

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 4, 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 some visiting students in the city under the Winnipeg Jaycees Student Exchange Program. There are 10 students from Quebec City, Quebec; 10 students from Moncton, New Brunswick. They are accompanied by 10 students from Daniel McIntyre Collegiate and 10 from Gordon Bell School of Winnipeg who are their hosts. These students are accompanied by Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Billows from the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and are the guests of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

We also have 60 students of Grade 11 standing of Churchill High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sabeski and Mr. Morton. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne and the Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

And there are 80 students Grade 7 standing of the Elmwood High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Joffansson, Mr. McAlpine, Mr. Gus Bodarchuk and Mr. Gulezewski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works.

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.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if he can indicate to the House what the current situation is in connection with negotiations between the City of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg City Police Force and the potential of withdrawal of services or a strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Executive Committee of the City of Winnipeg met this morning following the issuance of a statement by the solicitor for the Police Association, a copy of which I received just shortly after 9:00 o'clock in my office this morning, indicating that there is the possibility of a gradual withdrawal of services commencing one week hence. I have no information as to what this really means but anyway this morning the Executive Committee of the City of Winnipeg met and they are prepared to resume negotiations with the Winnipeg Police Association and have requested that the conciliation officer of the Department of Labour is involved, and he will be involved, Mr. Speaker; the precise time and date of the resumption of negotiation has not been directed to me as of this particular moment.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister would indicate what course of action the government will undertake if there is a withdrawal of services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Labour will indicate what action he intends to take if the negotiations - when the negotiations --(Interjection)-- what course of action he undertakes when the negotiations are broken off again?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is still in the same realm of hypothesis. I'm sorry. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Can the Minister provide information on an RCMP seizure last Saturday of some 84 head of cattle from a farm in the Scanterbury area where an additional 45 head of cattle were found dead and the surviving group of some 85 were in a serious state of malnutrition?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I cannot, and I don't think it would be proper that I comment in any regard because the matter is probably one that will involve proceedings before the courts, that will be taking place.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister inform the House as to whether or not charges of cruelty to animals have been laid arising from this incident on Saturday?

MR. PAWLEY: Probably they have been, Mr. Speaker. I would not be able to confirm or deny that any particular charges have been made. I could take that part of the question as notice and indicate but I would not go beyond there to comment in respect to the particulars of the case.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question then to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he provide the House with an up-to-date report on the livestock condition throughout Manitoba and indicate whether or not there is a serious shortage of fodder and low nutrient level that's creating a problem of malnutrition and starving of cattle?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): The Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, has indicated through a number of publications in the last month that they are concerned about the lack of awareness on the part of many producers who are feeding hay that may not be of good quality and which is resulting in some degree of malnutrition right across the province, and we have had some serious cases reported to us. We have publicized those as much as we can.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether he is aware of the facts alluded to in my question to the Attorney-General that 45 cattle were found dead of malnutrition on Saturday and 85 taken into custody?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is out of order. The Minister's awareness or not is not essential. The question has already been answered. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Agriculture. Has he taken any steps to ascertain whether cattle were found dead from malnutrition or starvation in the past three days resulting in seizures of starving cattle by the RCMP?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did undertake in the last few days to ask the Department to make sure that where the government is involved financially that we canvass all of those farmers to make sure that they are not finding themselves in a similar position. So it's a matter of advice that we are now offering to our clients in particular, aside from the general information that has been distributed over the last month.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister - and I apologize for not having given him notice of this, I would have had I known the answer he would have given. Perhaps he can take this as notice. Would he undertake to ascertain whether a farmer by the name of Gordon Monkman in the Scanterbury area was the recipient of a loan or grant under the cattle diversification program of his department in the amount of some 80,000, I believe the figure is?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't know the amount. I believe the person in question is a participant through our Farm Diversification Program, yes.

MR. ASPER: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister advise the House as to what qualifications or conditions are placed in general terms on people receiving these grants or loans, and what supervision as to how they perform is exercised by his department? Are they given the money and left alone and told to do their thing, or does your Department exercise some supervision as to the quality of care they give the animals they buy?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition probably is not aware that that is an ARDA program federal-provincial, and that it is intensive and that there is supervision provided.

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. Is the Minister in a position to advise the House what form the gradual withdrawal of City of Winnipeg Police services would take? What services would be affected first?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've not been made aware of the plan of action of the City of Winnipeg Police if there is a gradual withdrawal of services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A different question, Mr. Speaker, on a different subject but to the same Minister. Has the Minister had recent contact with leaders of the garment industry in Manitoba with respect to the continuing worker crisis in that industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Not recently, Mr. Speaker, due to commitments in the House I've been unable to continue at least temporarily my association with the garment industry, both worker and employer.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, his last point of contact, or on the basis of his last point of contact on the subject, would the Minister be able to assure the House that efforts are being made to fill the acute worker shortage in that industry, and that consideration is being given to those who are unemployed in Manitoba in that respect.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture which relates to the questions the Leader of the Liberal Party was posing to him - the Minister mentioned supervision in acquiring loans from either the Provincial or Federal Government. I am wondering if the advice that this farmer or farmers received, did he investigate to find out whether they had received bad advice in feeding of livestock?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the whole question is under investigation and when we have the report we will be able to give further information to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, the question already raised is now new. I wonder, directing the question to the Minister of Agriculture, would he undertake to supply the House with the actual number of instances where public moneys were involved in advancing to respective livestock growers, moneys for cattle purchases, just how many cases we have as the ones that were reported by the Leader of the Liberal Party?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, I believe that would be an Order for Return more properly. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and it relates to statements made, I believe, before the Thompson Chamber of Commerce by him this weekend. I wonder if he can indicate to the House the figures that were used in a voice interview or a voice statement of the capital requirements that Hydro will be making for the next two years and following that for the next ten years. I believe if I'm correct, the figures were \$275 million for the next two years, and 150 million for each year for the next ten years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, in attempting to give a broad measure, or indication, of the level and pace of public investment in renewable energy development, I indicated that in a very approximate way it would be something in the order of \$150 million averaged out over a period of ten to twelve years as being the kind of order of magnitude of investment required to develop renewable energy at an optimum pace.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate the reasons why the figures introduced even here appear much higher than the original program that was presented by Hydro before Public Utilities Committee.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, they are not really a significant variance from the kind of magnitude that was spoken about when the Nelson River construction began. It has been referred to as being a Hydro electric development program over a period of 15 years, that the order of magnitude of public investment would be in the order of \$2.5 billion, approximately, as a guideline; of course the costs are subject to adjustment from time to time in the light of changes in the construction costs indices, etc.

MR. SPIVAK: Is not the information now being provided the House indicating a billion dollars higher than the original figure proposed by Hydro?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Well yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been some considerable adjustment in the figures since, for example, the first or preliminary indication that was given in this House at the time when the decision to proceed with the Nelson development was first announced. At that time, for example, a figure of approximately 150, as I recall, to \$200 million was referred to as the cost of Kettle Rapids. Well, that was in advance of the construction of Kettle Rapids itself. Now that the years have passed in which it has actually been built one finds that the actual cost of Kettle Rapids was substantially more than what was estimated in 1966. So it is obvious, Sir, that there will be need for adjustment of these figures as we go along from time to time, depending upon economic conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Can he confirm whether or not the new level, proposed flooding level of South Indian Lake will not be established at 850 feet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a definitive answer to that question; the Minister of Mines and Resources may be able to confirm. It's my understanding that that figure is expressly stated right in the license as being the maximum allowed, and therefore that is a specific answer to my honourable friend.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable First Minister for his help in re-directing the question. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who I am sure also indicated at the time that it was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please, not an argument. Order please. Order please. Order please. Would the honourable member state his question, not argue the point.

