

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 1, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 54 students Grade 5 standing of the Sherwood School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McLaughlin and Mrs. Brody. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works.

We also have 60 students of Grade 11 standing of the Miles MacDonnell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bugeera and Mr. Peters. This school is located in my own constituency of Kildonan.

We also have 65 students of Grade 5 standing of the St. Andrews School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Yarish and Mrs. Siddle. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Attorney-General. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a very brief non-political statement, before we get into the question period. (Agreed)

It gives me very great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to remind all members, fellow members of the House, that today is a very special day for people of Welsh descent. In effect today March 1st is for persons of Welsh background, the equivalent of St. Patrick's Day for the Irish, St. George's Day for the English and St. Andrews Day for the Scotch; namely today March 1st, Mr. Speaker is St. Davids Day; St. David being the patron saint of Wales and it's a day for people of Welsh background to remember many of the very famous people they produced in their heritage. I might mention such people as Mr. Richard Burton the actor, Tom Jones, singer, Neelin Thomas the poet. I understand Ray Milland, an actor . . .

A MEMBER: Lem Harris.

MR. EVANS: And indeed Antony Armstrong-Jones otherwise known as Lord Snowden. It's therefore, Mr. Speaker, a land of singers, of poets, of artists, and indeed is a land that has produced some very fine politicians. I would add such names as Aneurin Bevin, a late Minister in the former Labour Government of Clement Atlee, and indeed Sir, Mr. Lloyd George, former Liberal Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. And indeed in this very House there have been former members such as Lem Harris, formerly of Logan, and indeed our present member I believe is of Welsh origin also, the present Member for Logan. And on St. David's Day, Mr. Speaker, people either usually wear the leek, which is a member of the onion family, as a symbol, or the daffodil which is a very famous flower. I was contemplating whether I should ask members of the House to join me in celebrating this national day, this national holiday of the land of my fathers and I thought that I should really try to spread a little sweetness in the Chamber and I decided on the daffodil over the member of the onion family, the leek. I would therefore hope that members of the Assembly would join me in accepting this symbol of St. David's Day; and certainly not to be outdone by the Irish or others, let me wish you one and all a very happy St. David's Day. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (Leader Official Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister would be prepared to comment in this House on Governor Link's remarks on CBC radio this morning, in which the Governor indicated pleasure bordering on surprise at the reception the Manitoba Government had given to the Governor's case on the Garrison Diversion.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, it's always a welcome opportunity to comment on a statement such as that. The Governor of North Dakota and the colleagues that came with him to Manitoba impressed us as being very civilized and friendly and neighbourly people. We did our best to give them a reception and a hearing in which there would be a maximum exchange of available information to date and that took place. We agreed that there was still a great deal of information and refinement of information yet to come and that as several stages of refinement of information took place, we would be able to exchange views and positions with increasing precision.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether he heard the radio broadcast this morning?

MR. SCHREYER: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would undertake to receive a transcript of the radio broadcast . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I cannot see that it's any purpose of the procedures of this House whether we get transcripts or any other news media outside of this Chamber. I do think the questions should be able to be asked so that an answer can be given without having to get other communication media involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): The statement made by the Governor of North Dakota this morning on CBC radio is a very important one, and there's some variance with the views that he expressed in that statement with the information that the government is communicating to the House. I think it is a very proper question to ask the First Minister to obtain a copy of that statement so that he can comment on it, because this matter does require some clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to do that, but let it be understood that in obtaining a copy of something that was said through the media, that I certainly intend to obtain the comments directly from the Governor as well. I don't think that at any time we should come to certain conclusions by virtue of something said via the media.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order. I think the First Minister should know that the voice of Governor Link is contained in that report, direct. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can then ask the First Minister another question. I wonder if he would be prepared to present a ministerial statement to this House in connection with the meeting of Western Economic Opportunities in Saskatoon.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, a communique has been issued by the Western Premiers Conference, the communique - I will attempt to get copies of it and distribute it to honourable members. They may then have questions to ask. I do not intend to make a statement.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will not debate this on a point of order, there may be another occasion in which this can be debated as to whether we are or are not entitled to some information here. But I would ask questions . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have just indicated that the whole text of the communique will be made available.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I have to ask some questions directly of the Minister. There is a suggestion in the news reports of the conference and from the communique that in effect the government of Manitoba will be arriving at some trade-off with the governments of western Canada - the other governments - with respect to an industrial strategy for western Canada, and I wonder if the First Minister can clarify that position and clarify in what way this will enhance or prejudice Manitoba's Industrial Development?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, what was agreed by the western premiers was that there would appear, certainly there would appear to be an opportunity and good reason to at least attempt systematically to develop a western Canadian industrial development strategy that would be based on the principal of complementary specialization of new industrial expansion in western Canada as a replacement for scrambling and non-productive competition and concession granting by the provinces. So we have undertaken to ask our respective

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . departments of Industry and Commerce to work together in close liaison and with considerable frequency to attempt to lay the foundation of that concept. And until we have an opportunity to review the first progress report of that committee of western ministers it would be premature to say that we are bargaining away our birthright.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether it would be the intention of the government to in fact enact a legislation in time to provide this or is this going to be an understanding between premiers?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, until the first progress report is made to the western Premiers, which report can only be made after there has been considerable detailed analysis done prior to that, it is completely premature to even suggest legislation at this date. It is, if at all, it is a year premature to say the least.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would indicate that as a result of this discussion it would preclude the development of another steel mill in Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, and if it precluded it, if it did, it might be because it had brought to Manitoba some other industrial capacity that at the moment we have no reason to believe we could obtain here any more than any of our sister provinces.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Was the First Minister or was the conference correctly reported as having agreed that there would be no more competition . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must remind the honourable member Beausiesne Citation 171 indicates that questions oral or written must not inquire whether statements made in newspapers are true. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: I made no reference to the newspapers, Mr. Speaker, there was a communique issued to which the First Minister was a party. I'm asking him if the communique is correctly interpreted, as it is widely being interpreted that an agreement was reached, and this is the question: Was an agreement reached whereby the four provinces - Manitoba would no longer compete with the other three provinces in the west for industrial development but would only work in harmony and co-operation trading off as it were?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the communique did not say that Manitoba would not compete, the communique indicated that the four western Premiers had agreed that there was every reason to look toward the concept of western interprovincial co-operation and the concept of compatible specialization as a preferable alternative to that of non-productive competition and concession granting. This is what the communique stated.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, would it be fair to conclude then that some of the badges of competition, for example, would be removed, such as would Alberta now impose a sales tax, a death tax, would they raise their income tax to be the same level as us or are those not included in the kind of tax competition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the emphasis was on the extent to which it is possible to determine sectors of industry in which the four western provinces could formulate a program that would attempt to proceed on the basis of compatible or complementary specialization as to whether some provinces have different levels of taxation at the present time, that's one matter. Implicit in this however is that there not be an extension of tax concessions of variable kinds in the future.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. It related to the contents of Order-in-Council passed yesterday. Will the Minister explain to the House why Dr. Ted Tulchinsky was paid \$35,864 as an Associate Deputy Minister of Health and Social Development as at March 31, 1973, that's according to the supplements to the Public Accounts, when the Orders-in-Council 539/71 and 862/71 covering this appointment period provided for a maximum salary of only \$31,202 and \$2,400 extra for an advanced degree which the Associate Deputy had? In other words the question is, why was he paid \$2,256.04 more than was stipulated as the maximum?

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

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, my point of order is that information relating to specific

## POINT OF ORDER

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . numbers whether it be salary or whether it be other statistical data should be requested by way of Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . surely this question is one that is more properly directed in the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Both points . . . Order, please. Both points that have been made in respect to that particular question are very germane. I would suggest the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party consider that? The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

## ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase my question. Before I do I would like to comment on the point of order that was raised.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already indicated my ruling on that point of order.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I was not given an opportunity to comment, it was a point of order raised on something that I had said. I ought to have been offered the opportunity to make an observation based on the First Minister's comment. However I'll rephrase the question. Why was Dr. Ted Tulchinsky paid over \$2,000 more retroactively than the authority granted, allowed him to pay?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again, the question although it's been rephrased is still the same question. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Order, please. The honourable leader have a point of order?

MR. ASPER: No, Mr. Speaker, I will put another question on the same subject but a different question.

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

MR. ASPER: Could the Minister of Health indicate to the House what the purpose is of Order-in-Council No. 219/74 which on a retroactive basis raises Dr. Tulchinsky's salary?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question with regard to Dr. Tulchinsky as notice, although it can be discussed at the Public Accounts Committee.

I would point out to the member however that Orders-in-Council are adjusting the salaries of those members who are not part of the bargaining unit. It has taken, whatever length of time it was, a year or something, to finalize that and it was only after that was finalized that Orders-in-Council were passed to therefore make adjustments in salary to those people who are not within the scope of the agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. --(Interjection)-- The honourable member has . . . The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Acting Minister for Autopac, and I have to ask the question today, Sir. I wonder can the government tell us are there many renewal forms, that have not been returned to the individuals who have sent them in?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice. I would - oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: . . . with the House's indulgence I can direct a question directly to the Minister involved. My question is simply this: Does the Minister have any information as to how many renewal forms the Autopac Corporation has not been able to get back into the hands of those individual Manitobans who have sent them in?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister responsible for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I was on the phone just checking this matter out and I would like to say that the report that was aired yesterday is totally false and I would consider it complete irresponsible reporting, and there have been no mail bags, or as I heard reports lost, and there are no renewals lost.

MR. ENNS: I'm somewhat dumbfounded by the answer.

A MEMBER: How come I didn't get mine?

ORAL QUESTIONS

A MEMBER: You had no idea . . .

