time it may not be quite feasible for them to do so, although it's interesting to note that none of them indicated to us that it was impossible for them to do so.

It's a question that I raised earlier in some of the debates in this House when I questioned whether or not the Wheat Board or the Grain Commissioners haven't to some extent - and I qualify that very much though - to some extent not always taken the primary producer's, the farmer's consideration uppermost or foremost in their dealings. It may be very convenient in the matter and the way the grain trade is handling the grain to do it this way and they may point out to us at subsequent hearings, to which we would have to agree, that it is to our interests as well that this is not possible. I find nothing wrong with supporting the resolution as put forward by the Member for Virden, that is, that it would be in the interests of the farmers of Manitoba to have a fixed and firm date for their final payments on their grains already sold and delivered.

Now the different members have suggested that the whole question of grain and the problems that we're facing with the outlook for grain should be ventilated and aired at the Agricultural Committee. Again I certainly agree with him. I would suggest to him, and to all other members, that I would hope, or I would think the prerogative of the Agricultural Committee is to call upon these honourable gentlemen, these learned gentlemen in the grain trade, at any time to come to us, to explain to us certain areas of operations. I would think that a Committee of this House, Mr. Speaker, certainly would command that respect, that if we as a committee decided to ask members of the Wheat Board or members of the Grain Commissioners to speak to us, to explain to us different phases of the operations, to examine with us some of the problems as we see them as legislators and as they see them as administrators, this is in no way a problem to me. I think that this is something that we should do. I don't necessarily see it hindering or necessarily see it having to be attached to this particular resolution.

I think the honourable members opposite probably recognize that my astute colleague from Virden has touched on a sentiment that farmers of Manitoba are very much aware of. He has expressed it very capably in the form of this resolution and I think that we've really probably exhausted the subject. I would ask the honourable members to support the resolution as it stands, and indicate to the farmers of Manitoba that this would in fact be a desirable thing, that is that the farmers should have a firm date for their payments, and allow and ask the members of the Wheat Board or the members of the Grain Commissioners to come to us at committee, or otherwise, and tell us why this cannot be done.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question. What is your position in respect of the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my position with respect to the Honourable Member from Rhineland's amendment is that if he wishes to make this a resolution of his own, I would suggest that he do so. It is muddying up the water of this particular resolution, I suggest.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, apart from muddying up, I would still like to know what my honourable friend's position is on the amendment because that is the motion that is before the House at the present time.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against it for the reasons already stated. I want to support the Honourable Member for Virden's main resolution.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Doesn't he feel that just by supporting the main motion that this is still restricting? This would enable the farmers to deliver more grain and thus enable them to sell it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I feel that in the proposing of these resolutions, and particularly those that come from government side of the House, that we have to be cognizant with the dollars that attach to them. I feel that before I will support a resolution calling for the

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) building of inland terminals, of which I know very little of at this particular time; before I support the resolution which would call for a massive movement of a completely different kind of grain from the prairies to our seaports, which I still don't know enough about, we have transportation studies that are involved here; before I have some assurances from the railway companies that they are prepared to move into this area of super tanker grain carriers or what have you; these are the kind of things that I would want to know about supporting a resolution that would call for what I see considerable financial outlay in the building of terminal elevators, large terminal storage facilities here on the prairies.

I'd be quite prepared to debate these particular issues and look into it, and perhaps support it on its individual merit if it was presented in that way. I don't see that its attachment to the main resolution has any particular bearing though. We're suggesting in the main amendment that this is something that can be done, can be looked at right now without any great input of new programs, without any great expenditures of new tax dollars which are pretty scarce, pretty hard to find these days. This is a pure and simple request of those who administrate our wheat sales, or who administrate our grain marketings, whether or not they cannot re-examine their position with respect to the manner in which payments are made so as to facilitate the farmer in attempting to help him organize his financial house in better order, and this could be done if this resolution was supported.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to clarify some things in the motion that he is completely misinterpreting in my opinion. The motion as it reads certainly just — (Interjection) — Well he claims that — (Interjection) — I never spoke on the amendment. He thinks that this involves large terminals. I'm not speaking of terminals at all; I'm speaking of inland storage only, a very cheap storage for that matter, and save the farmers a lot of money. Certainly just a roof and a slab floor doesn't mean large expenses for the Canadian Government, or if the Manitoba Government so desire to step in it would be a very small expense. This in turn would enable farmers to make deliveries and therefore get the cash, the necessary cash in their hands so that they could pay their bills, and in turn it would save them interest costs which they all have to contend with.

MR. LYON: I wonder if I could interrupt my honourable friend to ask whether he is speaking on a point of order or what, because I thought we had already had a ruling from the Chair that unfortunately prohibits him from speaking on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable gentleman intended to say that he was speaking on a point of privilege. With that thought in mind, I anticipated that he would probably be questioning the remarks of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, but thus far he doesn't seem to be doing that. I wondered if he had that in mind.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, this was my — I didn't get to my question because he interprets this as building costly storage facilities and this is not what I had in mind. I would think that we should provide cheap storage, and can this not be done?

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to point out that the Minister of Agriculture spoke for ten minutes and he never had anything to do with the amendment at all. He spoke about the main motion, and I think the honourable member should have a word to say here.

MR. SPEAKER: I think he probably attempted the same habit of many speakers that he did mention the amendment from time to time, or at least I heard him say so, whether he spoke to it or not. However, we are now at the point of putting the question. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): I was unavoidably out of the House for a moment or two, and do I understand that the amendment to this motion was ruled out of order? -- (Interjection) -- In order. Well, I would like to speak to the amendment.

We have had the farmers of Manitoba, that I am speaking of, who spent a good many thousand dollars in creating storage of their own, and I'm thinking of the Manitoba Pool Elevators Association. They have built storage of the best. I am also thinking of the United Grain Growers who have built storage of the best. And when you mention the Wheat Board, Grain Commissioners, they want a certain type of wheat or grain that they can move at a certain time, and I understand that there is time and the farmers are notified of what types of grain they'll be required to deliver through the quota system, and to ask the farmers to go out and spend more money for the type of storage that the Honourable Member from Rhineland asks for, I think the loss would be very great.

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd.)

In my experience we have seen grain that has been stored that way where some animal, birds or such like, will get on top of a pile of grain and there's a big loss to it. I feel this way, that I would have to vote against the amendment on account of the money that the farmers of Manitoba have put in to create their own storage, and if I understand the situation the way it should be understood, that they're satisfied fairly well with the storage facilities that they have in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we have here before us a resolution by the Honourable Member for St. James and it suggests that municipal councils be encouraged to give leadership and direction in this essential service to the public. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that's putting the cart before the horse. Here we have people that have been doing this work, and I know in my own constituency that we have gone and assessed ourselves one mill expressly for this purpose. I know that we have people in there continually on a voluntary basis doing the work with limited funds. They go from door to door trying to solicit memberships and participation, and we are saying, "Let's get them and encourage them." Well they are already doing it; they don't need the encouraging. They need help in another manner, Mr. Speaker, and this resolution, in my estimation, is just a little too vague.