MR. ENNS: Question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is it the intention of the government to now flood South Indian Lake to the maximum levels permissible under the license applied for?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I did not get that impression from either the First Minister's answer or from what I read in the newspaper. What I understood to be the case, and I hate to rely on my memory where it's specified in the license, but that the initial levels would be at 847 and that it would not go beyond 850 feet, but that we would try to - that Hydro would try to work at the lower levels and would only go up from those levels if they didn't get the amount of water at the lower levels.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, directed to the same Minister. Is the Minister aware of the expressed desire of the community at South Indian Lake to have the lake flooded higher and maybe higher yet?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the only information that I have from the community to this point is that the lake should not be flooded, that the water level should not be raised at all. However, if there is an overwhelming desire that the lake be flooded higher, we would try to resist that desire and flood it only to a maximum of 850.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister can report to the House on the strike this morning at Transcona at the Co-op Implement Shop respecting some 500 employees who went on strike. I wonder if the Minister had any communications, and did his department play any part trying to resolve this strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with Manitoba Labour laws the employees and the employers have a difference of opinion as to a term contract and they have withdrawn - the employees have withdrawn their services, which is their proper right. I understand that there was a mass meeting and there is to be a mass meeting today and the conciliation officers of the Department of Labour are ready and available at any time upon request.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the two sides can be brought together shortly to reopen negotiations.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as soon as they are of a mind to be brought together they will be brought together.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake to publish regularly in this House during the session a report on strikes in Manitoba as to the number of employees that are affected, the number of men hours laid off.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm prepared at any time to answer any questions pertaining to this matter upon request of all honourable members, including my friend the member who asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina. The honourable member has had three supplementaries.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): My question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Does the Minister care to give us his impression of the report of the Federal Government's Prices Review Board?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is out of order. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the federal budget announcement of a 20 percent increase in budget, has any interpretation been attempted by himself or his department to determine the influence that this may have on the inflationary trend that we're in in Manitoba and in other parts of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, to have a proper overview of this kind of a proposal, of this consideration, would take considerable time which I've not been able to give to it. One would have to judge not only the increased cost but also the increased benefits that are transfer payments and that will require an extensive study. I am not aware that anybody in my department is making the study; I would think that they too are too busy being involved in provincial affairs.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate whether there is any combined attempt of federal and provincial authorities given the problem, or faced with inflation, of attempting to tailor their budgets to have an impact one way or another on inflation?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would have to invite the honourable member to read the papers that I have submitted from time to time which represented the arguments that I have presented at past meetings of the Finance Ministers of Canada in order to assess proposals made by this government, and from that he can deduce responses given by the Federal Government. There has been considerable discussion.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, then might I ask a question whether the Manitoba budget coming in, will in any way take into account the Federal level of spending; and might I ask a further question on that, when we might expect the budget?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the budget when presented will reflect the views of this government on the question of inflation, and methods designed to deal with it. As to the date in which it is brought in, it has not yet been determined but I would say that I'm pretty close to being able to answer soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Referring to some questions which I asked on February 21st relating to the capacity of the Shellmouth Dam to serve as a flood control mechanism in the Assiniboine Valley west of Brandon, I wonder if the Minister has any information on that subject?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my honourable friend. I believe that the information is in my office and I'll try to make a point of having it here tomorrow afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Would he be prepared to table in this House any information, studies or analysis that were presented to him by the government authorities of North Dakota concerning the impact or questions of water quality on the Garrison Diversion program;

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the study that was presented at the meeting is the study that I indicated that I would try to get copies of and make available to each party; that was the only study.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, then to the Minister of Mines and Resources. In view of the issue raised by the North Dakota Farm Organizations on the reliability of that information, is he, or is this government prepared now to assemble a task force of Manitoba scientists, engineers, and economists to provide an independent analysis of the impact or effects of the Garrison Diversion in the water quality question in southwest Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have in this case the unique advantage of having our officials, the Canadian officials, the officials of the Federal Government of the United States and the officials of the Government of North Dakota, plus their Garrison Diversion Program group who will be meeting together, looking at all of the studies that have been done, looking at those things which the Government of North Dakota and the Government of the United States have indicated will be done to prevent pollution of Manitoba waters, as undertaken by the Government of the United States, which note was described, Mr. Speaker, as perfectly satisfactory by the Liberal Minister of External Affairs, Mitchell Sharp, a former Manitoba resident, who said that there is absolutely no reason to say that the United States will not fulfill the obligations that it has made to Canada under this note. And we have been a little bit less sanguine that the Minister of External Affairs for the Government of Canada, the Liberal Minister of External Affairs for the Government of Canada, we have said to the Government of North Dakota, show us how you intend to fulfill the obligations which you have undertaken in this note, and we have therefore arranged the meetings of those four governments that I have spoken of to go over the information and, if necessary, to get new information.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's statement just now, could he explain to this House why the Minister of Environment at the Federal level registered his opposition, and also said that the U.S. State Department is opposed to the diversion plan?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if he's referring to the Minister of Environment in the Government of Canada, then I would only have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Environment of the Government of Canada does not talk to the Minister of External Affairs of the Government of Canada, and that is a problem which is not for me but for the First Minister of Canada to deal with.

With regard to the other question as to how can I explain Mr. Davis' responses? I've never been able to explain them, and I will not be able to explain them now. I can only say that the Government of Manitoba has said that if the United States State Department says there will be no pollution of Manitoba waters, we are taking the position, show us. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we have a committee of officials, involving the officials of the four governments, and also a monitoring committee of public representatives to make sure that the committee of officials are doing their job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, following up the same line of questioning, I then ask the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources now, if he confirms or agrees with the question that I put to the First Minister the other day when he said in reply to me, that the pollution that might occur from the diversion of the Garrison Dam would be minute. Now any further --(Interjection)-- All right, any further pollution must be taken into consideration. Does he agree with this that there will be further pollution into the Souris, into the Assiniboine, into the Red and into the Winnipeg Lake.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have on, I think at least three occasions, indicated to my honourable friend and to the members of the House, and I've tabled documents which indicate that there will be problems associated with the three rivers, the water bodies concerned. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, this government asked the Federal Government to ask for a moratorium on the project - which the Federal Government then did. In response to which the United States Government indicated that there would be no pollution of Manitoba waters, to which the Federal Minister of External Affairs said that that is entirely satisfactory, and to which the Manitoba Government said, no we want to see how they propose to do that - and that is why the committee was set up.

MR. WATT: I ask the Honourable Minister is it not a fact that the project is now under way in spite of the fact that there are negotiations going on, that the American Government have now proceeded with the projection of the diversion of the Garrison into the Souris River?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that program has been under way I believe since 1965, a period of nine years. The part --(Interjection)-- it's not all paper, Mr. Speaker. Construction

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) works have been under way for many years. The part that will affect the Souris River is not scheduled to go into construction until the late 1970s at the earliest. We have been able, Mr. Speaker, because we have not done what the Leader of the Liberal Party, that supreme negotiator, would have done, said, give us compensation because I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if we would have said that the United States Government would have given it immediately, and they would have proceeded with the program in whatever way they wanted to.

We have succeeded, Mr. Speaker, in getting an undertaking from the Federal Government of the United States saying there will be no pollution; we have also succeeded in getting ourselves involved in an in-house Committee with the people who are doing the job to see how they intend to achieve that; we also have succeeded in getting an undertaking from the Governor of North Dakota with ourselves that policy people will monitor the work of that committee on a six months basis, the first meeting to take place six months from today. Mr. Speaker, that has been done in my opinion because we have handled ourselves vis-a-vis our neighbours in a proper way; and if we would have handled ourselves in the way that I have heard certain members suggest that we handle ourselves, then I suggest to you that the response of the United States would have been, well these people are impossible to deal with, we will ignore them and go ahead with the project just as we see fit. We have not done that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister of Mines, Energy and Natural Resources in his capacity as the Minister for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Has the Minister met today, or did he meet today, with representatives of the striking mill and bush workers from the Columbia Forest Industries plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker. But so there be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, a group of people from the area came in to see me vis-a-vis the problems that have been experienced in that plant for the past many years, and were good enough to give me their opinions as to how some of those problems they feel could be dealt with. Continuing meetings will take place with some of the people in that meeting and directors of the -- and people from the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are the people from the area whom the Minister describes, people who include mill and bush workers at the plant and among their number, strikers?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that may be, but none of them identified themselves to me as strikers nor, except for one fairly remote remark, was the strike discussed.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if the Minister can advise if he has received assurances from those consultants which will be operating the PEP funded Community Income Tax Services Incorporated that they will be capable in answering the requests or the queries that will be made to them vis-a-vis income tax problems?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): I would be pleased to deal with that question but I believe it would be more appropriately dealt with through the Minister of Finance or the Minister responsible for PEP.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, dealing only with that part of the question relating to the ability of the people involved to assist and guide persons in the preparation of their tax return, the department, the division of my department which has been dealing with these tax returns for the last two years has been requested and has agreed to give as good advice as we can on this very issue so as to guide this project in being able to deliver that service to people who are in need of it at a -- in order to prevent outrageous prices both for doing the work and for the selling of the returnable portions of the T-4 slips.

MR. MARION: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Is this organization tied in in any way with the credit union movement?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that this group has made arrangements with a credit union to provide funding at a lower cost than is now being charged on the market other than that.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to a question that was taken in my absence on notice by the Premier, a question posed by the Member for Fort Rouge in respect to instructing Land Titles Offices to expedite the processing of 300 unregistered lots because certain building was taking place upon those lots. My information is to the effect that if a plan of subdivision had been approved or is approved by the appropriate municipal authority, then the Land Titles Office would be in a position to process the titles in a space of seven to ten days. I can only assume, short of further information, that the problem here must be that the plan of subdivision has not been approved by the appropriate municipal authority involved.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder in view of the concern expressed by the cattlemen, a large number of cattlemen in Manitoba, and especially the users of AI, over the past number of months, I wonder if he is considering in this session bringing in an amendment to Bill 120 removing the monopolistic clause which these AI users have found unsatisfactory to their requirements?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not considering doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask him if he can confirm whether or not all retail stores who sell milk over the counter and other dairy products require a licence?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: I believe that is true. I'd have to take that question as notice to be more precise, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a second question to the Minister, and would appreciate if he would also take a second question as notice and give us an explanation of why a license is required.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member has access to the Milk Control Act, and I don't specifically recall whether in fact all retail outlets are required to be licensed. But he can look it up for himself if he wishes.