MR. ENNS: No. I'll ask the question again. Are there any renewal forms not yet returned to individual Manitobans who have sent them into the corporation?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the renewals forms were sent in prior to the deadline that they would be mailed back, I have no information that there are any held up.

MR. ENNS: In the event that is the case, can the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That's hypothetical.

MR. ENNS: . . . will the Minister intercede on behalf of those Manitobans who have sent and paid for their insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is still hypothetical.

MR. ENNS: . . . sent the renewal forms in but the corporation has not sent the renewal forms back. Will they be charged . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder how many times I have to say a question is not in order. I asked twice and informed the member it was hypothetical. Will he rephrase it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister in charge of Autopac is simply this: Will those persons who have paid for and sent in their renewal forms, but for some reason or other have not had the renewal forms returned, will they be liable for prosecution as of 8 o'clock this morning as the law enforcement officers are now doing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SCHREYER: Well my point of order, Sir, is that the question necessarily is hypothetical and in the event that there were such a problem of non-delivery of posted or mailed forms that would become a problem involving the Canada Post Office as well as the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, and if in fact investigation revealed that in fact there was some such problem in the mails or loss thereof, then I would think that proceeding under normal rules of evidence in ascertaining of acts that the Crown would not proceed to prosecute in circumstances such as that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On the point of order, I must comment - I make it a point of House order or House privilege, Mr. Speaker. The honourable members opposite seem to be referring to a particular matter that I have no particular knowledge of, about mail bags missing or some difficulties within the Autopac Corporation; I am asking, soliciting straightforward questions from the Minister in charge of Autopac. I look at the First Minister in all sincerity and wonder what kind of information he has been getting and from whom.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister on the Garrison Diversion project. Can the Minister inform the House whether during the meetings with the governmental delegation from North Dakota, whether the Manitoba Government raised the issue or discussed with that North Dakota delegation the five corrective measures that were recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation to be taken to control pollution, considering the fact that those corrective measures have a fair amount of time lag for implementation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the meeting lasted the better part of a day; a number of possible remedial steps or corrective measures were discussed back and forth. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, the important point is that in the course of the next, approximately six years - it is approximately six years, Sir, between now and the projective date of commencement of diversion works- that there will be opportunity and it is fully intended to map out a course of investigation and further study to ascertain the full facts of any impact that will result as a consequence of the Garrison Diversion project.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the First Minister again

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . inform the House whether separate discussions have been held with the Canadian government in terms of mapping out a joint strategy, and particularly in terms of diplomatic representations to the Federal Government of the United States and the Bureau of Reclamation in terms of corrective measures that may be required or any other kind of diplomatic moratoriums that may be established through the Boundary Treaty agreements?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that there has been close communication at the technical level - between the Department of Mines and Resources, Manitoba and Environment Canada, and in fact Environment Canada was represented at the meeting last Monday and in light of the discussions that took place it is obvious that there will be a need for continuing analytic investigation and co-operation by both levels of government in Canada in this respect.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, another supplementary. Would the First Minister undertake to communicate with the Minister of External Affairs to arrange a ministerial meeting between the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada to map out a joint strategy at the ministerial and governmental level as opposed to simply the official level.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been communication already taking place. At this point in time the important task is to have additional technical investigatory analysis and work carried out, and when that is done, to a further significant extent there may well be need to meet at the political level. At this point in time, without anything near the full facts being in yet, I don't see that there's any crucial necessity of meeting unless we wish to oppose merely for the sake of opposing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (BUD)SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Does the Winnipeg Police Association's statement that it will be making a definitive statement on Monday as to its position in its dispute with the City of Winnipeg mean that positions now have polarized and crystallized and that no further communication between the two sides is taking place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I, too, heard a news report this morning, a radio report - I believe that's what my honourable friend is referring to. I didn't have the opportunity of attending the meeting, so therefore of course I cannot comment on what the outcome of that meeting of the Executive of the Police Association.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister be checking into that situation today, to see whether any efforts on his part or his good offices may be put to value and use over the weekend?

MR. PAULLEY: Both I as Minister responsible and the whole department are available at all times. I believe in the competence of the Executive of the Police Association, and all others involved in this possible withdrawal of service.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary for purposes of clarification. Is the Minister advising the House then that he is not going to take any initiative between now and Monday?

MR. PAULLEY: I haven't stopped beating my wife . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SHERMAN: I didn't hear that answer.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I haven't stopped beating my wife . . .

A MEMBER: Oh, it wasn't worth hearing.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, relating to the Western Economic Opportunities Conference and the reports that indicate the concern of the Premiers with respect to the information to be supplied by the railways as promised by the Minister of Transportation and by the Prime Minister at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference at Calgary. I wonder if he would be in a position to comment on that and to indicate if any co-operation has taken place with the railways and where there appears to be a road block at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premiers and their colleagues from the

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . western provincial departments of Industry and Commerce for the most part expressed concern at the slowness with which the railways were forwarding the cost disclosure information that had been promised by the Prime Minister and reconfirmed by the Federal Minister of Transport; and it is our understanding that some time around mid March that there is to be a meeting of the Federal Minister of Transport and the western Ministers that relate to transport matters, and if at that time it is not possible to have confirmed that the cost data is in fact being made available, then I believe it's the intention of the western provinces to submit directly to the Federal Cabinet a request that this matter be dealt with. We are also suggesting that if there is, and there is, a commitment to provide cost disclosure on railway operations, that this ought to be embodied in the National Transportation Act as a legislative requirement as well. I'm not sure if that answers my honourable friend's question completely.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for his answer. I'd like to now ask a question dealing with the problems relating to the industrial development strategy to be worked out. I wonder if he would be in a position to comment whether the Premiers in their discussion of a western Canadian industrial strategy and the announcement that was made in the communique, whether the Premiers themselves felt that that kind of communication, that kind of pronouncement would have a direct effect on the funding that would take place by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion from the Federal Government with respect to present day industrial activity and future industrial activity until such an industrial strategy is worked out by western Canada, will that pronouncement not in effect really affect the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do believe the honourable member is making a speech and then asking a question in regards to it. Would he rephrase his question?

MR. SPIVAK: Well my question is, would that not prejudice in the short term - will this potential new strategy development not prejudice in a short term the negotiations for Manitoba with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little surprised that that interpretation could possibly be read into the statement, the joint statement by the Western Provinces. We do not feel, and it was not suggested in our discussions, that merely because we are attempting to carry out, or at least explore, in a systematic way the advantages and the possibility of having an integrated or co-ordinated, at least, western development strategy that this in any way should have any bearing on the operations and financing available from the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion. As a matter of fact, Sir, one should have thought that a co-ordinated complementary western regional development strategy should enhance the operations of DREE, so that it would have a much clearer picture as to what areas of industrial development were being considered in each of the provinces, rather than having to contend with conflicting requests and demands from four separate provinces.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . if the First Minister would comment whether the premier has considered the probability of postponement of priorities by the Federal Government until such a strategy is worked out.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in the discussion, and therefore nothing in the communique that even hints at any request or requirement or necessity of any postponement whatsoever. As a matter of fact it was because of the slow moving pace with which DREE is proceeding vis-a-vis western Canada that, and particularly the Federal Department of Industry Trade and Commerce, that this concept of western co-ordinated industrial development strategy really emanates.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I can be of assistance to the honourable members and indicate that Beauchesne's Citation 171 says, "In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limit; in making a question, observations which might lead to a debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question, and the purpose of a question is to obtain information not to supply it to the House - and the same thing applies in respect to answers. They should be brief and distinct and be limited to the necessary explanation." That may expedite our question period. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question then is to the First Minister. I wonder if he would be in a position to comment on the problems of energy that were discussed at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, particularly the lifting of the freeze that will

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . take place, or is to take place on April 1st.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Again, I wonder whether the Honourable Leader of the Opposition heard me in what I just said in regard to questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition - he's asking for a comment which may take an hour, and I don't think that's the proper place for a question period.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the comment that I want from the Premier I think is a very simple answer, and I think it's one that this House is entitled to, and with all due respect I have listened to your comments and I understand the parameters on which the question and the answers are to be put in this House, but my question is germane, it is one in the public interest, and one I think that the Premier is quite prepared to answer.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would be prepared to comment on the discussion that took place with respect to the energy matter and particularly, the question of the lifting of the price freeze that is to take place on April 1st, and whether there was any co-ordinated agreement among the premiers.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I've been in this Legislature for quite a number of years. I've never heard a question yet that was allowed as being in order, asking a Minister to comment on something.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member will get another opportunity I do believe I have to recognize all members and at least some that haven't been recognized before. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for MDC. He's not in here this morning. Perhaps I can direct my question to the Minister for Industry and Commerce. I would like to ask him if Misawa Homes at Gimli, which is 50 percent owned by MDC, is launching a large land development program to create a market for its homes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm simply not in a position to comment on that.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Perhaps the Minister can take it as notice and give the House an answer, but my supplementary would be how much more money the government through its agency will have to inject into Misawa Homes to be - so that Misawa can undertake this land development project?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice on behalf of the Minister responsible for the MDC.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question and I would like the press to take notice. It's a good day when I answer a question; it's also a good day because I am hoping with this carnation that's here that the Labour Party in Britain will win this election.

My answer is to the question posed by the Member for Assiniboia the other day with regard to the sale of imported butter in Manitoba and the labelling on the butter wrapping. Sir, I think the member knows, and other members here know, that Canada has for some time been a net importer of butter. As a result of that situation butter has been imported from Ireland, but we are informed by the Federal Department of Agriculture, Dairy Division, that all the Irish butter has been sold. I'm sure the member whose name is Patrick will be disappointed at that. As to the labelling, Sir, the federal department establishes the labelling requirements and they do not require, the Federal Government does not require, that the country of origin be designated on the wrapper on the butter.