Mr. Speaker, last year in this Chamber we had a request by the City of Winnipeg for a Charter amendment so that it would make it possible for them to have joint development of existing facilities with the School Board and with the community centres so that more recreational facilities could be utilized and in a more efficient manner. That government, of which the Member for St. James is a member, turned that down; and now he comes in here with a resolution that we should help and make these people and encourage them. Well, I don't think that we are doing it by just giving them a pat on the back and tying their hands behind their backs. This is not the kind of thing that will move the recreational into a more enjoyable atmosphere in the municipalities, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that in most of the community centres and in the recreational areas that are necessary, they have cookie drives, they have bottle drives, paper drives, all kinds of voluntary work. They organize recreational facilities, the likes of which would astonish most of the members. There is everything from bingo to square dancing, to hockey, to baseball, to lacrosse. All of these things are being done on a voluntary basis today and now we are saying "Let's encourage them". I think this is kind of slapping them in the face. What they need is a little assistance, and the provincial government could provide this by allocating a little bit of resources, because the municipalities at the present time are just not in the position to tax their members any more. As I said, on a voluntary basis, on a referendum basis they have agreed in many of the municipalities already to contribute towards community centres and towards recreational establishments.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that we amend this resolution and put it in its right perspective, and the amendment is that the resolution be amended by deleting the words "encouraged to give" in the penultimate line thereof and substituting therefore the words "commended for giving". And then the resolution would read, Mr. Speaker: Therefore Be It Resolved that Municipal Councils be commended for giving leadership and direction in this essential service to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before you put the question, I'd like to make a comment or two. What started out to be a relatively simple resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for St. James has been given a great deal of attention by the House. I'm sure that my honourable friend the Member for St. James did want to recognize that within our municipal councils, and indeed other bodies, a considerable degree of activity is taking place in the area of recreation. I've listened with a great deal of interest to my honourable

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) friend, and while there had been one or two previous amendments suggested which would give strength to his contention, the same were rejected of course in the due process of democracy. I think now that my honourable friend the Member for St. James is in a position where he can subscribe to and support his amended resolution, because it does give to the municipal councils commendation for the job that they have endeavoured to do in the field of recreation and the co-ordination of recreational facilities.

In essence now, the proposition that members of the House have to consider is whether the Honourable Member for St. James will say to his municipal council of his great City of St. James, "Thank you, Mr. Mayor and council for the good job that you are doing; we compliment you and commend you for the job that you have done, for the leadership and the direction that you have given to your community." This is slightly different, I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the original motion which said simply, "We give encouragement" - of course during the process of debate we considered that encouragement was there - now we say, "We commend you for what you have done; we commend you for the leadership that you are giving."

I think that my honourable friend the Member for St. James will join with us in this corner of the House in saying to Mayor Bill Hanks and the Council of St. James; to Mayor Harry Fuller and the Council of Transcona; Mayor Saul Miller and the Council for West Kildonan, etc, and say, "Thank you boys, thank you very much boys. We commend you for the job that you are doing; we commend you for the leadership that you are giving, and are giving, to your community." I'm sure that the Member for St. James will be prepared to accept the amendment as proposed by my colleague from Kildonan and give this motion, as amended, the unanimous consent of this Assembly to those municipal corporations which are the creation of this Assembly.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party for his kind words, which are absolutely true. It is a good work. As I explained originally, it is the good work that the St. James Council and their various community enterprises have done, and the methods they've used to achieve what they have done, that really gave me the thought of bringing in this resolution. As I pointed out at that time, they have a good organization working there. They're on the road, I think, to where we should be, and I would like to see more municipalities on that same road. This was the purpose for which I brought in the resolution in the first place, that it is working very well.

As the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party stated, I could not of course oppose such an amendment because it's true, but I would still like to see a great improvement everywhere, including St. James, because I think it's becoming so important in our community today. So I support it, but I also support the resolution originally because I want to see more progress, not in condemnation of what is being done, thank those, congratulate those for what they have done, but let us continue to improve it, because as the years go by it becomes more and more important to our society.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that even without discussing this with the members of our party we certainly will support this amendment. There is no doubt that the New Democratic Party are having a little bit of fun at the expense of the Member from St. James but I think that he deserves it. When there's so much to be done and a member of the government comes in with a frivolous motion such as this, the original motion - they have so many things to do - and if the Member from St. James wanted to say what he just finished saying, that he thinks that we should always improve, that we should keep on going, he should have -- well, first of all I say that there was certainly no reason for a resolution on this. This could have been discussed in the estimates. There's so many other things that we can talk about - or at least when he saw that we didn't go for the bait in his original motion and when he said that he wants to see improvement, all he had to do was support the original amendment because that was real improvement - real improvement. Now, if it's just window dressing that he wants, he's caught now. He can not say to his municipality "you're not doing the work," and this is what he was doing with the original motion.

So maybe we will have a vote now and finish this once and for all. I know it must be awful for the backbenchers in the government side to just follow, especially when they get so little - well so much lack of leadership, I could say, from their elders in the front bench. It must be quite difficult, and I think that they would like to express their views once in a while. But they can in many instances. They can on the question of Medicare and they can on a lot of

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... other things. But nevertheless, I think we've lost enough time on this. We certainly will support it and I hope that we'll end this once and for all, the member will learn his lesson, and everybody will be happy.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

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

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

MR. LYON: There were no nays.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as Leader of my group, I can call for a vote at any time I so desire. I desire a vote on the amendment as proposed by my colleague from Kildonan.

MR. LYON: We just heard something, Mr. Speaker - on the point of order - about frivolous matters. I'm sure my honourable friend well realizes that ...

MR. PAULLEY: There is nobody that is more frivolous in this House than the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: You'll live to eat that.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir and Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't think that was necessary, but however I see one vacant chair. Those opposed please say nay.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 54; Nays, nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried. Are you ready for the question on the main motion as amended?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, may I request the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution as so presented by the Honourable Member for Gladstone is an excellent one and we are supporting it in this group. We feel that there are so many inconsistencies in the present structure of what is taxable and what is not that there should be such a committee constituted so that the public may appear as suggested in this resolution.

I have some examples. The first one I would like to discuss is the fact that we have coin-op car washes. If one investigates, you may purchase a coin-op portable washing machine and there is no tax involved. The coin collector only takes 25-cent pieces, so there is no tax involved there as well. Now it was my understanding that if a piece of machinery is purchased to produce a tax, that there was no tax to the public; but if a piece of machinery was not taxable, therefore the money it would produce would be taxable. So I'm a little confused in this and I'm sure that many of the people that are in the business are wondering what is going on too. If you realize that in most instances it's almost impossible to wash a car for a 25-cent piece, one must place the extra quarter at least, therefore this is 50 cents in one operation yet we have no tax on it.