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

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister for Agriculture. Can he indicate to the House what the position is on the grants and loans, and I take it we're talking about grants when we speak of the cattle diversification program, or perhaps both - under what circumstances are grants repayable if the farmer, the recipient, abuses the grant, for example in the case that is being discussed today, where the cattle have been badly treated and die of starvation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have two different programs. One is a program outside of ARDA, which is a straight credit transaction wherein grants are provided under certain conditions. Commitment has to be made that increases in livestock herds would be maintained for five years. If those conditions are not met, then of course the grant is not provided. On the ARDA project, of course, I don't believe there is a provision whatever.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister. Could he clarify or explain where negligence is discovered and the crop or the herd is lost would the grant be repayable by the . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Point of order.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that I believe it's generally understood and accepted in this House that when a Minister's Estimates, the estimates of a particular department are currently before this House, that questions of detail interpretation are deferred from the question period and dealt with later that very same day in consideration of estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister gave me an opportunity to really become on the ball because much as I appreciate his point of order it was not valid. But I will indicate that it is valid, or it is invalid to ask a question asking for a legal interpretation of a statute, and that's what the honourable member is doing. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister I believe was willing to answer the question. It didn't involve an interpretation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member wish to ask a question?

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am asking about departmental practice. Is it the practice of the department where there has been negligent handling of cattle and a grant has been made, is it the practice of the department to demand repayment?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be most appropriate if the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party would wait for the Estimates period, wherein we can have a full debate on the subject matter.

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a very specific question to the Minister of Agriculture. Were the cattle that were purchased with provincial grants by Gordon Monkman, was the growing program supervised and were steps taken to ensure that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General state his point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm becoming increasingly concerned about reference to a particular case which I understand is going to be heard before the courts and I do think it's not fair for repeated references to this case which may prejudice the party in question.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development in reference to a question raised on Thursday concerning a request from the Manitoba Association of Medical Students. Has the Minister yet found that request in either his office or in the department, and if so, is he prepared now to meet with the students to discuss remuneration with them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Seven Oaks): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the request by the fourth year medical students. The matter has been before government for some time. There are many implications or ramifications in meeting their requests, and at the present time there are no immediate steps to meet their requests.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could confirm to this House whether it is a fact that the medical students and medical clerks in Manitoba are only one amongst two provinces where no monthly remuneration at all is received by them compared to other provinces.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is true. It's also true to say that no other province has as good a student aid program as Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, all I want is the permission of the House, if I may obtain it, to revert to Tabling of Reports. I wish to table the Annual Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1973 if I have the agreement. (Agreed)

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister can give us information about the contingency plan which he earlier advised exists, respecting provision of essential police services in a strike situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: The answer actually is no, Mr. Speaker. I could give him information but we haven't a strike. The matter is under active consideration by the Attorney-General and the Minister of Labour and if in the event of a strike, plans will be revealed.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Can the Minister advise if his department has received any requests from the public sector to set up a central abortion clinic?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of such a request.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister can tell us if he's taken a positive position with the federal authorities, the railways, and the grain companies in regard to the loss of sales of grain from western Canada, including Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, through the Vancouver port because of the lack of movement of grain, and if he now agrees that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The second part is argumentative.

MR. WATT: Okay, I don't want to argue with him at all, I just want to ask him a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there have been many occasions wherein the subject matter was discussed over the last - well it's actually now a couple of years, because it has to do with the whole question of the railway system and the abandonment of railway branch lines and the building of boxcars for allocation for the grains industry. My honourable friend fully knows that the railway companies are trying to bring about a squeeze on the whole question of the movement of grain in order that some measures would be taken to remove the Crow's Nest freight rates.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question, then. Does the Minister now agree that the movement of grain out of the Vancouver port is directly affected - or that the farmers in Manitoba are directly affected by the movement of grain through the Vancouver port?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think really what the honourable member is trying to ask me is whether I would now, three or four years - no several years later, agree that he should have made that trip to Vancouver when he did.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to . . .

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

MR. WATT: Would the Minister of Agriculture now agree that he should go to Vancouver and find out what the hell's going on out there and why grain isn't being moved, and why we are losing sales?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister in charge of the Manitoba Development Fund. Did the people from Sprague that met with him this morning express concern about the operational viability and the future of the plant at Sprague?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BANMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to use the insurance settlement to rebuild Columbia Forest or will it be applied against the MDC loan?

MR. GREEN: There is no existing intention to rebuild the chip board plant, Mr. Speaker. Therefore the money will be taken as part of the indebtedness owned by the Corporation to the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, could I have the leave of the House, Sir, to make a brief statement of a non-political nature? (Agreed)

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Sir. Actually it's in the nature, Sir, of a presentation to the Honourable the First Minister. I've been asked by the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, His Worship Stephen Juba, to present to the First Minister a memento of what was a memorable evening on Saturday night at the Winnipeg Arena, Sir, the first hockey classic between the Golden Boys and the City Fathers. This is a small, minor replica - which I'll send over to the honourable gentleman by a page, Sir - that will remind him of the efforts put forth by his colleagues that evening and by himself in attempting to uphold the honour of this Chamber against the City Council. Sir, the stick is small in size, and I don't suggest there's any

STATEMENT

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) significance to it, there was no admonition from His Worship to suggest to the First Minister that he walk softly but carry a small stick; and there was no suggestion that his stickhandling capabilities being what they are, it was understood that he didn't need a regulation size stick to compete in the contest in this Chamber. But the memento does go to him with the best wishes of the Mayor and I'm sure all City Council. It was made by a Mr. Cartwright who is the father of one of the City Councillors playing on Saturday night, and it's my pleasure to act as the Mayor's go-between in this presentation, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in thanking the Honourable Member for Fort Garry for relaying this memento or token in commemoration of the event of last Saturday, I thank him, and through him wish to thank His Worship the Mayor of the City. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that when I look at the configuration, not only the size but the configuration of the hockey stick, that I can see why our team lost. One couldn't get away any kind of a slap shot, nor could he get away a shot that would fool any goalkeeper. But despite that, Sir, I understand that with that shortcoming notwithstanding that the Golden Boys did at least make a very valiant effort and that had they had perhaps just one or two more opportunities to practise, and had I perhaps not had two standing prior engagements in Northern Manitoba and been able to join them, that it might have turned out otherwise. (Applause)

It would be remiss on my part, Sir, if I did not acknowledge on behalf of the Golden Boys that did play to thank them all, and to also in particular to take note of the fact that the Honourable Member for Morris performed exceptionally well, stout-hearted goalie that he was. (Applause) Having played goal only once or twice in my past years I think I can understand the mortal fear with which he cowered in the net knowing the calibre of the defencemen in front of him. But I understand, Sir, that he did play exceptionally well on behalf of the Province of Manitoba and he is congratulated in particular, as all are. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I'm wondering if he could confirm if the loss, the excessive loss of newborn calves is the result of lack of Vitamin K in the fodder this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that we have accepted as a matter of fact that there have been general deficiency problems but I couldn't be that specific, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ADAM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if -- this is quite important to the livestock producers of Manitoba, and I wonder if the Minister could undertake to make investigations if this is a mineral that is really quite deficient in the feed this year?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and it arises out of the remarks he made in response to those of the Honourable Member from Fort Garry. My only question is, will he confirm that there is no intention by his government resulting from Saturday night's events to cut the size of the grant or the size of City Council itself?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Perhaps both in equal amounts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in the same vein, I direct a question to the First Minister. Is he in receipt of a note of thanks with gratitude from one Robert Marvin Hull for the obvious inspiration the Golden Boys gave him of the Saturday's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, this is to all the Golden Boys, the Health Spa in the CPR Building is extending a free steam and sauna for those that wish to take advantage in case you have any aching bones, you can go there anytime during the week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, while we're on the topic and in this vein, we should acknowledge for the records that last night Bobby Hull did score his 3 goal hat-trick and passed the number of 700 goals in professional hockey which he is only the second player to do

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

(MR. CRAIK Cont'd) in the history of the game along with Gordie Howe.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SCHEDULED MEETINGS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind honourable members that we've called the meeting of Public Accounts for tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock. I'd also like to give notice that we would want to have Public Utilities meet on Thursday of this week for consideration of the telephone report. Unless there is any problem associated with the honourable members, I intend that those meetings will be held.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: There are some Orders for Return first, then we can go to the others. Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, That an order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The number of new industries established in Manitoba in 1973.
2. The names and locations of said industries.
3. The number of employees employed by each new industry.
4. The initial capital investment of each company.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to accept the Order for Return to the extent that we have the ability to answer the questions that are asked of us. As the honourable member understands we rely to a considerable extent on Statistics Canada and upon the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for these types of statistics. To the extent that we have those statistics, we'll make them available but we cannot guarantee that we have every last figure on every last industry, or every last employee that has been given a job in the province in this period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, That an order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Number of parcels of privately owned land the government has taken into use in its highway program during each calendar year 1972, 1973.
2. How many of the above parcels of land were taken before final settlement was reached with the owner.
3. How many of the cases referred to in question 2, still are unsettled and how long has settlement been pending.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we accept that order.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? So ordered.