The other point that I should point out to the member is that the butter must be labelled "Canada, Grade A", and the federal graders and inspectors assure that the butter meets that Canada Grade A standard. We are informed that apparently the federal department feels that it is more important that the quality of the butter imported be controlled than have the country of origin stated on the wrapper for the butter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister. He stated that the federal regulations do not require labelling. Is there any prohibition against a butter

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . processor putting on a label which indicates that the product is an imported product?

MR. TURNBULL: Sir, I have to take that question as notice. As the Member for Morris well knows these regulations are federal regulations, and I wouldn't want to comment off the top of my head about what the Federal Government is doing in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the Minister assure this House that the Garrison Diversion will not jeopardize the future expansion and the attraction of new food processors to Manitoba?

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister in his capacity as Minister for Urban Affairs. Can the Minister advise whether the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act to be introduced in this session will still provide for the popular election of the mayor at large?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Monsieur le Président, pas de question, pas du tout.

Translation: Mr. Speaker, no question, not at all.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker I gather - que c'est une reponse dans l'affirmative, alors M. le Premier-Ministre. Ma question supplémentaire.

Translation: - that this is an answer in the affirmative then, Mr. Premier. My supplementary question.

Are there also structural changes in the community committees contemplated, revisions with respect to the authority of the Board of Commissioners, and perhaps further powers for the mayor contemplated in the legislation that will be brought to the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, just as a point of procedure, it is very questionable whether it's good practice to indicate in advance of the introduction of impending legislation what that legislation will contain. The only reason I answered specifically in the case of the first question is that it was announced in this House last spring that we would be doing such and such, and I'm merely confirming it now.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. The question is, why did he sign an Order-in-Council . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: Why did he sign an Order-in-Council retroactively raising Dr. Tulchinsky's salary to \$35,000 for the preceding year when in fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour state his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PAULLEY: . . . order to raise a matter that's already been decided by a previous question.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is very well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party have another question?

MR. ASPER: Yes the question is, in raising Dr. Tulchinsky's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: Well Mr. Just a minute . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I do believe we do proceed in a courteous manner. I have indicated that the question is out of order. I think there's been substantial support from this House that there are other ways of getting that information, and I'm sure the honourable gentleman can take the hint. Now if he has another question, I'll recognize him. If he doesn't then I'll move to some other member. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I know of no way that we are assured of having information such as I'm asking being given to the House in any other way. It may be suggested, it may be suggested . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order, that is an opinion the honourable member is expressing. It may have validity but I'm not certain about it, but it

## POINT OF ORDER

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . is not a point of order. Does he have a question?

MR. ASPER: To conclude the comment I was making on your ruling . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That, I am sure the honourable member is aware, is contrary to the rules of this House, that one does not reflect upon the decisions of the Chair.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Would the honourable member state his point of order.

MR. ASPER: I am wondering under what authority you rule a question out of order before you've heard the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member didn't have a point of order. He was making a statement. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, further to the point of order that has been before us off and on in the past twenty minutes - the same point of order really, Sir. The first time this point arose, it was indicated that in the course of estimates, and I believe the Honourable Member for Morris suggested in the consideration of public accounts - and I certainly concur with that - it is appropriate to deal with questions of numerical detail such as is involved here. But despite that, and despite the ruling that you have taken, Sir, the honourable member persists in attempting to ask the same question with somewhat different wording, but the basic principle and point of procedure still obtains, Sir, that a question of that kind can be dealt with in public accounts or estimates.

ORAL QUESTION Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can he confirm that Dr. Tulchinsky will be receiving a 17 percent increase away above the guideline of 8 percent set by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm or deny that kind of arithmetic.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A question of the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate whether the Premiers discussed the question of energy and energy pricing in the freeze to be lifted on April 1st at the Conference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of discussion for some period of time in yesterday's meeting.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether there was an agreement among the premiers as to the policy to be followed by the premiers in connection with this.

MR. SCHREYER: No, Sir. There was not. Mr. Speaker, the position being taken by Alberta and Saskatchewan, is a position which they articulated at the conference in Ottawa in January. Manitoba's position and British Columbia's position was articulated at the Ottawa conference as well. We had some discussion yesterday but basic positions haven't changed, and I don't believe that there is any change in the timetable with respect to the present price freeze.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then can the First Minister indicate, did Manitoba present a position which would suggest that the freeze should be extended beyond April 1st.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the discussions which took place yesterday, and which took place in Ottawa in late January at the Energy Conference, were on that very point, suggestions of that very kind were made. The positions however of the oil producing provinces were articulated, and it's been public knowledge for at least what - at least a month now.

MR. SPIVAK: Well again I ask the First Minister, was Manitoba's position that the freeze should be extended beyond April 1st?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that was a suggestion we put forward in Ottawa in January at a meeting which took place at that time between the Prime Minister and the premiers of all the provinces, but in the end a consensus was reached as to what was a course of action that would be possible to agree upon. It is a compromise. It's obvious, Sir, that even if all,

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . if seven of the ten, or eight of the ten provinces take one position, the oil producing provinces take another position, and in the end, in the end a decision was arrived at that the price freeze would end on a certain date. It has been announced, concurred in by the Government of Canada, and tacitly or otherwise by all the provinces.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether there has been any communication to the Federal Government asking that the price freeze remain.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that kind of communication is extended to Ottawa by all of the provinces that are in an importing position. In that respect Manitoba's position is no different than Ontario's. We made our views known but in the end a consensus, was reached, such as was announced at the January Energy Conference. We can go through the exercise once again but one assumes that the result will be the same.

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

MR. ASPER: The Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. With the new salary of Dr. Tulchinsky at approximately \$38,000 a year, could he inform the House why the Associate Deputy Minister for Health, at \$38,000 approximately, is the highest paid civil servant in the province, and why is he paid more than full fledged deputy ministers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I could answer the question - I won't. I'll discuss it in estimates or at public accounts.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister. Could he indicate to the House whether he has received reports or information that there is a very serious morale problem in the Civil Service as a result of this? Payment of one civil servant and his associate, \$5,000 more than the Deputy Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. My matter of privilege, Sir, is that the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is using innuendo, no supporting evidence, to suggest that there is a morale problem in the Civil Service. The kind of vague, unascertainable statement such as that can easily be countered by saying that there is some morale problem in having to contend with my honourable friend's mere presence here.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, if there's a morale problem that the Premier refers to relating to anyone's presence in this Chamber, if there's any kind of a morale problem, Mr. Speaker, that may be a two-edged sword. And - no Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member ask his question? The honourable member ask his question?

MR. ASPER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm addressing myself to the point of order, and I'm addressing myself to that which you allowed the First Minister to put on the record. If he want to refer to morale problems . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I thought I would give the latitude of the honourable member to ask another question since he'd been, his attention had been drawn to the fact that there was a point of order. I hadn't made a hard and firm decision to rule the honourable member out. I gave him the opportunity to rephrase. Since he wants to discuss the point of order I'm going to indicate that what the Honourable First Minister raised was very valid, and would the honourable member rephrase his question.

MR. ASPER: My specific question which I put, and which is highly in order is: Has he had a report, has he had reports that the payment to one civil servant at a lower level a salary higher than career civil servants have been getting, whether that has created a morale problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I assume the question is directed to me.

MR. ASPER: It was.

MR. MILLER: It is directed to me. Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of such a morale problem. I don't believe there is a morale problem. I believe the Leader of the Liberal Party is trying to create a morale problem. The Leader of the Liberal Party, I accuse of muck-raking of the worst kind.

## ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister for Consumer Affairs. Will the Minister advise whether he has ordered an investigation yet into the spiralling costs of sugar, inasmuch as he has shown a great deal of concern in this respect by evidence of his answers in the House in the last few days?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the problem with inquiries, of course, is that they raise expectations of people without providing necessarily the kind of remedies that are required to lessen the impact of the increases in prices. And I would not want the remedy to be worse than the sickness. But I should say to the member that in dealing with food price increases it is very difficult to come out with a policy which will in fact lessen the impact of food price increases on people who cannot afford to pay increased prices.

I did indicate the other day that according to the Canada Statistics figures sugar is only .1584 percent of the total CPI. Now if you attempt to deal with sugar, being such a small portion of the CPI, I don't know if that would have a very beneficial effect on people that have to buy the sugar.

I should point out to him as well that if there is an inquiry into sugar in this province that I would want to see recommendations come out that would be salutary, that would have some lasting effect on controlling or reducing the price of sugar to the Manitoba consumer. He should also be aware that the sugar industry in Canada has been investigated likely more than any other single industry in this country and another study, merely for the sake of study, I think would be a waste of the taxpayers' money.

In any case, Sir, I have now, or have in the past, several days ago, weeks ago, written to the Food Prices Review Board and demanded of them that, as they have the budget - and they have the staff - of some millions of dollars, or a million dollars anyway and considerable staff, that they should mount an inquiry into the price of sugar, the increasing price of sugar in Manitoba, and I am awaiting a reply from them - a definitive and written reply, although I have had of course verbal communication from them.

I should point out to the member, Sir, that I do not believe that inquiries in any individual province, which merely duplicate the inquiries that presumably will be conducted by the Food Prices Review Board, are beneficial to the people of Canada. I think that such duplication of inquiry merely for the sake of inquiry is simply a waste of the energies of government resources.

I hope, Sir, that I have given the member as thorough an answer to his question as he could want.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. I think - is it not a fact that the Honourable Minister did use his offices for a survey of prices and an examination of prices two years ago with beneficial effect? And I think that notwithstanding his comments on sugar . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please. Question please. Not a speech.