And then many of these same operations have a dispenser for towels. I think the charge is 10 cents for a package of towels with three in it. There's no tax on this of course because it's a 10-cent purchase, but yet on the other hand the machine is taxable and so are the towels. So you can understand that there is some confusion in this area and I am sure that a committee so suggested by the Honourable Member for Gladstone might make some sense out of this particular area.

And then we have carpenters and mechanics. They purchase tools to do a job either on a home or to make repairs on automobiles, etc. Their services are taxed. Therefore, according to the Act these tools that these people purchase should not be taxed. So there's no

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.)... consistency once again.

And then we go into the business of sealers, which practically everyone that is trying to save some money, and particularly the people that are on farms and have the opportunity to have gardens, they must purchase these sealers for their preserves. These sealers are tax-able; yet on the other hand if you go out and buy the produce already packaged in a sealer there's no tax on the sealer nor is there any tax on the produce, which of course is proper, there should not be any tax on food. But the point I'm trying to make here is that this is one of the essentials on most low income families that they do a lot of preserving to save money, therefore I feel that this should be looked into. The same goes with the farm people that the sealers are taxable and that in all probability they shouldn't be. And then when one has children and is purchasing scribbled and writing pads and crayons and water colors, you find that these items for school children are taxable and it's an extra expense to any parents that have children attending school. Yet on the other hand you can go into any newsstand and buy a comic book for 10 cents or 15 cents, or whatever the cost may be, and there's no tax. There's no tax, not because it's only a 15-cent item, it's because books are not taxable, and of course we have many questionable books that are on the newsstands and these are not taxable as well. So there's no consistency there as well, insomuch as we might say that part of the necessary items for school children are taxable, yet on the other hand the things that are unnecessary such as the comic books are not taxable.

And then we have so many service charges which were instituted. I recall reading the Honourable Provincial Treasurer's opinions on the Carter Report, and in his opinion, I gathered from the little pamphlet that he put out, that he was opposed to many things in the Carter Report; yet on the other hand, anything that he thought was good to increase revenue for the province he adopted from the Carter Commission, and of course this was the service charges. We have car repairs, dry cleaning, and most of these are necessities of life nowadays which affects all income groups and in particular the low income group. This situation should be reassessed as well. It's an unfair tax, and of course you could almost say it's an oppressive tax.

We have the grain storage bins which are a necessity for our farm people. When we went through the Sales Tax Bill last year we were told that anything that was essential to a farmer would not be taxed, and of course the grain bins we have found out since are taxed and of course this increases the farmers' costs and adds to more trouble and expense.

Then when we go into building material, we find that this situation could most certainly be reassessed. If one wants to buy some material for a farm item, if you're going to build a hog trough or a well, you can go to one lumber yard and they say it's not taxable because it's for the farm; you walk up the street in the next block and you'll find that the other chap is taxing this particular material. More inconsistency again.

I feel that in building materials that this government should encourage our young people who are married to purchase homes, and this could easily be done by exempting them from the five percent income tax -- this is not income tax, pardon me, it is sales tax. On a new home this could save up to three to five hundred dollars for young people. The same could apply to many of our older people too who are trying to purchase a home. I think that the government could also encourage the Federal Government to do the same on the 12 percent sales tax.

All in all, there are many examples and I've touched briefly on some of them, only to try and show those on the other side that the resolution as suggested by the member for Gladstone is an excellent one and should most certainly receive support from all members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand today.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

May 7, 1968

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have followed with great interest the debate of this particular resolution which was proposed by the Honourable Member from Inkster and amended by the Honourable Member from Kildonan, and I find it very difficult to associate my feelings with the amendment, especially the last six or seven words of the amendment wherein he says: "as they in their discretion deem advisable."

May I refer, Mr. Speaker, to an article from Time Magazine, the issue of April 19th on newscasting. The article says in the aftermath: "Despite incidents of sensationalism, inaccuracies and distortion, newspapers, radio and television on the whole make a real effort to give a balanced factual account of the 1967 disorders. Despite this effort, the overall effect was, we believe, an exaggeration of both mood and intent. The President's Commission on Civil Disorders." The remark in the article goes on, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say: "This back-handed slap coming just a few weeks before the assassination of Martin Luther King was a sharp reminder of television's great and grave responsibility in times of national crisis. Thus when the explosive news event occurred, TV's mood and intent were one - cool it."

I think, Mr. Speaker that this House is well served by the medium of the press, by the medium of radio and by the medium of television. This morning I picked up the Globe and Mail in the St. Regis and noticed the Prime Minister of Canada, this exciting man Trudeau, his remarks where he spoke to the broadcasters in Montreal, on I believe Monday night, and I'll quote you some of his remarks, Mr. Speaker, wherein he says, "On televising Parliament"; he said "too extensive exposure might encourage oratory at the expense of constructive discussions of legislation." To his mind, the most popular orators are among the least useful members; conversely, many conscientious and effective members are not brilliant orators. There is a widespread impression that in the House of Commons is a continuous show and that the members are paid to be entertaining. In fact, much of the business of a Legislature is necessarily routine and often tedious. Would such coverage be to the advantage of the House or to the television spectators? He goes on to say, "To sustain spectator interests, the taped record of debates would probably have to be edited. The editor, no matter how impartial, would wield considerable political power and undoubtedly many members in all parties would feel that the editor was dealing unfairly with them."

May I deal briefly with some of the problems that I as a back bencher and a new MLA would experience if we were exposed to the medium of television in this room, and I think being a newcomer in the Assembly I could associate myself with many of the viewers who would be viewing the proceedings of the Assembly. The first thing that would be drawn to my attention, Mr. Speaker, would be some of the dry speeches, that come across in this particular room, speeches where I here in my short term I think I've heard some ten times from the same members, old speeches, some of the things that have been repeated many times over, that I think to the viewing public or to the listening public would be very hard to give the correct image of our Assembly as it performs the business of this province.

I recall the incident of the other afternoon where the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party rose and adjourned the House due to the absence of certain members. Were a television camera to view that particular scene and then come back and review the scene some 25 minutes later, he would have seen that on the bench over there, there was only two members there 25 minutes after that resolution was --(Interjection)-- only two were on the bench -- (Interjection)-- on the front bench at the moment that I looked over there were none, on the second bench there were none, and on the back bench there were two. One incident, one minute, and it changed completely. How would the television camera analyze that and bring the message back to the people that were viewing. Or would the television camera explain the absence of the members of the New Democratic Party, because at that particular moment if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. Speaker, we were reviewing the estimates of the Treasury Department, one of the more important departments of government --(Interjection)-- about Duff? Well, I'll come to that.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, another incident of television which to me I think gave the viewers of that particular day a chance to see democracy at work on the television screen, and may I refer to the debate of that day, a black day when the Arab and the Israel problem was on the screens I think of everybody's television around the world, and many parts of that particular debate appeared to me, Mr. Speaker, as a sort of a sporting event. Commentators who would come in and fill in when the show became sort of dull, and then all of a sudden you would get your interest in some particular event and the camera would shoot over and

(MR. McKenzie cont'd.)... take a look at somebody with a particular costume on, or some event that to me had no bearing whatsoever on the dramatic events that were taking place in that Assembly at that particular time.