The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, That an order of the House do issue for a Return showing in each case:

Amounts received by government in the fiscal year 1972-73 from the following Corporations for:

- (a) royalties
- (b) rentals, licenses, permits and fees,
- (c) stumpage, or any other income or taxes, including Mineral Acreage Tax in the

companies:

1. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Co. Ltd.
2. International Nickel
3. Sherritt Gordon Mines
4. Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd.
5. Churchill Forest Industries.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. ASPER Cont'd)

6. Abitibi Pulp and Paper.
7. Tantalum Mining.
8. Churchill Forest Industries.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I must indicate that there is some -- there is lack of clarity in this resolution in several respects, and in addition I suppose only an expert in taxation would know that much of this is not permissible, so that we cannot accept it in the form proposed. If the honourable member wants to debate it, then of course it can be stood over. If on the other hand he wants to withdraw it and discuss with probably the Minister of Mines and me a proper form for presentation, then we might --(Interjection)-- No. He can either put it over for debate or withdraw this . . .

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

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put it over for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia That an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information with respect to the inspection of public buildings in the Province of Manitoba:

1. The number of public buildings in the province;
2. The location of these buildings;
3. The date of construction of these buildings;
4. The date of inspection of these buildings;
5. The name of the inspector responsible for the inspection of each building;
6. The qualifications and credentials of the inspectors.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return also lacks clarity and in certain respects seems to be grossly beyond any reasonable and convenient means to the Crown to answer. I refer specifically, Sir, to the fact that reference is made to the number of public buildings, that could be interpreted to mean buildings owned by the Crown, or it could refer to all buildings owned by the Crown and by municipalities and by the Government of Canada. It could also refer to those buildings that come under the ambit of the statute entitled An Act Respecting Public Buildings, which certainly is much wider in its category. And then, Sir, I also could point out that asking for the name of the individual inspector who carries out inspection services on behalf of the Crown is something which in the past, in the present day, in the future, I would assume would not be made available in any case so we reject the order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Order has been rejected. Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for St. . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to the honourable member, in fairness it should be pointed out to him that he can ask that it be put over for debate.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in this case I would prefer to redraft the Order for Return and resubmit it.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case, it's withdrawn. Very well. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie, That an order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The total number of vehicles now owned or leased by the Manitoba Government and/or any of its boards, commissions, Crown corporations or other agencies, detailing the vehicles supplied to each department and/or boards, etc.
2. The cost of operating the vehicles referred to above for each department and/or boards, commissions, etc. excluding the insurance costs.
3. The total cost of insurance to cover the vehicles as described in No. 1 above.
4. The total number of vehicles owned or leased by the Manitoba Government and/or any of its boards, commissions, Crown corporations or other agencies, detailing the vehicles supplied to each department and/or boards, etc. all as of July 15, 1969.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we accept this Order subject to the usual caveat respecting reasonableness and cost in terms of obtaining the information in accordance with Citation - I believe it's -- well whatever the Citation No. of Beauchesne.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed). Ajournd debates.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING - NO. 7

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

MR. SPEAKER: No. 7, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, could I have this stand? If anyone else likes to speak, I have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in entering the debate on this bill it comes at a time when we've had the opportunity of reviewing the bill and an extensive debate. It will be my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to make reference throughout my presentation of the remarks of the members opposite because it's my belief, Mr. Speaker, that though the bill contains only 15 sections it does contain sections which - about half a dozen - which are significant in which there are more than one or two principles involved which command our attention.

Mr. Speaker, two of the principles have already received considerable attention in the debate and that is the question of allowing civil servants the right to seek political office without affecting their status as civil servants. The other, Mr. Speaker, is allowing civil servants the full range of political activities allegedly open to all employees, that is the right to campaign in the election and to solicit funds for political parties.

Now the Honourable Minister of Labour when he introduced the bill in his usual manner skirted the Act, or the proposals, by suggesting that this was really a change of "a sort of housekeeping", - and I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, from Hansard - "a sort of housekeeping basis to clarify some of the points contained in the present Civil Service Act." And it will be my intention, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this to point out that it is far from housekeeping the government is proposing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether the members opposite, including the members of the Cabinet, really understand the implications of some of the sections that are being proposed and truly have an appreciation of what this bill proposes. In fact, Mr. Speaker - and I'm sorry the Minister of Finance walked out. I heard his off-the-cuff remarks to the Minister - in speaking on the bill himself, he indicated that he thought that the principle of the bill was this, not that he had read it but he thought that it was, and he thought that the only principle was the question of the political involvement or the opportunity for civil servants to run for political office. And those very words, Mr. Speaker - and if I had to I could quote them from Hansard, but I'll paraphrase them now - are indicative to me of the fact that the members opposite don't really know what this bill contains and are not really familiar with the implications of what's being proposed. And it's my intention in dealing with it to deal with those matters.

Now first with respect to the question of the political equality that is to be offered for civil servants. Mr. Speaker, the members on the opposite keep saying that there is one principle involved and yet, Mr. Speaker, we really are talking about two principles, and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that when we discuss this in this debate that we're going to be in a position to influence the members opposite in attempting to bring in amendments which will clarify both principles, so that there will in fact be some kind of consensus in this Chamber. And, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Liberal Party is not here and the Member for Fort Rouge is not here, but I would hope that when they have the opportunity of reading my remarks that we're going to be able to persuade them that on this issue unless the bill is prepared to be amended by the government, and it is expressed by the government that they will bring in such amendments, that because the bill goes far beyond what the authors themselves claim for it, and which confers on the government powers that no one in this Chamber, including I suggest the backbenchers of the New Democratic Party, would want the government to have, that they will be persuaded as a result of it to vote against the bill unless, Mr. Speaker, amendments are going to be brought forth.

Now let me deal with the first principle, the principle of political candidacy, the right

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . to run. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are obviously a wide range of opinion, all the way from those who would reject candidacy on the part of civil servants outright, to those who would encourage candidacy with the full protection and security, and this has been expressed to a certain extent by some of the members who have spoken on our Party. But I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, with respect to our position, that we believe civil servants should be encouraged to seek public office and reject any notion of applying some kind of sanction from encouraging them to seek public office. We reject the proposition that civil servants should be discouraged from seeking public office; and we reject any suggestion that some kind of sanction should be applied to ensure that result.

We say, Mr. Speaker, let us facilitate the candidacy of public servants; let us guarantee in the event of their defeat that their seniority, that their tenure and their staff benefits are unimpaired, and let us ensure that they will be eligible for their old job if it remains unfilled or an equivalent position as it becomes available. This indeed, Mr. Speaker, is the position in Ontario. Indeed the Ontario Act, Mr. Speaker, goes farther because it provides that even after five years in public office a civil servant might return to an equivalent position in the public service.

If you wish, equality appointments for the civil servants to seek elective office, this is the area in which we suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the government was going to innovate, this was the kind of position that they should have undertaken. Because, Mr. Speaker, if in fact someone does retire from the Civil Service by running for public office and is elected, is he to be penalized if he is defeated in the next election? And surely, Mr. Speaker, this problem is much more severe than that faced by a civil servant after a 60 or 90 day leave of absence. Yet on this, Mr. Speaker, the bill is silent, while it seeks to codify in a rigid way, a right that most civil servants already enjoy. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is on the right of the civil servant to run for political office, federal or provincial.

But now on the other principle, which I suggest that the members opposite fail to distinguish, on the question of the other political activities of the civil servants our views and the government diverge much more sharply. Mr. Speaker, we do not hold with the view that the relationship between the government and its employees is the same as any other employer-employee relationship.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPIVAK: We say this because we recognize, as all people must recognize that government is not like any other employer in our society. All the coercive power that the state has at its disposal is embodied in the power of government. Government has the power to alter and effect all sorts of relationships in the society, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, those civil servants are also by definition servants of the public. They are also in the most direct way the servants of the most powerful institution in the society. I suggest that there's no clear way that you can or will be able to distinguish between the actions of civil servants as agents of government, as opposed to them as agents of the Party in power, once you remove the prohibition that now exists on partisan political activity by civil servants. Where will the line be drawn between members of the Civil Service in their dealings with one another; where will it be drawn in their dealings with the public?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a document that illustrates the problem. This, Mr. Speaker, is a raffle ticket being sold in the provincial buildings for the Manitoba New Democratic Party. The money is to go for a draw, or this is a raffle for a draw, the money of which will go to the New Democratic Party. It is to be drawn on June 16, 1974, by the President of the New Democratic Party. This is a fund raising campaign of the present government, of its political party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing wrong with raffles or fund raising, but I pose the question: if a branch director in a government department has taken such tickets around to his subordinates, to the people to whom his goodwill is important, can it seriously be argued that they would not thereby have been placed in an invidious position, many would themselves be supporting the governing party against their will as a kind of an insurance policy; or alternately, refusing to buy and perhaps thereby implying something about their political beliefs and that may be perhaps wrongly, but implying something nonetheless that is really no one else's business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's consider for a few examples other government institutions.