MR. MARION: Well let me phrase it this way. Can the Minister verify that previous efforts on his part have resulted in beneficial effects to the business of our province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister. Very briefly.

MR. TURNBULL: Sir, I am hesitant to get involved in answering that question, but I do believe, Sir, that meetings that are held between any Minister of the Crown of any province of Manitoba, or the Federal Government with representatives of any industry which is producing, marketing, and distributing food, is beneficial to the people of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. During the discussions that were held with the Government of North Dakota, did the Government of Manitoba delegation, or any member of it, at any time raise the issue of the potential sale of Manitoba Hydro power to the State of North Dakota considering that it will lose significant energy resources as a result of the diversion project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there was no discussion with respect to any possible sale of hydro electric energy to the State of North Dakota; that did not arise. The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, merely demonstrates . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It is out of order..

MR. SCHREYER: . . . that there are those who are making assumptions that are far from proven, certainly far from quantified, and are merely opposing for the sake of opposing.

What we did discuss, Mr. Speaker, on Monday, was the manner in which we would continue to exchange information and arrangements for further scientific investigation so that we could develop a full appreciation of the potential impact of that diversion before we start to make definitive statements in favour or in opposition to.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Minister undertake to table in this House a copy of the Impact study conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation, and undertake hereafter to table all relevant meetings of the Monitoring Committee and relevant documents that they receive from that Bureau of Reclamation for the purview and observation of members of this House?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the material becomes available it can be arranged to have it available for scrutiny and perusal. However at this point in time, Sir, I certainly will not give a commitment for the widespread mimeographing, or shall I say reproducing and distribution of voluminous documentation. That, Sir, I will take as notice and under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond more fully to a question asked by the Honourable Member for Riel yesterday in relation to the school tax rebate, and I think it should be on the record for clarification. The rebate plan referred to by the Honourable Member for Riel appears to be the Education Property Tax Credit Plan which was implemented for the year 1972, so that no one can be eligible for credit for years previous to 1972 as the plan did not come into effect until the '72 taxation year. A person who has not filed a 1972 Income Tax Return may file a return and a tax credit application form for 1972 up to four years late, that is, within four years from the end of the year. Thus a 1972 return may be filed up to December 31, 1976, in accordance with Section 164 (1) of the Federal Income Tax Act.

A person who has already filed a 1972 return but did not file a 1972 Education Property Tax Credit application form may make a written request for an adjustment to his 1972 return. I indicated that it could be an amended return but I'm now informed that the Department of National Revenue does not like to have a second return but rather prefers a written request for an adjustment. Requests for adjustments should be directed to the District Taxation Office at 391 York Avenue, Winnipeg. And the request for an adjustment may be filed after four years after the end of the relevant year, as in the case of a new return.

Under the Education Property Tax Credit Plan tax credits were allowed on the basis of Education Property Tax paid. Since many senior citizens homes and nursing homes were exempt from school taxes, the residents of many of these homes were not eligible for credits in 1972. However with the expansion of the Property Tax Credit Plan for 1973 to include all municipal property taxes and not only school taxes, then residents of senior citizens homes and nursing homes in respect of which property taxes are paid will be eligible for tax credits for 1973.

I think that really clarifies the questions asked by the Member for Riel and points out the value of either taking as notice questions such as that, or the submission of questions such as that in advance to the Minister so that a fuller answer can be given, and properly given when a question is asked. So I'm sorry that I didn't take this question as notice as probably I should have done. I'm equally sorry the Member for Riel did not submit the question to me with notice so that I could have had an answer ready. Either way would have handled it better I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to a question from the Member for Fort Rouge. He asked a question with regard to bulk leasing of housing in Leaf Rapids. I now have an answer for him. In early 1973 accommodation at Leaf Rapids was at a premium and very little housing had been started. As a result the units were made available for transitional purposes until new construction could meet the demand, and a temporary arrangement with Sherritt-Gordon Mines was made whereby Sherritt-Gordon would guarantee rental payments and damages to any units which were allocated to their staff on a transitional basis, the same as done with some other companies that were building within Leaf Rapids at the time.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

As the situation eased a letter from MHRC on December 6th to the local housing authority was sent and as a result this practice was discontinued, and as of January 1st of this year all lease agreements have been signed with individual tenants rather than with the company, thus cancelling the lease agreements with the employees. I think that answers that question.

There was also a question from the Member for St. Boniface with regard to the Ambulatory Care Services at St. Boniface Hospital, and that was a little unclear. I read Hansard and I wasn't quite sure what the specific nature of the question was, but I'm reading into it that he was referring to a new Ambulatory Care Clinic that was opened - and he nods his head in affirmation - The Ambulatory Care facility began operation in September of 1973 and from the outset it was clearly understood that a comprehensive evaluation of the facility would be undertaken after six or eight months of operation with experience. It's expected that this evaluation will be in some time in April or maybe even March. The Manitoba Health Services Commission advises that from what the indications are that the Ambulatory Care Facility does appear to be functioning efficiently with respect to the number of patients that the facility was estimated to be able to serve and at this time in its development.

A third question, Mr. Speaker. The member for Rhineland asked the question with regard to nutritionists. I want to inform him that the Department of Health has a nutritionist on staff and the Manitoba Health Services Commission has the services of two nutritionists as consultants.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that we have no Canadian sugar policy and that we have to rely on the London daily market for pricing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I know that it's the tradition of this House not to be harsh on new members but that question is really based on an ignorance of the marketing situation with regards to sugar; and, Sir, on an ignorance of the impact that any government, and particularly a provincial government can have on such a commodity marketed on a world-wide scale as sugar is.

MR. BROWN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and just for the Minister's information this is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. BROWN: Now the question I would like to ask is this: Can the Minister confirm that it is the federal Liberal party that is, in spite of many requests by the beet growers, that has repeatedly refused to give Canada its own sugar policy?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply tempted to answer that question in the affirmative but, Sir, that is a matter, that question is a matter for the Federal Government and really is not properly addressed to me in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as Acting House Leader I wonder if you would go to Page 2 for Second Reading of Government Bills and have Bills Nos. 15, 16 and 17 introduced and then revert back to the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 15. The Honourable Attorney-General.

BILL NO. 15

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is in the main a technical bill, a bill which has been requested by the Courts. The bill would clarify the position and authority of the County Court Judges and that the Chief County Court Judge is a local Judge and a local master of the Queen's Bench. In judicial districts other than the Eastern Judicial District. The bill also clarifies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the conversations that are being conducted could be conducted elsewhere. Thank you. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: The bill also clarifies the position of other County Court Judges who are acting in judicial districts other than the one for which they were appointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON:(Sturgeon Creek): I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 16

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 16. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 16, an Act to amend The County Courts Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is also a bill which comes by way of request from the Chief County Court Judge. Under the proposed amendments to the County Courts Act, individuals wishing to appeal the decision rendered by a clerk in a small claims case would be able to do so before the clerk's decision is formally filed. This provides the appellant with additional time in which to formally prepare his appeal. At present an individual may appeal a clerk's decision within ten days of the filing of the decision. What we propose is to grant an individual additional time to launch that appeal by being able to do so before the decision is formally filed.

Other proposed amendments to the County Courts Act include allowing service of processes by certified mail in addition to registered mail. This is a result of some changes in post office procedure that now mail can be served by way of certifying it as well as the standard procedure of registering it. Clarification of the position and authority of the Chief County Court Judge and provision of a form of oath jointly applicable to both the Chief County Court Judge and other County Court Judges.

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

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

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 17, An Act to amend the Attorney-General's Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

BILL NO. 17

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, this comes by way of recommendation from the Attorney-General's office. At the present time lawyers acting from the Department of the Attorney-General in cases before the courts are not able to receive awards on behalf of the government of costs when they're successful in cases. If on the other hand they lose a case, award insofar as costs are concerned are delivered insofar as the opposite party is concerned. But insofar as those instances where a government paid lawyer represents a body other than the government itself - and I should clarify there where it says Department of Government, there has been no problem

## BILL 17

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . in this respect - but where persons and bodies would include the Provincial Municipal Assessor, the District Registrar, the Natural Products Marketing Board, among others, there is presently no provision for the collection of costs by the Crown in the event of success by the Crown in the proceedings that it has launched before the courts. It is only a fair and equitable means to ensure that costs are paid regardless of the outcome, whether it's in favour of the Crown or contrary to the proceedings launched by the Crown.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. KEN DILLEN (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to make a non-political announcement.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? The Honourable Member for Thompson.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. DILLEN: This weekend, Mr. Speaker, marks the beginning of the Manitoba Games - Northern Region in the City of Thompson, and I would just like to for the record give you the objectives and the purposes of these games.

Before any event of the magnitude of the Northern Games occurs there must be a great deal of sound planning. For the Manitoba Games - Northern Region, an Advisory Council, with members from all Northern Manitoba, was formed to determine the purpose of these Games.

The general purpose of the Manitoba Games is to develop a regional games concept, to allow for greater participation and interest in physical recreational activities in Manitoba. Specifically, the purpose of these Northern Games is to provide a Winter Games competition for the Northern Region of Manitoba. (That is all areas north of the 53rd parallel.)

But, what is the basic idea behind any Games concept? Could it have anything to do with trying to bring a multitude of people together to share experiences, to develop and strengthen mutual understandings and friendship? Could it also lead toward a stronger feeling of identity? (In the case of bringing together all communities in northern Manitoba.)

The pursuit of excellence and development of top calibre performance must be viewed as desirable outcomes and may in fact be more clearly in the focus of many others, but they most certainly are not the reasons for the existence of the Games event.