And yet — yet, Mr. Speaker, in some commentator's mind, the cameraman in this particular case, events which he saw were more important to him than the ones that I saw. I was concerned about the problem that was trying to be settled by those around the table; he had other things in mind. And this in my personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, that intervention, that personal intervention destroyed in my mind the decision-making process which seemed very urgent at that particular dramatic moment in our history. That meeting televised around the world, in my mind, Mr. Speaker, it was impossible to reach a decision as long as the television screens were viewing the events of the day, because there is no way that I know of, Mr. Speaker, that either side could change the decision of his government while all the world was standing there or viewing him on the screen. The eyes of the world would brand anybody who backtracked on that particular day as a traitor to his people and to his government.

Let us briefly compare the television coverage of our Assembly with the coverage that we have from the press, or as the honourable member of the New Democratic Party described as the "fourth estate". May I say, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba, I think has a very fair, unbiased and good press. I like the feeling of my constituents where the articles that are wrote arrive in Roblin or Grandview or Gilbert Plains or those towns some 12 to 24 hours after the events take place in this particular room, and with the background of the events, Mr. Speaker, that are included in the newspaper articles, one does not have to be associated with the debates in this House possibly to know what is referred to in the article because the reporter gives a little background of his report and then fills in the proceedings of that particular day, and that to me, Mr. Speaker, is well accepted in my constituency.

It is also said, Mr. Speaker, that TV debates are said by some as those debates which can not be resolved. And this I think is where I should draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the problem of being misunderstood, which I think would be one of the real challenges of this particular room on television. I don't think there is a member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, who can stand up and make a speech and won't be misunderstood or misquoted through circumstances which are no fault of the individual who makes the statement or the one who writes it, and I'll cite you an example of a man of the cloth who spoke in my church last Sunday morning at great length on a subject, and I thought the sermon was an excellent presentation by this man. And when I came down to the door after the service was over to shake his hand and congratulate him, he said, "McKenzie, what did you get from the sermon?" And I went on in glowing terms and tried to describe the message that I got, and it was entirely different than he was trying to put across to me. This, Mr. Speaker, I think would be one of the real problems of television in this particular Assembly room.

And then let us move into the field, the problems, Mr. Speaker, that we would encounter with commercials. Could you imagine the Leader of the New Democratic Party last night when he was all fired up there, having to sit down for a "soap jingle"? Would the Honourable Member for Wellington have to take a breather for a beer commercial or a beer jingle? Could you imagine the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, all fired up, having to take a recess like they do now in the football games while they run a commercial or the referees blow a whistle or something? Could you imagine, Mr. Speaker, how television would take complete control of this House and take, I think, the Orders of the Day right out of your hands so that you would have no control over the proceedings of this House. —(Interjection)— Hallucinations.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that possibly there is room for experimentation in the field of electronic viewing. I think radio if — my experience and the only one I have that I can relate to, is the Province of Saskatchewan where they've had radio for many years, and I can't say that as I listened this past session that the quality of the debate has improved any over those years even though they've had that great background of experience in radio. I don't think radio will solve the problems of this province, Mr. Speaker, at a level such as I maybe could say improved the democratic process. I'm not here as an actor; I'm not here as an announcer; I'm not here as a commentator; I'm here to perform the duties as a legislator for Roblin constituency and to assist the government and the members opposite to make Manitoba a better place to live. And if television shows and radio shows have to be brought into this room so that they can expose the big guns of our Assembly, how many viewers or how much interest would we have in our Assembly? Could you imagine the housewife giving up her normal duties of the day,

(MR. McKenzie cont'd.)... her washing duties, to listen to me speak? Or some of the members opposite? I can't see it, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that any of our Manitobans would change their viewing habits in any shape or form to watch the proceedings of this Assembly. And in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we vote against this amendment and that we also vote against the resolution.

... Continued on next page.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a greater demonstration of misunderstanding that can arise even without television or radio but from a person who is directly in the House and people who have been here when the resolution was put and heard what was said, I haven't heard one. Because surely the honourable member who has just spoken has either misunderstood or he wasn't being serious in what he has just said. Nobody, nobody suggested that any television producer or company would be stupid enough to try to attract the attention of the public generally to the ongoing proceedings of this House, and I really, Mr. Speaker, dealt with that in putting this resolution and I thought that at least having done that, people would direct themselves to what the resolution said. Apparently members of the Liberal Party for some reason felt that possibly the wording could permit that type of interpretation, and though we didn't agree with it, we amended the resolution so that there would then be no question that this is not what was intended by the original resolution and we specifically excluded any type of interpretation in the amendment that we put.

Every single argument that was used by the honourable member who has just spoken could be used against the press generally. Isn't it a fact that the press can misinterpret what goes on in this Assembly? Isn't it a fact that the press can sometimes, as the honourable member has said (and I didn't say it) that they could sometimes convey a different atmosphere than that which should be conveyed. But if, Mr. Speaker, we believe in freedom of the press, and what is more important if we understand it - and I'm not sure that the honourable member does by what he has said - then we know that this is a very, very important part of the legislative process, and just as they can err members on the floor can err, members of the government can err, and all of those things are part and parcel of the ongoing process of democracy and the adding to the media of the press can't do anything to hurt that situation, it can only do something to help it.

Isn't it a fact that if there were only one newspaper that was reporting what was going on here, or still worse, let us assume that the only media that gave an ongoing account to citizens as to what occurs in the Assembly was the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce's media, the Information Branch, even the honourable member would agree that that would be the worst possible situation, that the news should be disseminated through a government agency and a government agency only. The honourable member would agree that if there were only one newspaper doing it that this would be at least a little better situation but it would not be the best situation. And we're never going to arrive at the best situation; all we can do is move towards a better situation. So the honourable member would agree then if one newspaper is better than his department doing it, then surely two newspapers insures or at least halves the opportunity - and I suggest to you more than halves it, because once you have one watching the other, both are trying to avoid the criticism of misinterpreting the news - that two newspapers is a better situation than one newspaper. And surely three would be better than two. And that's why we in this Assembly have at all times tried to give the greatest opportunity for the press to come in.

But that doesn't mean that the press can't misinterpret what was said, can't convey it in a light other than what was intended - and can't, by the way, Mr. Speaker, intersperse it with commercials. Because if you look at your daily newspaper you will see all the news interspersed with commercials, but the honourable member seriously suggests that what is intended in this resolution is that at let us say five minutes from now, I am to stop speaking and there is to be time for a television commercial, and I am to wait for that commercial to be over and then to start again. Is that what was conveyed to the honourable member? Because then I would suggest that he read the resolution again. All that was suggested is that the media who are not now able to do so be permitted to take their equipment into the Assembly, record such things as they wish to, edit it just with the same discretionary authority that it is now being edited by the press, and show whatever parts of it they see fit. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that that will be the best situation. Possibly the best situation would be for anybody who wants the news to appear continually in the galleries of the Assembly. That's what the galleries are for. But that's not going to happen. Not even the members are going to get the best situation because they won't be here continually in the Assembly. And by the way, I'm not suggesting that they have to be or that they are doing their job best if they are here every minute, because I know it's not so.