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . Let's consider the rentalsman, and the people involved in the rentalsman's activity, where complaints are registered and work must be undertaken in dealing with many of the landlords in this city. Consider the consumer's office where people must investigate actions by people who claim that in some way the Consumer Act has been violated. What about the problems of the Purchasing Bureau and the whole range of government involvement in the allocation of orders for work to be delivered and for services to be given? Let us look at the Human Rights Commission, which is a very sensitive area, where civil servants must investigate a whole range of sensitive areas in which people are in the position of being investigated on charges that may or may not be true; the whole question of the Public Works Department and the contracts to be awarded by that department; of the Highways Department; the relationship of the civil servants who are dealing with the Department of Health and Social Development in the welfare field, and have the discretion that must be exercised by them as to whether a person should or should not receive a particular amount that they may be entitled to under the Act; or civil servants who deal with the Attorney-General's Department, and who are in a very sensitive area of whether a prosecution should take place or not.

Mr. Speaker, all of the civil servants in the few examples that I have mentioned have discretionary power and are capable of exercising discretionary judgment about the problems of individuals and the situations of groups of persons in the community with whom they deal on a day to day basis. Do you really want, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the government, do you want these people to be involved in the political process?

A MEMBER: They do.

MR. SPIVAK: Do you really believe that such persons can combine professional responsibilities with an overt political role without professional responsibilities being impaired or comprised? Mr. Speaker, will not those on the receiving end of services, or advice, or assistance, of the types of civil servants that I have mentioned, see an additional reason for maintaining their goodwill if they come to see civil servants not only as agents of the government but as agents of the parties.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, on the radio program "Up To Now" the biographer of Richard Daly and I believe the book is called "Daly" from Chicago appeared on the radio and was interviewed. That presentation was an enlightening one to me. He talked about the book, but he also talked about the ward system that was used by the Democratic Daly machine in Chicago, and he pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that it had, in his opinion, some benefits in the earlier years before government became involved in the whole social service field, because he said at least the person who was in charge of the ward, who was the political boss of the ward, had the ability to be able to respond to the needs of the people, and was in the position to at least see that some funds were available from government for people who were disadvantaged because of their particular situation, or who required some kind of assistance, he was able to bring it to the attention of the government. And he did this for two reasons: one, because people were in some difficulty and that had to be drawn, and he was the political boss of the area; but more importantly by acting on their behalf, he was going to have the people beholden to him, and that meant, Mr. Speaker, that when the election came he was going to be able to deliver the ward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are Chicago American politics - I could describe Tammany Hall in the same way - and what the honourable members opposite are proposing now is to take the civil servants who now can become active in the political process, who in effect are going to be in this same kind of position, and are going to be capable, Mr. Speaker, of accomplishing that which the machine, which I think is repugnant to all of us, has been able to accomplish in Chicago. And surely, Mr. Speaker, that is a retrogressive, a retrogressive step on the part of government.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote as well from a handbook of public administration produced by the United Nations, called "Current Concepts and Practices with Special Reference to Developing Countries", and I'd like to deal with several paragraphs dealing with political neutrality and the career service. This is on page 38 - 36 of the book. "Political neutrality is an essential complement to the merit system for it guarantees that career officials who have competed for their posts and advanced by merits of the highest rank, will give the government, whatever its political makeup, absolute impartial advice, criticism and assistance on any matter which concerns it. Further, it is shared that Ministers that whether they accept

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . the advice of the career officials or not, their ultimate decisions will be loyally accepted and faithfully carried out. Political neutrality means more than the mere absence of political activity or bias on the part of individual career officials. It means that the career official will always respond to the will of the government; if he finds his department policy distasteful on some specific ground, he may of course make known his objection in the proper manner, but having done so he must, if they are rejected, accept the policy and carry it out. In rare cases where the official feels that his moral or religious acceptabilities are involved, he should have the option to be given employment in some other capacity or to resign.

"It takes time and patience to build up a political administrative relationship of this kind, based upon understanding and confidence between the ministers and officials. The minister has to support and defend the decisions of permanent officials and to regard their advice as confidential. He deprives himself of experienced counsel unless he permits high career officials to speak frankly without fear of rebukes or penalties. Such a relationship helps maintain the minister's responsibility for the policy and the conduct of his minister. The price of an official career is a high degree of anonymity. The career official for his part must accept some limitation of political activities. He may retain his basic political right to vote in local and national elections, but his standing as an impartial adviser and administrator would be impaired if he engaged in political activity in such a way as to commit himself wholly or to the views of any one Party."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this book was for a guidance for underdeveloped countries. And it's somewhat curious, Mr. Speaker, that it seems necessary to remind the Government of Manitoba of what the so-called enlightened societies were offering to the Third World ten years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we want civil servants to enjoy full political rights for candidacy. However, the evidence of the raffle ticket underlines the failure to define and protect the rights of those who want to be a political. And I'd like to if I may refer to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Portage, because he pointed that out. How do you deal with the civil servants who want to be a-political? How are they going to be a-political when you have a political Civil Service? How are they going to be able to deal with their department heads, with their officials within their own range of activity, when they have people who are committed to the party, who are committed to think of the government they maintain, and whose every action - and I'm not talking about the a-political civil servants - will be examined and watched to see what, if any, and how they are handling themselves with respect to the problems that they have to deal with.

Mr. Speaker, the survival of any government depends on its being able to persuade large numbers of people to support it, and this is what the government's trying to do. Now the survival of the T. Eaton Company, or Salisbury House, or Mary Scorer's books, is not dependent on any agreement between the employer and employee beyond seeing that the firm functions efficiently, is able to maintain a profit, and has good public relations. But, Mr. Speaker, the proposals before us I believe bespeak a guilty conscience on the part of the government to provide a positive retroactive sanction for a policy upon which they have already embarked; and I suggest that we check this process rather than legitimize it.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals I've talked about have already received some attention. There are three others which merit attention, because taken together, and with those already mentioned, they collectively constitute a very serious threat to the Civil Service. Several parts of this bill will have the effect of altering or conferring the power to alter the composition of the Civil Service Commission. The Commission and its equivalent in other provinces, Mr. Speaker, represents a device for which over the last 50 years we have moved from pork barrelism and wholesale patronage to the merit system. The independence of the Commission has never been absolute, but has been sufficient that a government wishing to by-pass it had to employ somewhat unusual measures, or to come back to the Legislature itself. Under the present government, one of the most extensive ways of by-passing the Commission and the merit system has been the use of technical officer device and the contract arrangements which we have seen so much of in the Department of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, there can be little question that in many cases these devices are used to employ persons whose chief qualifications are political, and whose applications would not normally be meeting the standards imposed by the Commission. This bill, however, will

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . change that by changing the Commission. This bill will give the government unlimited power to add to the Commission and even limited power to remove.

On the assumption that a government does not, in a bill of this kind, seek to obtain powers that it does not intend to use, one may fairly ask - what's it intended for? I think it is clear that on the one hand the government is seeking the power to add to the Commission's membership so that at any time it could, if it so desired, dilute the numerical strength of those who upheld the present system of appointments and promotion. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, it could add indefinitely persons prepared to see that the candidates sympathetic to the party in power were given preferment. I have to assume the members of the government -- well, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister of Public Works thinks this is cynicism, let him amend the act so that this power is not given; let him justify why the government is taking this power. Mr. Speaker, I have to assume that the members of the government know what they are doing unless, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Public Works is going to admit that the members of the government don't know what they're doing.

MR. ENNS: They don't. They don't.

MR. SPIVAK: And I wonder whether the public of Manitoba realize that the government, by their action, is seeking to turn the clock back 50 years by undermining the independence of the Commission, the Commission that has really come to act as a buffer between the politicians and the non-partisan public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I also find it very hard to believe that it is merely coincidental that this proposal is coupled with one to force retirement at the age of 65 on commissioners, which will require the retirement of two of the present members of a three-man commission. There are many government boards and commissions that have no such provision. Why is it so politically sensitive that a commission as this one be singled out?