These Games, Manitoba Games, Northern Region, are identical in philosophy and objectives to any other existing Games, and I quote the Arctic Winter Games and the Canada Games that dissimilarity lies only in scope, size, available resources and last but not most important, regional differences and disparities.

Thirty of thirty-three communities of 100 people or more North of the 53rd parallel have participated in the development and the organization of these Northern Games and as a result of these communities meeting and expressing their concerns, their priorities and their needs, the Manitoba Games-Northern Region have taken shape and form.

The specific objectives of the games have been set down as the following: to stimulate interest and physical recreational activities at the local community level; to introduce new recreational activities to the local community which would appear to be consistent with the community environment; to expand, improve and add continuity to local recreational activities; to encourage participation and involvement and add a natural climax for winter physical recreational opportunities; to develop further programs based on interest created by these Northern Regional Games; and to provide an opportunity to discover athletes capable of advancing to higher levels in sports such as Provincial Games, Canada Games, Pan American Games, Commonwealth Games and Olympic Games.

The communities that are participating at the present time are Churchill, Cross Lake, Flin Flon, Garden Hill, Gillam, Grand Rapids, Leaf Rapids, Lynn Lake, Moose Lake, Norway House, Pikwitonei, Red Sucker Lake, Shamattawa, Snow Lake, Ste. Theresa Point, The Pas, Thompson, Wabowden and Wasagamach.

The events that are taking place are the Arts Borealis, which is an opportunity for the creative artists in the North to display their talents, and to encourage everybody who is

## ANNOUNCEMENT

(MR. DILLEN cont'd) . . . . observing to participate in some creative activity.

The Chairman of that event is - Chairlady, I should say - is Jean Clements. The archery event Chairman, Martin Munsters; volley ball, Bev Buhler; table tennis Chairman, Ken MacDonald; snowshoeing Chairman, Dave Stirling; broomball Chairman, Eugene Kiansky; cross-country skiing Chairman, Fred Hartman. And an event that's bound to get international recognition is the trapsetting event, where the traps - if I could explain this a little further - are all placed into a gunny sack and on a given signal the competitor picks up the sack of traps and empties it; the competitor sets the traps in the shortest time possible, and each trapsetter goes alone and the fastest time wins. Six traps will be used for the trapsetting competition designed for a weasel, mink, lynx, beaver and mice.

The speed skating event Chairman, Bea Faickney; target shooting Chairman, Jim Wessell; badminton Chairman, Gary Smith.

One significance of this event, Mr. Speaker, is that the medals that will be introduced-- and I'd like to point out that the mining companies were very much involved in preparing the medals for these Games, and they are very fortunate in having truly unique medals which will be presented to the athletes. This uniqueness comes about in that they represent four major mining companies located in northern Manitoba. The first place medal will be made of nickel; second place of copper; and a third place of zinc. These medals represent the mining industry in northern Manitoba. The four companies involved are the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, Manitoba Division; Manibridge Mines Limited; Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Limited and Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited. Each has contributed to the cost of striking the medals which will run close to \$1,500.00. The medals will be made at Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta, a part of the total operation of Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited. The actual medallion will be 37 mm in diameter, and on the back will be the logo of each mining company contributing to the cost of the medals, and on the face of the medallion will be the logo of the Manitoba Games, crossed snowshoes with a clasped hand. The ribbon upon which the medals will hang around the athlete's neck will be coloured Northern Games yellow to complement the overall Games colour scheme of yellow and black.

I have with me, Mr. Speaker, Booster badges that I would like now to have distributed to all of the members of the House, and I'd hope that you will join with me and the City of Thompson, the host city, in wishing all of the committees and the participants a successful event and good sportsmanship, and on their behalf I invite you all to attend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, let me concur with the honourable member's comments re his good wishes for the Northern Games in Manitoba, and certainly we from our side, as I'm sure do all the members of the House, wish the host city well in their ability to carry out these Games and the participants every success in the actual participation of these Games.

Mr. Speaker, I may point out to you, and it's not by way of criticism to the honourable member, that there are of course, or he might have been advised of other occasions to give us this very helpful and understanding insight into what the Northern Games are all about; one comes to mind of course perhaps the Estimates of the Department of Tourism and Recreation, which undoubtedly has some input into these games. However, that's I think just a question of House privilege that perhaps can be considered in the future with respect to these kind of games. I do that without detracting at all from our thankfulness for the member's very detailed description of what is about to take place in Northern Manitoba, and we the Official Opposition certainly wish them every success in the next few weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to say a few words in respect to the Northern Games. I want to associate our Party with what the Member for Thompson has just said, and extend our best wishes to the committee and to the people in Northern Manitoba for expressing our greetings for Northern Games.

I do believe that the Northern Games, as was mentioned, will not only create interest to Northern Manitoba, but it will create perhaps interest that people will be able to participate in physical education, and that there perhaps will be greater participation by many people in different forms of recreation and physical participation. I hope that the games will develop more programs in respect to physical education. I believe that this form of participation should be

## ANNOUNCEMENT

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . expanded to what we have at the present time, because it's not too long ago, only a few years back, the Canadian athletes participating in the Commonwealth Games had very difficult times in winning any medals, would perhaps win one or two gold, and only just the past few months when the Canadian athletes finished participating in the last Commonwealth Games, they came back with something like 25 golds. So this is an indication - and the reason for this is, it's only in the last few years, in the last ten years or so that governments, provincially and federally, have started to give some consideration and some financial assistance to programs concerning physical education. I think it has been updated in schools and I don't want to take any time, but I do wish to associate myself with the remarks that's been said to the House here by the Member for Thompson, and I want to wish the people up north the best in their activities in Northern Games.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have proceeded on this matter by leave. It is not a debatable subject. We have had representation from the recognized groups and therefore I cannot recognize any further. We are now on the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading of Bills, Government Bills. Bill No. 7. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. (Stand) The Honourable Member for Crescentwood have a point of order or something?

CORRECTION- HANSARD

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): A point of correction, Mr. Chairman. I would like to refer you to Hansard, the 2:30 p. m. sitting of February 27th, Page 879. About two inches from the bottom of the page, it is shown there as Mr. Patrick making - or, I'm sorry the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, making a statement which I actually made and I would like Hansard to show that it was myself that made it. Because the Honourable Member for Assiniboia may not wish to speak of his Leader in those terms. I know we don't look alike because he's got muscles where I haven't even thought of having them yet, but apparently we sound alike at the end of the microphone. So I would like to have that corrected, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Correction shall be noted. Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

A MEMBER: Bill No. 7 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I asked for Bill No. 7. It was asked to stand. Bill No. 18. Stand?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the bill standing in the name of the honourable member who took the adjournment yesterday, but I wonder if any other member may wish to make a contribution to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL NO. 7

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on this bill, and I thank the Minister for bringing up the fact that if somebody else would care to carry on while it stands in the member's name . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will entertain that form of procedure with one caveat - that no amendments are introduced, otherwise we get into a complex of - how can you make - can we agree to that. --(Interjection)--Very well. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of presenting an amendment to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with real interest to this particular bill for, I guess it's close to three weeks now, and the debate on both sides has been very interesting and it boils down I think on the government side of saying that they want to make first-class citizens out of the people who work for our government in Manitoba, our civil servants. I have never really felt that they weren't first-class citizens, and quite frankly I think they believe they are under the way the present Act is. It's always very surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, why this government continues to push things onto people. We have had many previous occasions when the majority, or even when it was even-even, or even very close their way, where you would think that they would stop and have more consideration for the people that they are dealing with and not push the legislation through, but this government seems to continue all the time to push things onto people when there is an indication they don't really want it.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion - in fact there's pretty factual information that the civil servants are very, very pleased, the majority of them, the way that Act reads at the present time. And I think all of us, Mr. Speaker, when we have been canvassing in our constituencies in elections, and I think we are the ones that are probably close to this matter

## BILL 7

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . more than anybody, the government members and the Minister of Labour who has canvassed for many, many years should know it better than anybody else. When you call at a civil servant's home when you're canvassing you are very welcome; we know that he has the right to vote as he pleases and he also says, you realize I am a civil servant, and he says I do not want to participate or I cannot participate actively in politics. The fact that he says I do not want to, most of the time says that I want it the way it is. It's better for me that way. I go in, I do my job, I do it well. I'm there, there's nothing in the way of promotion, there's no indication that I would favour one government over another. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is knowledge among the Civil Service about who may support what party or not support what party, but they have a protection at the present time. They really do have something that puts them in the position of saying, I'm very proud to be able to do my job the way I want to and the legislation as it now stands helps me do it that way.

But the government continues to push, so you have to wonder why, you know, when somebody wants something and they find out that there may not be a real consensus among the people this will really affect, you wonder, you have to say, if that's the case, if that's the case this government or whoever's pushing for it, or ramming it down peoples' throats, must have possibly an ulterior motive. I'm not in the position to say whether they have or they haven't but that certainly is the indication one gets when that type of a situation arises.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what favour is being done to the civil servant when you say you are going to put this bill through to make him a first-class citizen. You know, I, in my own vocation, I'm a manufacturer's agent, I represent different companies, Sir, and the companies I represent have every right to say to me Mr. Johnston we would be disappointed if you got too entangled in political involvement in Manitoba, we would prefer that our men that are calling on companies would not express their politics or make their politics too well known, because after all, we are not wanting to have political confrontation with anybody, we would prefer to not have it that way. And they have every right to do that, every right; the same as the government has every right to have the legislation as it is now, that you would not want the employees to be in political confrontation for the benefit of themselves and for the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

What benefits are we going to give to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, if when public or civil servants now decide that they want, or can, or lose this wonderful protection that they have; what happens when they - and this has been said before in the debate and we have to keep saying it because the Minister and the government will not recognize it's a problem - what is going to be said when you didn't work for the government or what is going to be said when you hadn't worked for the party that wins?