But we're not looking for a perfect situation; we're looking for a situation which is better than the one we have now, and the member surely will agree that if the dissemination of

(MR. GREEN cont'd) information to the public is done on a greater basis than it's presently being done, that can't do any harm; that can only help the legislative process; and any suggestion that this results in some sort of censorship or some sort of selection of what will be produced and what will not be produced, doesn't mean anything because that's what the media are doing now and that's what they have to do. They have to be selective. They can't regard every address as being of equal importance, and the honourable member knows that they can't, and the only way that we can make sure that at least there will be as broad as possible an interpretation of the news, is to permit as many media as are possible to make use of that news. And, Mr. Speaker, I've suggested that there are better ways of communicating information.

If television is a better way or if it's a different way which some people are attracted to rather than others, then television should be able to come in here and record what the honourable member has just said. They can if they want to - and I would think that this would be rare - they can announce that tomorrow at 3:00 o'clock they are going to broadcast live, although I don't think they would do so - but they can if they want to. And if somebody wants to watch it then he will. My inclination is to believe that from time to time they would record what is happening because it's important, or they would record parts of what is happening, or they would take film and show clips on the television news just as they now comment on what people have said. Surely a clip of what a person has said is a better way of communicating it than a comment on what a person has said. So when my honourable friend says that he's not here to be an actor and he's not here to entertain, I agree with him. But he's being watched all the time whether he likes it or not, and that is in fact one of the essential ingredients of the proper function of democracy - that the people who are ostensibly the people's representatives are continually being surveyed. And I know that the honourable member sometimes forgets that there are people in the gallery, but the gallery is there as a symbol of that, and as I said in my initial remarks, I merely want to say that the gallery will be extended to the extent that we are able to do so with modern equipment so that parts of the process that we are engaged in, as selected by the media themselves not as selected by the Minister of Industry and Commerce who now selects what he will give them and which people will be on the radio and what will be said and what will appear in the newspapers, but that part that they (that is, the Fourth Estate) feel that they would like to convey are conveyed in exactly the same manner as they are now conveying it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, either my honourable friend doesn't believe in freedom of the press, and I don't make that type of criticism because I think he does believe in it, but I suggest to him that he doesn't understand it, because if he understood it he couldn't, he couldn't possibly make the remarks that he has just made. And I'm not suggesting either, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba will judge their representatives by the appearances that may be conveyed to them through the media either of the press or of the television or of the radio. Legislators have different ways of making themselves felt. Some people's forte is to be able to help constituencies; it's to be able to deal with local problems; and those people will be able to gain whatever respect of the electorate that that type of service does, and may be elected time after time although they never make a speech in the House and I think the public will still elect them. Other people are able to serve their constituents by addressing the Assembly, and I think that the public is smart enough and objective enough to choose people on the basis of the work that they are doing and there are different ways of doing this work.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the inhibitions that various members seem to feel with regard to this resolution are totally unfounded. Nobody is going to try to entertain as a result of the media being forced on them. They don't do it now with the gallery. Or if they do, then there's not going to be any change. And if they do wish to play the game of being the fool, then I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's good that the public should see that that's what they're doing and next time they'll use their discretion to return somebody who won't do it.

The public is interested in serious and dignified representation and I don't think the advent of the media into this House which can convey in perhaps a different form how the representatives act, are going to change the public's good sense in that regard.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: I would like the honourable member to point out in what way the Department of Industry and Commerce prevents the media, whether it be TV, radio or newspaper,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) preventing them from speaking to any member in this House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, does my honourable friend say that I suggested that the department does that? Because I didn't. The honourable member came in a little bit late and I was addressing the Member for Roblin and I said, surely you wouldn't agree that the Department of Industry and Commerce should be the only one to disseminate information; that that wouldn't be a good situation. And then I suggested that the Department would then say what was in the papers, what was in the newspapers, what was on television, but that would not be a good situation. I don't suggest that the department is now doing that, but they're involved in that type of program. I would suggest that if the honourable member would perhaps read my speech and direct me to where I did say that, perhaps he can correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned if no one else wishes to speak.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): If you don't mind, I'd like to say a few -- (Interjection) -- First of all, I'm against it because I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would hog the screen. -- (Interjection) -- Well maybe we'd get cinemascope, Mr. Speaker. I think there are several things that come to mind in my respect, in my thinking. First of all, so you are going to get action-on-the-floor type of news, and I wonder if this would be fair in respect to newspapers who have to wait for 24 hours or twelve hours to produce the news. Now the Honourable Member for Inkster throws up his hands and he's greatly perturbed about this, but if he's going to be so fair then maybe he'd better think about it for a little while. Granted that you can go back and report the news on the hour during the day, but I think it's unfair in one respect to give one type of news media a jump on the others, but on the other hand I agree with him that if you look up in the balcony I just don't know what the average attendance is up there, but outside of the bureaucrats I believe there is approximately six or ten average per day, and out of a population of five or six hundred thousand, with many visitors in this community, I don't think there's too much interest in what is actually going on in this House. It is the legislation that comes out of this House and the reporting in the news media itself that people are interested in, but up to this time they certainly have not shown any interest in respect to coming down to listen to what we as politicians have to say from hour after hour, and I don't blame them. I don't blame them one bit nor does, I think, anybody else. They usually go away very discouraged and wondering just why elections take place from time to time, and I think that as we visit around to different provinces we find that it's not an exception in Manitoba. In fact, I might say that the one or two provinces I have visited, I find that this House has quite a bit more dignity than some of the others that I have visited.

The TV coverage, I can't see as how it really could be considered fair, because first of all it is not going to be able to cover all sides of the debate, and it is not going to stay with you for many hours during the day. When we debate an issue for two or three hours a day, when we're in estimates from 2:30 till 10:00 o'clock at night, then if the TV chose half an hour of that day to give live TV coverage, then it could have quite well picked the wrong period, or it could pick only one phase of the debate in those estimates. So, it would be in itself depicting the wrong story, or the wrong side, or just one side. The newspapers are usually sitting there most of the time; they indulge in coffee breaks just as the rest of us do; but they give what they feel is the fair side because they have listened to the whole story and then they make their decision as to what is right and what is wrong. They at least give an opportunity for rebuttal between parties so that they are giving both sides, but if you have half-hour or 20 minute coverage, then you're only going to be able to give one side of the TV.