Mr. Speaker, in another provision of this bill, an unsuccessful candidate for the Civil Service may appeal, not to the Commission or to some other independent body, but to the Minister who shall be empowered to appoint an investigator, who shall in turn report to the Minister whose decision shall be final. The question this poses is simple and basic. If a decision of the committee can by this process be overruled by a Minister, what purpose, Mr. Speaker, is there in having a commission at all? The real power of the Commission shall have passed again to the Cabinet. The Commission will be all appearances and no substance. It will exist to provide an air of legitimacy to an increasingly ad hoc process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Labour has, ever since he took office, acted as though he was the Minister of the Civil Service. Mr. Speaker, in fact and in law he is simply the Minister through whom the Commission reports to this House. But if we have in recent years faced the case of the Minister of Labour subordinating the Civil Service, we will now have the power extended to every other Minister of the Crown. And I wonder whether the honourable gentlemen opposite truly realize the implication of what they are doing. I wonder if they really want some future government not of their political faith to possess these powers.

To all of this may be added perhaps the most sinister provision of all, the provision which would confer on the Cabinet the power to organize or reorganize the Civil Service and to assign, reassign, classify or reclassify the duties and positions of public servants.

Mr. Speaker, this Act has a section - and I'm not going to deal with the particular section - which was placed in this Act -- one gets the impression that they would have liked the debate to have occurred on the question of whether the civil servants should or should not be allowed to enter public life, and the rights that they would have. This particular section essentially, Mr. Speaker, gives the Cabinet the authority to do whatever it wants with respect to any or all of the civil servants. And, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to allow this section to go through without a battle.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider that for government to function, the executive must have extensive power to direct the Civil Service, and it now does have that power. But I ask the government, in what other jurisdiction is so sweeping and all-embracing a power conferred on the Cabinet with respect to the Civil Service as the particular section - without dealing with the section that I've mentioned and the principles involved in that section? Now, Mr. Speaker, I've not looked at all the Civil Service acts in all the provinces but I have examined the majority of them, and I can say categorically that the provision that I am

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . referring to would confer greater authority on the Cabinet of Manitoba than that enjoyed by the Cabinet in any other act in which I have examined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is it introduced if the government does not intend to use it? And if it intends to use it, to what end? Is it to allow the government to make extensive changes in the Civil Service without further legislative sanction? Is it to allow the government de facto power to ignore large sections of the Civil Service Act by Order-in-Council? Is it to be able to allow the government to ignore its own guarantees to civil servants who involve themselves in politics by placing the authority of the Act subordinate to the authority of the Cabinet? Mr. Speaker, is it to allow the government to do by regulation whatever they want without ever having to come back to the Legislature? And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what that section suggests.

Mr. Speaker, let us take the example of the civil servant who does run, who in fact is not elected, who comes back to his position to find that there's a change of government and he ran for the other party. He is to have under this Act, as I understand it, the protection - and that's what we would want - of not being prejudiced because he ran. But under the particular section that I am referring to, the Cabinet can laterally transfer him, without any reference to Civil Service, by straight Order-in-Council and that authority will be given by this Act that we are asked and that you are asked to pass. And I ask the members opposite to consider the possibility of a government elected that is not of their political faith, who would then have the power by Order-in-Council without any particular reference to the Civil Service, to laterally transfer everybody out who they wanted to demote and to be in a position to interfere notwithstanding the fact that there was a protection in the Act given to them that they have a right to come back. I don't think that was intended by the members opposite but I must tell you that I don't think any of you have ever read this bill, and you've relied on the competence of the Minister of Labour in presenting this, and I must tell you you've relied incorrectly on this. I suggest you examine it because I don't think that you want the Cabinet, as this bill gives the power, to be able to do whatever it wants without any reference to anybody and not to be in a position to even abide by the Civil Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, when you take the total package, not just the clauses referring to the ability of civil servants to enter in the political field, when you take that total package the main underlying principle becomes much clearer. The government wishes to facilitate the politicization of the Civil Service by involving the Service in a positive way in the political process, but lest its moves in that direction will prove insufficient, it seeks by controlling the Commission and by asserting its own supremacy over its own Act, to provide itself with a full armoury to complete the task. Taken as a whole, it is most concerted frontal attack on the independence of the Civil Service and I suggest that it is a most concentrated frontal attack on the independence of the Civil Service of any jurisdiction in Canada. In part this is contained in an . . . but largely specious argument about the political equality of civil servants; the balance is contained in some apparently innocuous but I suggest potentially enormous powers conferred on the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, this is worse than patronage. It's more than pork-barrelism. This is a proposal which opens the door to the wholesale subversion of the political service in which large parts of it would be open to the adherence of the party in power and much of those who remain in the Civil Service through the process of intimidation. To be sure, Mr. Speaker, and to be fair, I'm really not certain whether the honourable members opposite are fully aware of the Pandora's Box they are opening, and I refer back to the Honourable Minister of Finance who in his remarks suggested--I think that this is what the principle of the bill is. I question, Mr. Speaker, whether the members on the opposite or the backbenchers really have read the Act and understand what I have referred to as this Pandora's Box. You know, they may believe that they are generally securing political rights for civil servants and no more. It may be that they have not contemplated the implications of three sections of the bill. If so, I earnestly--well if they're not connivers then I would think, if they're not connivers, Mr. Speaker, then I would say to the Honourable Member for Radisson, if that's your intention, so far no one has said that that's your intention and it would be far more honest to stand up and speak and say what your intention is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the members opposite will heed the

BILL NO 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . remarks and will express and show a willingness to amend the bill before the debate proceeds much further.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I want the honourable members opposite to understand one thing. Because one of their Ministers, who happens to have the responsibility, brings in the bill it doesn't necessarily follow that he knows what he's talking about. It also doesn't necessarily follow that he's done his homework. It also doesn't follow necessarily that he understands even the implications of the legislative wording that's been put forward. And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the members opposite - and I'm going to give some examples - that it would be in their interest to examine the bill and to see whether some of the things that I'm suggesting are correct, because if they are, I'm prepared to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that if we see a willingness on the part of the government to provide the kind of amendments that will take away some of the problem areas that we've identified, then we may be in a position to be able to support the bill.

I wonder if they understand, really, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not talking to the back-benchers - the possible results of supporting the Commission, supporting the Commission by altering the approved procedures. I wonder if they realize that if the Act is passed as proposed, that when we form a government we will be empowered, without reference to this House, first of all to basically throw out all the civil servants we want, to conduct a purge of the Civil Service if we want, and to be in a position to basically reassign, reclassify and rearrange. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to have that power; I don't want any government to have that power; and I don't think they want to have that power. But that's what you're providing in the Act. You're providing in the Act for the ability of any government, when a change takes place, to be in a position to essentially clean house without any particular reference to the Civil Service, to be able to reclassify, reassign, rearrange and literally to be able to accomplish that which the Civil Service Act was supposed not to accomplish, the complete ability of a government to be able to take care of their enemies if they so desired, and to be able to reward their friends.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the members opposite realize or know what the government is doing, but from what I've seen in the north and from what I know of things that are happening in the Civil Service, I fear that the government does know and has deliberately embarked upon a course which is sinister and shameful. Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility on this side, if our analysis is right, to do what we can to alert the public, and that is what we shall do.

Now let us concede, Mr. Speaker, that we face two handicaps. First, because this is the first session after the election in which the public may not be concerned about what happens in this Chamber. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to use all the means available to us under the rules to either get a satisfactory accounting of this government's intentions or to stick at this thing, Mr. Speaker, until the public through the media are made aware that something out of the ordinary - and I suggest it's out of the ordinary - is happening on Broadway. That is both our right and our responsibility as the Opposition in this Chamber.

Let us concede, Mr. Speaker, that many people are not much interested in the Civil Service. Some tend to think of the service as the bureaucracy, inefficient, overpaid, and all the other cliches. But in a society like ours where the government is involved in so much, the professional competence and the political impartiality of the Civil Service are things which eventually affect everyone. In 1956, Mr. Speaker, few people in this country cared much about a pipeline as such, but in time we all came to recognize it as telling a great deal about the use and abuse of power by the government. People may be similarly unconcerned about the Civil Service but we believe that people can and will see the government's handling of this as a reflection of its use or abuse of power.

With the exception I've noted, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of the candidacy and job security, I do not want this government or any government to have this power. I do not believe that government needs these powers and I do not believe that any government which I had the honour to lead would need these powers. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, we urge the government to indicate that it is going to be prepared to amend and to indicate that soon, so that we will be in a position to know what their objections are.

Secondly, in lieu of that, we serve notice that we shall use every means open to us to mobilize public opinion to stay the government's hand.