When a civil servant, Mr. Speaker, joins this Civil Service, I think every man is ambitious and wants to go to the top of the ladder; and the top of the ladder with the civil servants, Sir, is usually a Deputy Minister. What real potential has somebody that has now, in a position of making their politics known, other than with the party he's made it known with. What real potential or what real desire will a person have to be a hard working civil servant when he knows there's a possibility that he cannot get to the top if he does his work well? Mr. Speaker, I don't think the civil servants deserve to be working in an area of that type. We have legislation at the present time that takes him away from that and gives him the opportunity for advancement.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the other areas that have been brought up, of the accumulation of problems that can arise from this bill, such as a man going out - and I think it was brought up, I was not here, by the Honourable Member from St. James, speaking to him after his speech about it, being a bagman. No I wasn't here when he made his speech about the man, you know, you decide that you're going out to become a candidate and if you don't happen to make it as a candidate, or get the nomination of a party, you can't say to him then come back and stay out of it, because he has the right to run as an independent, he has the right to run as whatever he wants to. But I think you should consider the fact that if he hasn't got a nomination then he certainly is not going to run as an independent, he should then get back to work and stay out of it and I think he would prefer it that way.

I don't know why the government is pushing this. We have had all of us, as I said, the situations when we have been canvassing, and I think when we have been canvassing as candidates running for the Legislature of Manitoba, we have always been very proud of the attitudes taken by civil servants in the Province of Manitoba. We have always been able to go along and

## BILL 7

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . say you know, we have a good situation here with our civil servants, and you say they are second-class citizens. I say that we have given them some protection that is very valuable to them and should not be taken away.

Mr. Speaker, the other accumulations of a person being a bagman - you know, this could relate all the way down the line; the many civil servants who are involved with calling on people for inspection of premises, licensing, all of these things will now become under suspicion if a person has really declared himself to the support of any one party publicly. Why ask for the trouble it will bring, Mr. Speaker. Why ask for the American system in Manitoba? And that's what you've done; you've created a situation where after an election if the government changes, the dogcatcher changes, and that's just the way it is in many parts of the United States. And you are going to create that situation in Canada, and I can understand it being created by this government, in fact I can't remember the area of it, I can remember the section, page 144 of the famous book that I have of "Douglas in Saskatchewan", you know - there's no question, read it sometime, where it was very, you know, all the big election going on, we're going to straighten the Civil Service out, we're going to have an honest Civil Service. And he poured people in there by the carloads of NDP, and where he really had the Civil Service mounted up. That was written by somebody else you know, a Mr. Ayre. The government doesn't like it when somebody else criticizes the NDP, you know. We find this with the Minister of Agriculture who believes that we've been degraded in this House because we have the audacity to challenge him, you know. It all depends whose ox is being gored, so when I say Mr. Ayre wrote the book and he had the audacity to say something bad about the NDP - I could be corrected, but I think if we look it up in the library and I went over it, I firmly believe, and I could be corrected, somewhere in the Regina Manifesto it refers to all civil servants should be ones that agree with the government. It's not in so many words but I'm pretty sure it's there. --(Interjection)--I certainly will--(Interjection)--no I don't have it here; I don't carry that around very close to me at any given time, because I get a very bad feeling when I have things like that around me.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has pretty well now known that they want to know, they want to know what the political stripe is of a civil servant. That's really the obvious thing that's happening here, and because we've had a good Civil Service in Manitoba, and because there has been this marvellous protection that we have given them, they have to eliminate it because they can't find out what the political stripe of a civil servant is. And you know what's going to happen, when somebody doesn't work for them they're not an NDP and if somebody does they are, and it's fairly obvious that the NDP government, generally and socialistic governments generally, do promote within their own party and they believe in that fact. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it's often been said in this House - by the government - you can work with somebody much easier if you happen to know how he thinks, and so now you're going to know how he thinks politically. --(Interjection)--Well what about the judges, what about the judges - do you want the judges to go out and canvass, does the Member from Ste. Rose want the judges to campaign for him? Does he really want to say or infer that the judges make decisions one way or another because of political thinking? Am I hearing myself right, Mr. Speaker?

You know, I'm sorry that kind of an insinuation is made, because that's just another proof that they want to know the political stripe of somebody, for promotion sake. --(Interjection)--Yes and isn't it - again the Minister of Agriculture thinks it terrible, just terrible if somebody would have the audacity to contradict his cocky, childish, ill-mannered way of handling himself in the House, and I might say all other things undisciplined children should be accused of.

Mr. Speaker, the method behind this is to have the government know the political thinking of the civil servants for more promotion or promotion within the Civil Service, and I remember the debate last year at the time the Honourable Member from Morris brought up the little red tab if you were NDP and the little green tab, you know, if you were something else, and the little blue tab if you were something else, and that speech is in Hansard and it came from a memo that had come from a government employee at that time. --(Interjection)--Well I certainly will look it up for you, it's there. They want to really have red tabs and green tabs on everybody so they will know how they vote, so they will know what to do when promotions come along. So, Mr. Speaker, the message is there and if the Minister of Labour just once more stands up and says he's going to make first class citizens out of our civil servants, I say to him his favourite word "poppycock". He knows he's going to do it. He's going to do it and he's going to sit and to tell me that they're not first class citizens now because you say the legislation as

## BILL 7

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . it is is not good for them. I say the legislation as it is is what they want and is good for them and makes them better civil servants. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate shall remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell (Stands). Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7 (a). The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. The honourable member has eight minutes.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, last evening when I was making my observations on the Department of Agriculture and the Minister's salary, I commented that I was distressed by the Minister's statement, although there seemed to be some evidence to support it, about the quality and the level of politics, and he had used the term I believe - I'm not sure what it was but it implied dirty politics because of the kind of accusation that was being made. Mr. Chairman, we had an example of exactly what the Minister complained about just a few moments ago in the Chamber when opposition, and I'm referring to myself, spokesman questioned government actions to try to elicit information and was greeted by insult, greeted by personal name-calling, and treated to accusations of a personal nature. Mr. Chairman, we've tried, as we see our duty whether it's the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Social Development, or whatever it may be, to ignore the personalities of the people the Ministers, or the people who--Mr. Chairman, I hear standing in the Chamber the Minister of Finance asking for it again. Uttering things that are intended to provoke, intended to give the kind of response that that kind of thing must necessarily lead to.

The Minister of Social Development a few moments ago said that to try to elicit information amounted - or to uncover things that government would be happier not having uncovered - amounts to muckraking. Mr. Chairman, let me say this that there can be no muckraking if there's no muck. And, Mr. Chairman, no one in this Party, in the Liberal Party, has ever in this Chamber or outside this Chamber made an accusation of a personal nature against any member opposite.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance continues his calling out of invective or insult, and I can only ignore him because it eats into the time that I have to comment on the department's estimates.

Mr. Chairman, let it just be said that if the opposition, members on this side, didn't do what we think has to be done then a very substantial number of things of interest to the public, the public and its right to know, would not ever come out. It wouldn't have been known, and I'm speaking only of the last three weeks, unless we had asked and elicited the information that three companies financed by the Government of Manitoba had gone broke. And that is of public interest, Mr. Chairman. It wouldn't have been known that in one case the government had an opportunity to bail out of a financial . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I wonder if the - I'm trying to allow the member as much latitude as possible but we're not under the Manitoba Development Corporation we're under the Department of Agriculture, and I think that the honourable member knows the rules well enough that we try to keep on the department that . . .

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I was only using these examples in the light of the Minister's comment when he introduced his estimates.

The point I make is that in spite of any insult, in spite of the name calling, and in spite of any abuse that members on this side have to take when they try to do their job, we intend to

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. ASPER cont'd) . . . . continue, and we will not be intimidated by any accusations--and I must say that in this debate I was astounded that members of the Conservative Party sat quietly and heard the Minister accuse them - for all I know, I don't know if it's true or not - but I saw no response from the Conservative Party when the Minister accused them of attempting to elicit information on the hog contract designed not to help the people of Manitoba in any significant way but rather in effect I think he was saying, to help people in the meat packing industry or people whose interests were adverse to the farmers of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I want to hear some response to that because--(Interjection)--Mr. Chairman, I find it regrettable, I find it unfortunate that that issue can't be resolved because as I said last night I'm a layman to this kind of economy, the rural economy. But I, as a Manitoban and as a representative of the people of my riding, I want to know who's right on this issue. If the Minister has a case, I would like to hear it, and I would like to hear more from the Conservative Party spokesman on that issue.--(Interjection)--

Mr. Chairman, going to the issues that I raised last evening and I want to continue with, while I say I personally feel an inadequacy on the specific product of the agricultural community and their marketing, I do feel I have some contribution to make to the larger issue of the general rural economy within which the farming community works. Mr. Chairman, I said that the unfortunate thing about the Minister's role is that constitutionally in statutory terms he does not have in his department the authority to do the things that we look to his department to do, and yet there's no other department that we can look to. And so we have to ask the Minister to go to his colleagues and ask them, as the Minister responsible for the rural and the agricultural community of this province, to implement policy which will make it possible for him to be able to function and the farm communities to be able to survive. And I began by saying let's first go to the cost of communication. And that can be accomplished by having the Manitoba Telephone System begin a phase-out program so that the cost of communication for rural, the farmers and the people in rural communities will be eliminated and they will be put on a par with the people in the City of Winnipeg. And that can only be done by a gradual phasing out of long distance telephone toll charges, particularly as it automates the system and therefore no extra charge becomes apparent in implementing that policy.