And what does bother me, frankly, is of course the other side of it, that here in the House as we become veterans we get less hesitant in standing up and debating amongst ourselves, but you could find a reluctance, particularly in new members coming in, when they are for the first time in front of a camera before thousands of people. So maybe they would be reluctant in case they got on TV. Now, this is rather peculiar. I suppose all of us like to get on TV as much as possible but I don't think that it would really give any added coverage. How would it help? is what I'm concerned about. I think we're getting good coverage now. Certainly none of us agree with the press at all times; in fact we feel that they're wrong most of the time, probably in one respect or another, but that is one man's view, and this is the only point that I can come to agreement with on this Bill, is the fact that the general public would then be allowed to possibly have a better chance to come to some conclusion in respect to a debate because they would be allowed to make their own decision rather than one of the reporters making

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) a decision. I would agree on the strength of this point. I think it's a very strong one because sometimes I feel that in many respects people are liable to try to make news rather than to report news. But I can't see how we could do it on a half-hour basis a day. I think that in some way, shape or form, you would have to come to some agreement where the TV people would try to bring across to the public the real story that went on, not the small unimportant thing that was taken out of context and blown up and become a big issue.

So, I'm at a mind, I realize that there is the value of people seeing it for themselves and making their decisions, and granted, the shows that were put on down East this last fall gave people an insight into the different conferences. So there is a point where it can become . . . but until you arrived at a principle that was a little more confining than this broad aspect of it where again they may choose it just for entertainment rather than newsworthy comments and the proper type of perspective, I think that we should maybe vote it down this time and let's come back with a better resolution that would assure that what we are doing, we're not creating a monster but we are giving the public the opportunity to see a fair view of what we as legislators try to do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion that debate be adjourned, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Could I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member from Portage, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this one of the types of resolution that has been given a considerable degree of interest in the House. It is a matter that was raised, if I recall correctly, originally by a request of myself for an Order for Return dealing with the Informational Branch of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and it has expanded from that rather innocent request for information into a number of full-scale debates, and I think resulted in the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

I think it has been a most interesting debate. I think that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has been called upon on a number of occasions to come to the defence of his department and of the government respecting informational services. I doubt very much whether I can make any further contribution to the debate at this time because I really think that most aspects have been considered. I merely want to point out that so far as this group is concerned, in our opinion the Informational Services of the Department of Industry and Commerce, acting on behalf of the government, have been used, as suggested in the amendment proposed by my colleague from Wellington, for the political uses of the Conservative Party of Manitoba.

We have stated on a number of occasions that we have no objections to an informational service providing that that informational service is used for the purpose of giving information to the taxpayer of Manitoba, and also used to publicize Manitoba outside of our province, indeed outside of our Dominion. So I say that we have no objections to the use of the funds of Manitoba for these purposes, but again I say, and I pinpoint and want to emphasize, that we do not feel that this is the purpose or the sole purpose of the Department of Industry and Commerce and its Informational Services.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not something new. This situation is rather historic here in Manitoba. Even before the present government took over the reins of office in Manitoba this situation prevailed, and it might be - it might be - that someone can properly point the finger at me and say, "Well, the only objection that you may have as Leader of the New Democratic Party is because of the fact that you haven't had your finger in the pie and been able to use the taxpayer's dollar for propaganda purposes of your particular party." And I would say that if anyone were to point their finger towards me in that regard, I would have to confess that my party, up until the next election at least, has not had the opportunity of governing the affairs of state in Manitoba. I would suggest, however, in all deference, that the situation will change whenever the next election is held.

But I spent some considerable time the other day going back over journals of the past number of years of the Assembly, the last 15 or 20 years. I'm sorry that I have to rely on my

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) information -- rely on the journals. You know, Mr. Speaker, up until the present administration took over, we didn't have Hansards that I could go back over the speeches of the House, and while we did have a system in the old days, or the other days, of having recordings of the proceedings in the House, I'm sorry to have to say that I haven't got any of the recordings of a debate which took place in this Assembly to which I want to make reference at this time.

To indicate substantiation of what I am saying by the fact of the use of public funds for propaganda by the government of the day, is not something that is new. And I want to refer back to the journals of the session of 1956, where it is recorded that on March 28th of 1956, when the Assembly was dealing with concurrences of the estimates of the day, the following items are recorded in the journals.

"A motion was presented for concurrence of Resolution 111, which stated: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$200, 375 for Industry and Commerce, Bureau of Travel and Publicity;" \$200, 375 for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1957, whereupon a debate ensued and Mr. Roblin who was a Member of the Conservative Party and I believe the Leader at that particular time, moved the following resolution: "That while concurring in Resolution No. 111, this House regrets that the government has made use of public funds for the distribution of Liberal Party propaganda."

There was a debate at that particular time and the Conservatives of that day joined with the CCF in protesting the use by the Liberal Party of the finances of Manitoba for the purpose of propagating Liberal Party propaganda. Needless to say, at that particular time the government in power - the Liberal Party - had sufficient strength to defeat the resolution and I suppose the expenditure carried on, even though it was objected to by those of us in opposition.

And here we have today, here we have today a similar proposition by a substantive resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the government be condemned for using the finances of the province for the purpose of propagating Conservative information and propaganda.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that had we had a Hansard back in 1956, all that would have been necessary for myself or any of my colleagues to have done, would be to read verbatim what took place at that particular time and establish that it doesn't really matter, does it, as far as Manitoba is concerned with the type of government that we've had, whichever of the two old-line parties are in power, they would use the funds of Manitoba for the self-same purpose to which we object. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we will receive the support of the Liberal Party insofar as our amendment to the main resolution is concerned, that we do condemn the government and censure the government for misusing the administration of the Branch to further the political interest of the Conservative Party, and I heartily recommend support for the amendment as proposed by my colleague from Wellington to this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member from Wellington -- St. Matthews, pardon me.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I have a little difficulty in this House separating myself from my good friend from Wellington. There is one street that divides our seats but sooner or later maybe we'll find the difference with my seat being a holy one and his not being. -- (Interjection) -- No, we've had all those fixed up.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Honourable Member from Assiniboia in introducing the question of breathalyzers into this Legislature. As members realize, the whole question of liquor on our highways and drinking and driving is a very serious one, is becoming even more serious year by year, and people and all forms of legislative bodies throughout the world are starting to take a very serious look at this matter and trying to work out systems in which the misuse of alcohol by drivers and potential killers on our highways can be curtailed effectively.

My main complaint with the resolution as introduced by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia is that it is not specific enough as to what could be done by this Legislature and what should be done by the Parliament of Canada in order to attack this particular problem.