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, if the government, employing its majority, impose what we consider an unnecessary and reactionary legislation, we serve notice that as a matter of high priority the next Progressive-Conservative Government commits itself now to amend and repeal these obnoxious amendments proposed in this Act before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we're wrong and if we're being unfair in ascribing motives, the government can set our apprehensions at rest. They can do that by withdrawing the obnoxious sections of the bill. This will be the test of their good faith for if they do not propose to use these powers there hardly can be any argument that they need them. And I can apply to them a further test of their good will and good intentions, for I submit to them the following proposition:

I submit that the withdrawal of the sections that I have referred to of the bill will excite no agitation among the public at large. The poor and disadvantaged will not feel a whit more poor and disadvantaged if the bill be amended. You will not offend the women in the Civil Service by amending the present bill because you have not taken any of the recommendations of your own task force in bringing in a Civil Service Act and one wonders how a government who is supposedly committed to equality, which is the basis of the political references, would not have at least taken its recommendations from its own task force and brought those amendments forward. You will get no protest, Mr. Speaker, if the sections I have referred to are withdrawn, from the old age pensioners, from those concerned with day care facilities, from the conservationists. You will not face criticism of the academic community or from the labour movement for this measure does not constitute a measure that will lift the yoke of the oppressed, it does not seek to right a wrong or advance a cause. You will excite, Mr. Speaker, no agitation or opposition if you amend this bill because there's no agitation or anxiety to see it passed. But let us hesitate, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps there is one group that would be angered by the amendment to this bill that we've proposed; perhaps certain elements with the New Democratic Party who raised their voices in convention last December, perhaps they would be angered and upset for this bill surely opens the door to realizing their aims. If so, Mr. Speaker, this is a party measure if ever there was one, introduced by a party to serve a party at great public cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I invite the government to show that it is big enough to admit the possible error, wide enough in vision to concede that this bill may go further than they intended. The alternative will be for protracted debate in this House, and should the government insist, the opening of a Pandora's Box, Mr. Speaker, in the public service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be on the part of the government an attempt to try and explain the sections away in the hope that the explanation will be satisfactory, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt very much whether the government has done its homework as in other bills. I doubt very much if they understand the implications of giving the Cabinet the kind of responsibility that they're suggesting. I doubt if they understand that by allowing the appeal to a Minister under the particular section and wiping the Commission out in this particular area, that by doing this they are allowing the Ministerial discretion which if exercised by a government not sympathetic to those who have campaigned, if they are given this right under the Act and who have allowed their names to run as candidates or to be nominated as candidates, they are going to give that authority to a Cabinet and to a Minister to essentially be in a position to do whatever they want.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated there are several principles involved in this bill. The government has only talked about one. They have blended everything in to the argument about whether or not a civil servant should be allowed to be able to run for office. The Minister of Finance indicated that if there was some problems with respect to the raising of money, he would consider possibly accepting some amendments on that. I think I'm right in this respect, I think those were generally his intentions, and I find this startling, Mr. Speaker, because he didn't know of the full implications, and I'm not suggesting that every Cabinet Minister should know but I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that in this sensitive area where I think there has been concern expressed, and the government may say rightly or wrongly on our part about the politicization of the Civil Service that they should not have put themselves in the position of providing an Act which I believe can be interpreted in the way it was suggested by, I believe, the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie - I'm not sure if it

BILL NO. 7

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . was Portage la Prairie or Fort Garry, I'm sorry, it was the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party I believe who suggested it - and with the response to that, I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that in this sensitive area the government should have been introducing this bill without the Cabinet and the members of their caucus understanding its implications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so it will be clear from our point of view, we do not object to a political civil servant being given the right to run for political office. And, Mr. Speaker, we would suggest that the way in which that should be handled would be to follow the Ontario Act and we think that the Ontario Act is good and it provides initiative, it provides initiatives, Mr. Speaker, that the present government has not provided, taking care of the person who in fact has run, has been elected, and is defeated in a period of time, I believe five years in the case of Ontario, and seeks to be able to come back to the Civil Service. That is No. 1, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe that the civil servants should be allowed to work within the political process because of what we believe will be a comprising of their position, and because of the sensitive area that so many of them are involved.

And we believe, Mr. Speaker, we believe, Mr. Speaker, that these two principles can be separated and that we are in a position to debate both, and agree on the first, and disagree on the second. And we would hope that the government would consider the second, and if they will not they will put us in the position, Mr. Speaker, of not being able to support this bill.

And further, Mr. Speaker, we would want an undertaking and an indication by the government before we are asked to support the bill that the Cabinet will not be given the authority that it's been given, that the Minister will not be given the authority that it's been given, and that the Civil Service Commission will not be emasculated by a government who may not like what the Civil Service is doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, over a period of time we are going to be able to cite chapter and verse where particular sections have been used by the government to be able to place in positions people whom may want, who could not come up through the regular Civil Service channels. And, Mr. Speaker, that can be documented, and the members opposite know that, and we can and we will, and in saying that, Mr. Speaker, we realize that in doing this there is a power within the technical offices section of the Civil Service Act that can be used and in our belief has been abused by the government.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, having said that, we await some response from the government which will indicate, Mr. Speaker, that they are prepared to consider, or reconsider that, and until, Mr. Speaker, we have that position it will be impossible for us, even though we agree in the first principle, to be in a position to support the bill until we have the answers, and not from the, you know, remarks from his seat by the Minister but rather from maybe some serious consultation by the Cabinet with the Premier, who after having examined it will understand the full implications of what is happening and will be in a position to at least in a reasonable way present the position of the government and the changes that should take place so that in effect the fears that I have raised and that many of us feel will be at least allayed by the fact that the government will not act.

Mr. Speaker, this is the role of the Opposition as we see it and we have now presented our case and the ball is in the government's court.

BILL 7

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get clarification. Is this bill standing in the name of the Member for Gladstone?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes it is.

MR. MILLER: In that case, may I speak?--(Interjection)--Thank you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Official Opposition and what I am pleased about is the fact that we all now seem to be heading in the same direction, and that to me is important, because both the Liberal Party and now the Conservative Party have indicated that they too recognize that for too long civil servants have been second-class citizens, and that for too long in this province people have been prevented from participating as citizens should in the political processes of this province.

Some of the things that the leader has said I question. I think he's reading into it more than what is there; I'm sure he knows that today and last year, and two years ago, and five years ago, the same raffle that he referred to could have been sold by any civil servant in Manitoba at any time except after the writs have been issued in an election, because an election has been called. But otherwise there was no inhibition whatsoever and the section he's dealing with is really a part in the existing act. So there's no change there. So when he brings that up as something that this government is doing and I want to remind him this is a fact, these things could take place and have taken place.

And really what are we talking about? You know to follow his reasoning we're going to politicize everybody in the Civil Service. The reality is this, and he's a practical man and he should understand it, the reality is that the vast majority of civil servants will probably want no part of anything. They're prepared to continue doing their work, as professionally, as competently as they can without any involvement. And so be it. That's the way they want it to be and that's the way it shall be. But there is always a percentage in our society who feel that they do want to become politically active, and they have been inhibited up to now because they could not let their names stand, because if they let their names stand they had to resign from the Civil Service, they had to remove themselves from the Civil Service. This is a barrier that prevented people from moving and so there will probably be the vast majority, for various reasons and a very, in most cases probably, a very selfish reason which is - I'm not critical of it - but simply the fact that a lot of people will not want to be identified with any party simply because they don't want to be in the position where they may have to explain why they participated on behalf of any particular party, whether during election, or not during election, at any time, because there may be changes in government, because their immediate superior may feel differently than they do, and so by and large there isn't going to be any great dramatic effect.

All that will happen, as I say, is that certain people who have wanted to become involved, and have been involved actually over the decade, but have done it very quietly perhaps, but they've been involved, but now will be able to stand for office and will not be inhibited because an election was called. The magic of calling an election, the issuing of a writ, and suddenly the activity in which you've been involved, and suddenly the interest you've shown, and suddenly the meetings you've attended, and suddenly all the things you've done, including selling raffles, must cease. Why? The issuance of a writ. That was the magic. That to me is nonsensical. That is really nonsensical because you're telling a person you may do as you wish but turn that switch off because the writs have been issued, and that is the phoniness of our position. And I think that is the phoniness that I hope the Members of the Conservative Party, the Member of the Liberal Party, want to join with us in correcting, an injustice; and I think it's an anomaly which really shouldn't exist at this point in time.

And there are thousands of people affected generally by the inhibition which exists in our act today. I think it's wrong. If I am a civil servant and if I want to support a candidate, I want to do it openly, I don't want to have to hide, and I'll take my chances. That's why I say that the majority probably will not, but if I wish to do so I don't want to be concerned. You know at the municipal level there is no inhibition. If a person working for a municipality wishes to participate in an election, he's free to do so.--(Interjection)--He does it, period. And you know nothing has happened. No great tragedies, no great terrible things have happened.--(Interjection)--Very few do it because they don't want to get involved, that's right. The Member for St. Boniface is quite right. The fact is they won't and there is nothing forcing anybody. Some are going to, some aren't. What percentage of the total population is involved in

BILL 7

(MR. MILLER cont'd) election, Mr. Speaker? We've all run for office, each and every one of us here, and if we added up all the workers we all had together, what percentage would it be of the total of Manitoba? Now let's be realistic. So let's not, you know, exaggerate it; let's not make monstrous charges and see nefarious schemes where in fact there aren't any.