I called for the change of the name of the department so that it would signify something far greater than just farming. The department should be called the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development so that its commitment to that area becomes a publicly seen thing.

I would also call for the department to physically be relocated as a demonstration of the commitment of this government to redistribute and decentralize economic opportunity and career opportunities throughout the province. One of the ways that can be done is if a department such as the Department of Agriculture moves physically and puts its head office and its deputy minister out in farm country, out in rural Manitoba. That would be a demonstrable exhibition of this government's oft stated commitment to make rural Manitoba economically viable.

We called, and we asked this Minister to go to his colleagues and ask for implementation for a complete revamping of the Manitoba Development Corporation to become an effective tool in rural redevelopment. Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Development Corporation is a very contentious body in government but one thing that I think we can agree on is that it has failed . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I couldn't resist the invitation extended by the Leader of the Liberal Party to comment on something that he said the Conservative Party had not replied to, charges that were made by the Minister of Agriculture. If he'd been listening to his own colleague when he spoke on the Speech from the Throne he wailed bitterly because the Conservative Party had dealt with hogs in this House a lot more than they'd dealt with any other issue. And I would think that the Leader of the Liberal Party should on occasion consult with some of his colleagues in order to get their information straight.

Sir, the Minister in introducing his estimates started out on a very high plane but the atmosphere there was too rarified for him and he's not used to that kind of an atmosphere. It wasn't long before he wallowed in the gutter and has remained there ever since.

But I'd like to talk for just a moment on his observations with regard to the world situation. And there's no question that in the past few years it has changed dramatically from one

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . of surpluses to one of scarcity. And it should be pointed out that the scarcities have been created to a large extent by the imposition with that nostrum of the socialist of supply-management in the agricultural industry. And, Sir, wherever that has been applied it has proven disastrous. It has resulted in the destruction of the incentive of producers to produce. And I am a little bit alarmed with what I read in the Speech from the Throne from Ottawa where they say they're going to provide incentives for the producers to produce. That to me, Sir, simply means that we're going to have further shortages of food if the government in Ottawa are going to become more and more involved in agriculture. It's one industry that admittedly suffered its problems over the years, but those problems have never been a shortage of the ability of farmers to produce food till the government steps in. Now we are faced with the spectre of starvation across this world as a result of, as I said, the application of supply-management across the world.

We'll say however that the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa during his recent sojourn to Rome to attend the FAO Conference did make a statement that I wholeheartedly agree with, a statement that indicated that Canada over the past number of years has assumed the responsibility of paying for the storage of 45 percent of the world's surplus wheat, a burden that should never have been placed on the producers of this country. And, Mr. Whelan's suggestion was that if the world wants a stockpile of food, then they must be prepared to pay for the cost of storing. A reasonable suggestion. The record does not show just to what extent that suggestion was accepted by the Food and Agriculture Conference in Rome, but it's one that we should be working towards because it becomes manifestly obvious that the producers of this country are not going to assume the responsibility of producing the food and then having produced it, bear the burden of the cost of keeping it until somebody wants it. It seemed to me that this should be, if indeed we assume that it's an international responsibility to ensure that the people of the world get fed, then it's an international responsibility for the people of the world to pay for the cost of storing food when it is needed, because we're going to run across those situations from time to time. Indeed, Sir, the occasions when there's going to be famines in this world are going to be a great deal more than the occasions when there are going to be surpluses, and we should start to prepare to take care of those situations.

The Minister however lapsed into his usual role of blaming the opposition for all the problems that beset their government. That's a familiar refrain that we hear from the Minister all the time. And I want to commend to him a speech that was made in this Legislature - oh some time ago - and he should really listen to the words of one of his colleagues: The Minister keeps accusing us of criticizing his government and criticizing those who he appoints in positions of authority.

MR. USKIW: That's bad. That's bad.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well now I'm glad the Minister said that that's bad because it gives me the opportunity of elaborating on that particular point. Never before has a Minister of the Crown in this province, or to my knowledge elsewhere, placed people in positions of authority, given them the right, indeed I suspect instructed them, to make statements of a political nature, to make statements that should be left to the Minister to make, and then come to us and cry that we are criticizing his officials. If you're going to place your officials on the firing line then I suggest to the Minister that he can expect to get those officials shot at.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . if he is going to. If the Minister will assume the responsibility of a Minister, as he should, and place himself on the firing line, defend his civil servants - you know there was always a great deal of criticism that was leveled at the late Jimmy Gardiner as Minister of Agriculture, but there was one thing that I always respected Jimmy Gardiner for, not once would he allow an official of his department to be placed in the compromising position of having to make statements that the Minister could hide behind. Not once. If there were statements to be made he made them himself. He didn't ask his officials to take the burden of the responsibility for making statements on those things that were unpopular, or those things that the Minister felt he might get some criticism for, and then come out publicly and say you cannot criticize my civil servants. Well, the Minister has asked a question and I will reply. It wasn't very long ago that Mr. Craddock, made a statement, and I want to deal with that a little bit later. And in the meantime--(Interjection)--well, if the Minister will just contain his sole impatience I will come to it.

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

Mr. Craddock made a statement in a letter, public letter that he sent to the press, in which he dealt with an advertisement that the government, that the Minister had placed in the newspapers. And by sheer coincidence and you know the Minister of Agriculture has a habit, has a tendency to assume that the facts of a given situation just happen to coincide with his conception of that situation. But in his advertisement on rapeseed, Mr. Craddock took issue with it, and pointed out some glaring inaccuracies in the advertisement. Coincidentally, Mr. Craddock had been scheduled to appear at his Outlook Conference. Well, there's just no way that the Minister is going to allow someone who dares to criticize him be a speaker at an Outlook Conference, but he didn't have the guts to tell Mr. Craddock himself, the statement that was issued was issued by his deputy.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): . . . submit evidence to the effect that I had anything to do with the arrangements of the Outlook Conference.

MR. JORGENSEN: If my honourable friend will just . . .

MR. USKIW: If he has something to submit, let him submit it now.

MR. JORGENSEN: If my honourable friend will contain his sole impatience, we'll get to it. In a Press Release of January 10, 1974, Mr. Janssen who happens to be the Minister's deputy said this: "There's no truth to Professor Craddock's claim. He said the professor's statement was totally uncalled for." And, you know, there was going to be - "there's no justification for the statement that he was taken off the Conference" - and that's what he was referring to - "that he was taken off the speaker's roster at that Conference because of the letter that he wrote to the press. No justification for that at all." The Minister nods his head. I presume that that is in agreement.

But in the very next line, the Deputy Minister said this: "I think the department will be very hesitant about asking him to speak again." And the Minister says, provide us with the evidence. The Minister says . . . or . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. USKIW: The honourable member has not submitted one shred of evidence that would indicate that I gave any instructions as far as the arrangements for Outlook, the Outlook Conference is concerned, and he is implying that I did. I ask that he submit the evidence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . honourable member . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: We have a number of things that have happened to the Minister - I will give him some evidence. A year or so ago we were discussing the question of farm labour, and a statement that the Minister made to a Farm Bureau meeting here in Winnipeg. The Minister took violent exception to the article that appeared in the Free Press on this particular issue, and said it was a terrible thing because he was misquoted: "Low Cost Help Out". Well, I took the liberty, as I told him on that occasion, I took the liberty of phoning the Farm Bureau and asking them how far out was the press report. I was told by those who were there that the statement coincided reasonably accurately with the statement that was contained in the press.

MR. USKIW: That's not true.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, the Minister says it's not true. Does the Minister deny that he phoned the people at the Farm Bureau and told them to write a letter to the press repudiating that statement?

MR. USKIW: If the honourable member wishes me to answer him, I'm prepared to answer.

MR. JORGENSEN: Does the Minister deny that? Because he did. And that's a characteristic of the Minister. When the issue of Mr. Bole's loan in the Swan River area came out, the same Minister tried to get him to write a letter to bail him out . . .

A MEMBER: You're darn right.

A MEMBER: Terrible.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . succeeded in getting somebody else, Mr. McKay to write a letter - that's his favourite technique when he gets into difficulty.

A MEMBER: Everybody's writing letters for the Minister.

MR. JORGENSEN: He read another one in the House the other day. Well, we can't prove, Sir, but we sure can speculate as to the kind of arm twisting that goes on in that Minister's office because we've seen evidence of it . . .

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . not only on one occasion but on many occasions.

Well, Sir, he says that if we criticize the government everything in the agricultural industry is going to collapse. What a joke!

I want to read a statement that was put on the record on Page 1095 of Hansard, February 14th, 1967. It says this: "But what I do object to, and what I object to strongly, is his inability to have confidence in the democratic process,"--this was referring to a Minister of the Crown--"because what he seems to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that if this province is to make progress, the Opposition must abdicate its responsibility to its electorate, and to not criticize the government, but to attempt to create an illusion that everything is rosy. He feels that democracy and the economic progress of this particular province is dependent upon half the members of this House, or nearly half the members of this House, silencing themselves as to how they feel about what is going on. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the basic flaw in this government's thinking. We have confidence, Sir, and I for one have confidence in the democratic process. I say that if there is a strong province and there is a strong economy that a responsible Opposition can criticize the government as much as it sees fit and the province will continue to be strong."

A MEMBER: Hear, hear. Who said that?

MR. JORGENSEN: "Its economy will continue to be strong. It'll have a bright, economic future. But if the economic future depends on people on this side of the House keeping quiet when they see something wrong in this province, then, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government has misconstrued its purpose, and misconstrued the purpose of every member of this House, and that is my most criticism of the kind of talk that we're getting out of this government." Sir, those words were put on the record by the now Minister of Mines and Resources. And I commend them to the Minister of Agriculture. He suggests that we should, that we should silence ourselves.--(Interjection)--Oh no, he says. No. Stick to the truth. Well, as I said, his idea of the facts do not necessarily coincide with our ideas of the facts, or anybody else's idea of the facts. They certainly didn't coincide with Mr. Craddock's idea of the facts.