(MR. STEEN cont'd.) In my contribution in the Throne Speech, I mentioned the legislation that was proposed by the Minister of Justice and now the Prime Minister of this country, which he has very specifically done in amendments to the Criminal Code and which I think he should be commended for, with one single exception; and that is, he has placed too high a permitted level of alcohol content in relation to blood for potential drivers, and I think that we should, as a Legislature, urge him and urge him with one strong voice, to amend his proposed legislation or in the new Parliament introduce the same legislation but amend the figure of .10 to .08 as the level at which in essence a crime would be committed if anyone was found in care or control or driving a motor vehicle with that percentage or greater percentage of alcohol in his blood stream. And I was hoping that since the Legislature of the Province in Manitoba has absolutely no authority whatsoever in creating a crime of drinking and driving and specifying the alcohol content in blood, that we as a Legislature could specify our desire for the introduction of this legislation in Ottawa with the .08 figure.

As a Legislature, we have very limited powers as to what we can do in this whole field, but the Province of Saskatchewan have introduced in amendments to their equivalent of our Highway Traffic Act, a procedure in which the licences of drivers may be suspended if they refuse to submit to a breathalyzer test. I am hoping that the Legislature or the Government of this province will give very serious consideration to this matter and that we follow the Saskatchewan legislation, because this legislation has been tested in the courts of our land, it has been tested in the Supreme Court, which has come to the conclusion that it is within the powers of the Legislative Assembly of that province and therefore in any other province, to legislate on, and I would hope that we would take this step too, because this is the limit to what we as a province can do.

Now there is a great public feeling on the whole question of breathalyzers and the introduction of breathalyzer legislation, but I am afraid the general public do not realize the limitations that we as a Legislature have in this field, and I'm also afraid that they're expecting miraculous results from the introduction of any form of breathalyzer legislation. However, I would submit that when we do have breathalyzers introduced into the Province of Manitoba, I hope and pray that nothing but good will come out of such legislation.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a small amendment to this particular legislation which I think will get us onside both as a provincial Legislature in as far as what we can do, and maybe with the one strong voice will also speak to our Mother government at Ottawa as to what we would like them to do.

Therefore I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher, that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the word "a" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the following: "factor in a number of fatal traffic accidents in Canada; and

"Whereas the use of breathalyzers is one method of determining cases in which a driver of a motor vehicle has consumed alcohol to an extent which may impair his ability to drive safely;

"Therefore Be It Resolved that this Legislature request the Parliament of Canada to amend the Criminal Code of Canada

(1) To authorize the law enforcement agencies to require drivers to submit to a breathalyzer test where

(a) the peace officer has reasonable and probable grounds for believing a person to have consumed alcohol; or

(b) a person who is involved in a traffic accident or is observed by a peace officer committing a moving traffic violation;

(2) To provide that anyone who has the care or control of a motor vehicle and who has consumed alcohol in such a quantity that the proportion thereof exceeds 80 milligrams of alcohol in 100 milliliters of blood, is guilty of an offence and liable to punishment therefor; and

"Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of amending the Highway Traffic Act of Manitoba at the earliest possible opportunity to enable the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to suspend the driving privileges of persons who have refused to submit to breathalyzer tests when requested to do so by a peace officer."

I have extra copies of this amendment which I will send to the Honourable Member from Assiniboia and the leaders of the other Parties.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell,

(MR. DOW cont'd.) that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would request the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PAULLEY: May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that:

Whereas the price of farm products is the root of the farm income problem; and
Whereas marketing procedure to a large extent determines the prices of farm products;
and

Whereas in recent years there has been much confusion on the whole question of marketing of farm products;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Committee on Agriculture be instructed to look into all aspects of the farm income problem and the Natural Products Marketing Act and Regulations thereto.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Natural Products Marketing Act has come into focus in the last few years, very much so, as a matter of fact, because of the problems that we find agriculture involved in today, the fact of prices not being reasonable in recognition of increases in costs of production, and so we have heard from many corners of this particular province and indeed throughout Canada, that we must do something in the area of marketing or improving our marketing procedure in order that we might give to our farmers a measure of bargaining power to enable them to improve their lot in society.

Now I know that this particular problem is not a strange one to this House, Mr. Speaker, because we can only be reminded by the fact that a year ago we had substantial repercussions as a result of some decisions that were made by government with respect to certain marketing organizations in the Province of Manitoba, and this is really what prompted me to introduce this type of resolution. Last year's events proved to me, Mr. Speaker, that there were many members of the Legislature that were not at all familiar with the problems of marketing insofar as agricultural products are concerned.

To go back a few years beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I want to at this point commend the Honourable Member for Lakeside because he was the then Minister of Agriculture - I believe it was some time in the Thirties or the early Forties - he was the Minister of Agriculture in this province when the Marketing Act was put on the statute books, and although it was dormant to a large extent for a number of years, I think that we have finally caught up with things and the people are truly interested in this business of marketing of agricultural products. I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to recognize that the Minister of Agriculture is now in his chair, because this is something that I am sure he is going to be very much involved in in all areas, in all commodities insofar as agricultural production is concerned, so I am happy to see the Minister in his seat. I, in fact, was hesitant about going ahead with my speech on this subject matter because of the fact, or because of the absence of the Minister when I first started out on this particular resolution.

Now what is the real problem? The real problem is that farmers have been faced with a declining income position for the last 20 years and they have, as a result of this particular problem, decided that they have to look into areas, to marketing areas, to try and come to grips with the problem known as the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. And I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that you could blame farmers for looking for ways and means to improve their position, because they do have a stake in this province of Manitoba and they ought to have adequate bargaining power to assure them that their labours are not for nothing and that their investments are going to bring back a return. I am sure that all members in this House recognize that farmers do expect to get a return on their investment and their work. It has been suggested by many people for a number of years that farming is a way of life and therefore it

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) doesn't really matter whether you make any money at it but it's just a matter of one-enjoys-living-on-the-farm sort of thing. Well, that day is past, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that farmers today are farming because they simply like to farm. I think they've entered into the area where it is a business and we must approach it in a business-like manner.

The area of marketing has been one that has been neglected for many years in Manitoba but it is certainly, it has been brought into focus the last four or five years. I think I'm right in saying that we don't have too many marketing boards in Manitoba at this stage of the game. We have the Honey Board which has been in operation for a good number of years. We have had, or we still have the Potato Marketing Board - I don't know for how long; this, of course, will depend on the Minister of Agriculture to a large degree. And we do have now a Turkey Marketing Board, and I understand very shortly that there will be a referendum on the establishment of a board for broilers.

So we are moving into the area of marketing boards, Mr. Speaker, and I think because we are getting involved substantially into this area that it's necessary that the laws respecting marketing boards be updated and that we ought to, as legislators of this province, take a good look at the Marketing Act and at the regulations, and see if we can come up with some improvement, because again I repeat that a year ago we had substantial misunderstanding on the part of members on all sides of the House but especially on members on the government side insofar as the question of the vegetable marketing situation was concerned. And it's a shame, Mr. Speaker, if people will legislate out of ignorance. We must be fully informed, and it's for this reason that I want to draw to your attention that something has to be done in the area of marketing legislation. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we should. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will endorse my position that we should ask the Committee on Agriculture to look into this problem so that we might get representation from the farm community as a means of improving the legislation that we now have.

One of the other problems that farmers have faced over the years, apart from the fact that they didn't have bargaining power, is a lack of providing a uniform product on the market. In many of our areas of production there is a need for some uniformity so that the consuming public does recognize a Manitoba product, and it is good for us to have our products recognizable when it's in the market place because we do want to promote increased production of Manitoba farm commodities. It will augur well for the Province of Manitoba to look in this direction. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is important, and again I hope that I can get the support of the Minister of Agriculture in this important area.

The other problem we find is that because of the lack of uniformity in some of our commodities, we have had substantial consumer reluctance to buy locally-grown agricultural products, and many consumers, Mr. Speaker, have resorted to buying an imported product. And this is not good for Manitoba. It's not good advertising for Manitoba. And this again draws to your attention the need for adequate marketing procedure so that we can assure the consumers of Manitoba that we do have an authority that is looking into the questions of quality control, grade control, so that the consuming public can rest assured that when they buy a Manitoba product it is a product worthy of their consumer dollar.

I want to go back, Mr. Speaker, just a few years, to examine the changes that have taken place in the Marketing Act legislation, just to bring members in this House up-to-date. The Marketing Act was amended some few years ago when we had the Honourable George Hutton as the Minister of Agriculture. He introduced a new concept into the marketing legislation in Manitoba, namely the establishment of a provision to allow, not only marketing boards, but commission marketing systems, and I refer to, as an example, the Hog Commission and the Potato Marketing Commission that we have now.

Now I don't think I have to go into a great deal of detail to outline to the members of the Legislature just what these changes imply, but briefly, it's simply that we have now two concepts in the marketing of farm commodities. One is a commission marketing agency which is not an elected body, which is really appointed by the Minister of Agriculture. There are good points about it but there are also some bad points about this type of marketing setup. But again, I'm not going to be the judge on this particular area; I want the Minister to take this to the people and to the farm community of Manitoba and ask for their opinions. And by endorsing my resolution this is precisely what we would do. We would solicit the support of, or recommendations of the farm community at large, and possibly if there is a reason or a need

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) for improvement then we can do this subsequently.

The other area, the other type of marketing, of course, is the traditional marketing board concept where we have only producers appointed and subsequently elected to run these boards. I think a good example of that is the Turkey Marketing Board that has just been set up two or three -- two weeks ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can readily recognize there were substantial changes brought into the marketing legislation during the years, the time that George Hutton spent in this Legislature as Minister of Agriculture, and I don't know whether these are all changes that we want to keep on the statute books but I simply suggest to the Minister that we ought to take a good look and possibly make some revisions or amendments.

The area of marketing, unlike many other areas, is a provincial, mainly a provincial responsibility. I know the Minister of Agriculture at one time, about two weeks ago in fact, suggested to me that some of my ideas may be better presented in the House of Commons than in the Legislature of Manitoba, that they are really matters that are applicable to the federal area of jurisdiction, and that he was pointing his finger to Ottawa as the place to present some of these views. And I suggest to the Minister that here I am dealing with a situation whereby he, the Minister of Agriculture of Manitoba, has a direct responsibility, namely his approach to marketing of farm commodities in Manitoba - and I'm sure that the Minister will not attempt to tell me that I should be talking to someone else, because really I'm sure he recognizes that he has this responsibility, and I would hope that he exercises this responsibility very judiciously, Mr. Speaker, unlike that of a year ago. I would hope that he will be very careful in his approach to questions of marketing on various farm commodities as they appear before him so that we don't have the fiasco, if you want to call it that, of last year with respect to the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission and its operations.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you will recognize that my approach to this whole problem is a positive one. I am not being overly critical of the Minister, simply because I recognize that he inherited a pretty tough situation. He was a newly-elected member of this Legislature who was given the responsibilities in the field of agriculture, and I know that he had a very tough job. I know that he also recognizes the error of his way of a year ago, and that I would hope that he is now prepared to approach the problems of agriculture on a very positive course of action so that the farm community of Manitoba can be assured that their views and interests will be served by means of legislation through this House, Mr. Speaker.

One of the problem areas, as I see it, in the Natural Products Marketing Act, is the question of ministerial discretion, Mr. Speaker. I am not particularly too happy about the fact that the Minister has a very broad discretionary power in setting up marketing boards, in setting up referendums and so forth. I think I would rather see changes in the Act to make certain things mandatory rather than to provide the Minister the right to make these discretionary decisions. Because really it was because of these powers that the Minister had a year ago, that we entered into some serious situations insofar as the potato and vegetable growers were concerned, and it is the area of discretionary power that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, when I recognize that there are people constantly demanding of the Minister concessions that they be exempted from certain regulations or that they be given special privileges under the regulations, and when a Minister has the discretionary power, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . too much discussion going on. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead has the floor and I wondered if the honourable members would direct their attention to him.

MR. USKIW: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think we did misuse the discretionary power that the Minister had under the Natural Products Marketing Act, and for this reason I would hope that again the Minister would appreciate a positive approach and consult more fully the agricultural industry in Manitoba before he enunciates policy or before he makes substantial changes in direction. And this is reasonable, I'm sure, to expect of the Minister of Agriculture, and I'm hoping, Mr. Speaker, that I will convince him today that he will support this resolution so that we, as the farm community in Manitoba - and I'm including myself, Mr. Speaker - will have all the confidence in the world that our Minister of Agriculture is truly working for our best interests.

One of the areas of discussion, as the Honourable Minister is aware, has been the regulation respecting the majority required to bring in a producer control board or otherwise, by way of a referendum, and I know that the Minister is wondering whether the two-thirds majority

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) is the right one or not, and I am wondering whether it is the right one, Mr. Speaker. Again, here is an area that I would like to have some representation from the farm community, the farm organizations, to find out just what their viewpoint is; and if their viewpoint is other than what we have in regulations today, then we ought to give serious consideration to changing some of the things that we have under regulation under the Natural Products Marketing Act. I say this for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I know that the Minister of Agriculture has many pressures on him to make certain moves or changes, and I would hope that he doesn't succumb to pressures from other members of his government or Cabinet, to in fact support people or companies that would want certain privileges. And for this reason I would hope that we have something more rigid, whereby the Minister can simply point to the Act and say, "This is the Natural Products Marketing Act and this is the way the game goes. We have to accept the propositions as they are laid out."

MR. SPEAKER: . . . when I feel he's probably got one or two more items that he'd like to bring before the House, but I must now call it 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker -- oh all right. I was just going to finish if I was allowed another half a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: Order; order, please. I regret I interrupted the honourable gentleman and the House. Would you finish your remarks?

MR. USKIW: Well, I simply wanted to recommend to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister set up the Agricultural Committee and let's have a good look at the whole question of marketing in Manitoba, the question of farm income, and how we can help the cost-price squeeze by means of devising a reasonable system of marketing for the farmers of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by --

MR. SPEAKER: Did you wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. VIELFAURE: Is this on the resolution, Mr. Speaker? Well then, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:32 and I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00.