A MEMBER: Or the rapeseed growers.

MR. JORGENSEN: Or the rapeseed growers, or a lot of other people. Who is right? Does the Minister think that in his omnipotence that he only has the facts? He has them as far as he knows them, because as I say, he has a tendency to assume that the facts are what his conception of them are, and there's a heck of a difference between that and the real facts. Sir, the Minister invites constructive criticism. Sir, that's one of the catch phrases of the day - constructive criticism. Anybody who asks, who insists on constructive criticism is asking for nothing more than unqualified praise, and, Sir, on no occasion can members of this House accuse the Minister of not being able to praise himself. He does a commendable job of that in his own behalf. We come to some of the referendums that have been taking place in the last few weeks. He had a great deal to say about the rapeseed referendum. What a terrible thing this was, an imposition on the producers of rapeseed.

MR. USKIW: . . . undemocratic rules.

MR. JORGENSEN: Undemocratic rules, Mr. Minister says; it's undemocratic to have a vote as far as the Minister is concerned. I suppose that the imposition, I suppose that the imposition of a Hog Marketing Board on the producers of this province, in spite of the fact that in convention assembled they voted against the imposition of a Hog Marketing Board. That thought never occurred to the Minister, and when I confronted him with this situation last year, he said, "Oh! That resolution wasn't forwarded on to me." He happened to be at the meeting, he happened to be at the meeting, but it wasn't forwarded on to him. What an oversight! What an oversight on the part of the Pork Producers Association that . . .--(Interjection)--Now you see, we have an example of what I've been accusing the Minister of . . .

A MEMBER: We're all out of step but Sam.

MR. JORGENSEN: We have a perfect example in that statement he has just made. He now sloughs off his responsibility on the executive of the Pork Producers Association. That is characteristic of what the Minister does every time he gets into trouble. Somebody else is to blame. Sir, it's the mark of a weak Minister.

A MEMBER: That's right. You'd better believe it.

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. JORGENSEN: On the rapeseed referendum, he attempts to justify, he attempts to justify that which cannot be justified, by using taxpayers' money, to impose his will on the people of this province, the rapeseed growers of this province. Sir, I ask you, is there any difference in using the taxpayers' money to place in the newspapers an advertisement encouraging farmers to support the Wheat Board system of marketing their crops? Is there any difference in principle in placing an ad of this nature in one of our farm newspapers - and it was very conveniently and very appropriately in red - is there any difference there in using the taxpayers' money for that purpose than using the taxpayers' money . . . at least by saying, come out in the next election? We're going to take the money to run our campaign, that is the NDP campaign, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; the other political parties can scratch up their own money. --(Interjection)--I don't want . . .

A MEMBER: . . . Neither do I.

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't want my money to get elected coming from the taxpayers.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear. Hear, hear.

MR. JORGENSEN: They're being burdened enough as it is. (Applause) The Minister can, and I suspect he will do it, because there is no difference in principle using taxpayers' money to put this sort of an ad in the paper than there is using the taxpayers' money to get himself elected. Promoting his own ideology.

Well, the Minister says "payola system". You know, we're getting a little used to the Minister's statements. You know, Sir, there was a time in the farming communities after the Wheat Board system became operative, there was a time when you could go across this country and if you dared to mention one single word in opposition to the Canadian Wheat Board, my God, that was a sacred cow that you couldn't touch. Not one single word of criticism, regardless of the fact or regardless if the Wheat Board were doing things wrong . . .

A MEMBER: You helped destroy it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Oh! The Minister credits me with unusual powers, and I'm flattered, I'm flattered by the suggestion that I have enough influence that I can destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. I wish I could destroy - I wish I had enough influence to destroy the Minister because he's done more damage than anything else I've ever known to the agriculture industry. (Applause)

But I tell, you, Sir, but I tell you, Sir, that that will not work any more. The farmers of this province, or the farmers of this country have now had a number of years experience with the Canadian Wheat Board, they know its limitations. They know first of all that it is not the salvation to all their problems. If it was, then tell me, Sir, why was it in the years '69, '70 and '71, why was it in those years prices were disastrously low? We had the Canadian Wheat Board at that time. Nobody has ever assumed in the Board themselves that they had the power, or the responsibility of creating a heaven on earth in the agricultural industry. They had a responsibility for marketing, and that's all. So don't try to assume or get people to believe that - the Minister keeps tripping from his seat. He seems to be disturbed, and I wonder why. It's characteristic of him. He loves it when he can spout from a platform from which nobody can reply, as he does at the Outlook Conferences, . . . where there is . . .

A MEMBER: Political grandstand.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . where there is no opportunity for somebody to engage in debate. But from his seat in the Chamber, he chirps, and he offers no answer to the questions that are raised from this side of the House; he offers no rebuttal to the charges that are made from this side of the House, other than to hide behind his own civil servants. That's his favourite technique, Sir, and he's done it time after time.

But in the question of marketing boards. The Minister should know by now there's a great deal more to solving the problems of the agriculture industry than simply having a marketing board, a great deal more. But he continues to peddle this nonsensical nostrum that if we only have the marketing board, your problems are over. It has never solved the problems of agriculture, and never will. Indeed, Sir, in Great Britain, who are the pioneers of the marketing board system, they don't have any left at all; they kicked them all out because they were incapable of dealing with the problems; they have a better way of doing things.

The Minister talks about how forward thinking he is, the great progressive. Well, I tell you, Sir, any Minister who has discovered the use of carrier pigeons as a breakthrough in communications technology is a Minister that is really suffering from some sort of reincarnation.

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

A MEMBER: Yeah, but Warner it provided a change of diet for them . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, the first - well, that's a fact - but the first thing we're going to hear from the Minister now is that up in those remote communities he'll be inventing smoke signals with the Indians. And that, Sir, is the kind of technology that the Minister intends to impose on the people of this province.

A MEMBER: Is he going to get a Clean Environment permission license?

MR. JORGENSEN: He's got a great idea of how the problems of the rural community can be solved. Sir, he's wrong.

A MEMBER: Dead wrong.

MR. JORGENSEN: And we say he's wrong, and we'll continue to say he's wrong, because he has been proven wrong in almost everything that he has ever attempted. He suggests that the increase in the budget of the Department of Agriculture is an indication of progress. Sir, it is not, because if there is anything that's ever been proved in agriculture, is that the more money that a government spends in agriculture, the worse off the farmers get and that has been, and that has been his philosophy. And most of his programs work at cross purposes, most of them, they work at cross purposes. For example, he sets up a feed grain marketing commission to help, to ostensibly help farmers and then he puts in a farm diversification program. He does it without recognizing that the two are counter-productive. --(Interjection)-- Well the Minister says they're not at all - you know, that's an opinion that he expresses, and because he expresses that opinion the rest of us should fall in line. I disagree with the Minister. I disagree with the Minister, and I have a right to voice that disagreement with the Minister without him assuming that because he thinks so, that I am wrong - and he'd better get that through his thick skull because facts I have learned, or so-called facts, coming from that Minister are not facts at all--(Interjection)-- fantasies. The Minister is a slave to his own ideology, and he can't see beyond that. He assumes that because of the application of socialist philosophy to agriculture, it's going to solve all the problems. Sir it will not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member's time has elapsed. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I was asked by a couple of members opposite if I was going to make my annual contribution to the agricultural debate and three minutes should be long enough because really what did the Member for Morris say in his 20 minutes? The only thing he said is that he was against supply-management and I, on this side, would like to agree with him. If all marketing meant was supply-management, I would agree with him, because really that is what it is all about, it is marketing; control of supply is only one component of it. During the Agricultural Committee Meetings over the past four or five years, it was interesting to note that on the Task Force Report of the Liberal Government in Ottawa on Page 9 of that report, not away back after they had looked at the alternatives, but on Page 9, they had negated looking at what the Member for Morris is now suggesting that we look towards, is the national government, or the people of Canada, or perhaps even the world, picking up the cost of insuring an adequate supply of agricultural products. I would concur with the Member for Morris when he talks about ideology though, I mean, it's interesting to see the slight shift because in all of his speech all he said, Mr. Chairman, was that he is against supply-management. All of his attacks on the Minister were geared to that one point - hog marketing, or whatever, and the support of people who would attack the Minister on their bias against hog marketing, he will support.

But, Mr. Chairman, as a representative of an urban constituency, and I think people will bear me out on this, that I have consistently said that the farmer is entitled to a fair return for his investment in labour, and I will continue to support that. There is an additional problem that we have to help those people to insure that they have an adequate diet - the people on the lower end of the scale we have to help with the increased cost of production. But it was pointed out by the Member for Ste. Rose last night when questioned, you know how do you solve the problem of short supply, once again the farmer has to make sure that his labour and investment is going to bear fruit.

I, as one member of an urban constituency will support the Minister of Agriculture because really it is all in our own self-interest to strengthen the rural economy, and to do this we have to get rid of that idea of just supply and management because the corporate entity, such as Ogilvies and all the other ones - I remember the debate when it took place awhile back that

## SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . . all Ogilvies wanted to do was to get 100 brood sows, they just wanted to start a small operation in the Province of Manitoba, and the Minister was attacked at that time for being opposed to that idea because the large corporations wanted to control the supply, but they wanted to control the supply in the same way that they are controlling oil today. If you look at the profit picture of some of the oil companies this is how they control their supply, not in the interests of the people but in the interest of the corporations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 12:30 I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.