I recall when the Minister of Labour introduced this bill, he did say, that this bill was being introduced because he hoped the principle of participation in the public life of the province is now acceptable finally in 1974 by all parties, and that the bill could be approved in principle, and that in law amendments he would entertain amendments because he recognized that there may be differences, different views, and that this government has indicated, both through the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Finance the other day, that certainly a bill of this kind is not just being put on the statutes because a particular party wants it, but because all parties recognize that what has gone on in the past cannot go on. The people have a right to participate in public life, that this Act, if passed, will apply to this government and future governments, and it may not be the Leader of the Official Opposition will ever lead that government, but it will apply to other governments, this I can assure him. And therefore it has to get House concurrence and I hope that that's the way it would be.

You know, he brings up an interesting red herring - and I call it that - the relationship of civil servants, he says, with the . . . of the welfare recipients and with suppliers to government. Now is he that naive, and isn't he aware that when it comes to suppliers, and when it comes to people who do business with government, that they do support the government in office, and he knows it. --(Interjection)--After I'm through. And he knows it, and if they support the government in office because they want to support them for whatever their reasons, they're doing it with this Act and without this Act; they're doing it maybe because they think they're going to get some favorable consideration, and they may not get it. But it has nothing to do, absolutely nothing to do whether or not a member of the Civil Service is active in a political party, absolutely not. Because if a business wants to support a party in office during an election, they will do so - as a matter of fact they'll support all three; they'll hedge their bet. They've done that before in every jurisdiction. So the suggestion that somehow a civil servant who publicly admits to being a member of the Conservative Party, or the Liberal Party, or the New Democratic Party, that there is something evil in that, it's absolute nonsense. It has no validity because, in fact, as I say these things are known today, anyway they're done today, and it only is enforced during the period, that very three week period, the very short period when the writs are issued.

The Leader of the Official Opposition says this legislation does not regress a wrong - I think that was the point he made. I think it does regress a wrong. It regresses a wrong that's been on our statutes too long and, you know, the interesting thing is he wants to change it. He wants to make it possible for people to run for office, for people to serve, and if they are not successful in running for office he wants to make sure that they can get back into their jobs, that they'd be protected, that they either go into that particular job or into an equivalent job, because, if I heard him correctly, he does want to protect the individual who's running for office. So if he's wanting to protect them I assume he also wants them to have the right to run for office.

He also questioned whether an employee can speak frankly. You know, Mr. Speaker, I've been in this government now for four and a half years and I can tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the department that I have been involved in, I don't know what the politics of the majority of them are; in some cases I have a hunch what they were and what they still may be, but I know of no employee who has been inhibited from talking to me for that reason, who wasn't quite frank and honest in his appraisal of what I was suggesting; but finally, when a policy was set, those same employees, whether they were supporters of the Conservatives, of the Liberals, the New Democrats, accepted the policies laid down, and because they're professionals they enacted those policies; they performed as professionals; and if they had differences of opinion it was professional opinion, it was their point of view as to the kind of policy. At no time - and I say this unequivocally, at no time was any member of my staff, or any staffs that I am aware of, made to feel that because perhaps they may have shared a different political point of view, that somehow their judgments or their opinions didn't have value. It would be foolish for the Leader of the Official Opposition to suggest this, because in fact people who have given their many years in the public service are respected for their knowledge, for their

BILL 7

(MR. MILLER cont'd) capacity, for their expertise, and any good government and any Minister who ignores this would be losing the advantage of that kind of experience. In fact I know that my colleagues, as I, do indeed not only listen but we often heed the advice by . . . people who I know are not supporters of the government, of this government, and yet I know have given me that advice because they feel in all sincerity that's the best advice - and sometimes it is the best advice and we follow it as often as not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the Leader of the Official Opposition is saying to us today that his Party is prepared to approve the principle of the bill, to make it possible for people in the service of the Provincial Government to participate in--(Interjection)--I wonder if the Member for Lakeside could share with me his comment because I'm not sure I heard it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MILLER: Oh I see. Well, okay. Thank you. Now that I've heard the comment it really doesn't matter, you know, it's not that much value. I thought he had something to say. --(Interjection)--Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MILLER: But, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Official Opposition was talking for his Party and was now indicating, despite a lot of comments that were made by the other side, if he is now saying clearly that, yes, the Conservative Party recognizes that there should be legislation to make available to the civil servants the possibility, if they so desire, on an individual basis participation of the political . . . of this province, if that's what he's saying, that's what we are saying, and it's come a long way indeed; and I'm glad to hear it; I'm glad to hear it because in that case I don't see why this bill needs much more debating at this point in time. I think it should go to Law Amendments; I think at that point any differences of interpretation can be looked at, whether the fears raised or the fears expressed by the Leader of the Official Opposition are indeed valid--and maybe, maybe some of them are. On the other hand some of them may be within existing legislation, you know, and he may not even be aware of that - which is possible. And I'm not critical of him; believe me, I'm not being critical of him when I say that, because I don't expect every member to know all the details and all the ramifications and implications of every piece of legislation. That's what Law Amendments is all about. That's when it comes up; that's when it's clarified; that's when questions can be asked in the less formal atmosphere than exists in the House, Mr. Speaker, where we cannot refer to clauses, and we cannot refer to sub-clauses, we can only talk in broad generalities. If I were to start referring to a certain clause that I'm dying to refer to, you'd rule me out of order, and I don't want that so therefore I won't refer to it. But that's the inhibition at this level, at this point in debate, to deal with this matter; and so all we can talk about is the sweeping generalities and the principles of the bill itself.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I take the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition as a green light to go ahead with an act to amend the legislation which until now has been an inhibition to civil servants to participate fully within the public life of this province, and therefore I welcome his comments as we did that of the Liberals, and I also welcome the support which he also indicated. He may have some differences, he may feel that we haven't gone far enough, for instance he suggests that we should not only allow someone to run for office but, having run for office and having succeeded, we should then assure his job for the next five years; which is quite a, you know, it's quite a step forward. That's true, we haven't gone that far, and it's really asking a lot, because you have to recognize that in that five-year period a position just doesn't hang empty. Things occur; other appointments have to be made; and it's really asking an awful lot. Somebody has to move over when this man comes back after five years.

I'm thinking of the Member for - the former Member for St. Vital - I think it was Jack Hardy, who did run for office, I think he was an employee of the Provincial Government. He had no choice, he had to resign from his position. He couldn't help it; had no security of tenure whatsoever, had--you know, he was really in an impossible position, and the answer was, of course, he finally, he--(Interjection)--Which? No, no. That's the point, that he could not, he had no assurance either that his job would be there, and so he was really in the position where everything stopped dead for him and he had to eventually, in the light of his family needs, he had to resign and I believe he went to New Westminster or Vancouver, I forget where, but somewhere on the west coast.

BILL 7

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

Now it's true that our legislation therefore does not give that kind of guarantee after four or five years, but at the same time if that is what the Opposition wants, well we'll look at it, but there are many implications in that kind of proposal too and it's really far more reaching than what we have suggested. And so we'll certainly look at it, we'll look at it in committee when it goes to committee, but I would hope that at this point in time that this matter can now be proceeded with because I really have seen nothing or heard nothing in the comments today up to now which would indicate that there's a basic idealistic, philosophical difference in our approach. If we all agree, well, let's get the bill into committee and let's move on with the job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I believe the Minister indicated he would accept a question. I wonder if he could indicate whether at present suppliers of government services are being solicited for funds for the government's political party by the civil servants who award the government contracts.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if that is the case then I'm not aware of it, but I'll tell you this, if that is the case there's nothing in the present act, existing act, to inhibit that; not this year, not in 1968, '67, '66, '65, at any time. If it's going on now, it could easily have gone on then. That's all I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the Minister could undertake to discuss this bill with his Cabinet so they'll understand the full meaning of what they're doing.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition could look at the existing legislation so that what I've just said is correct, that in fact that kind of activity, not during the election period but today--right now there's no election, there's no election in the offing, whether ten years ago a person could not have done exactly what the Leader of the Opposition just asked me.

MR. SPEAKER: The question will remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. (Stand) Bill No. 16. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. (Stand) Bill No. 17, also Birtle-Russell. (Stand) Bill No. 18, again. Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Virden. (Stand) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Have we run through all the bills, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Except Bill No. 9, unless the Minister of Agriculture wishes to go on that.

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

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7 (a). The Honourable Member for Pembina. The honourable member has 26 minutes.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe when I left off my remarks I had been criticizing the Minister of Agriculture for going around to all the meetings in the province trying to brainwash the people into his way of thinking, but he was very critical if any members on this side that attended any political meetings, even if they just talked to people in the hall, you know. Just what does that mean? I don't see anything wrong with MLAs going to meetings that concern different things in their constituency. What is really wrong with the Member from Morris or from Lakeside attending any of these meetings? Is he afraid of the democratic process? And yet when he has the platform, even if it isn't at a meeting like that, he chooses to try to brainwash the people into his way of thinking.

Now I believe that the concept of producer marketing boards is here whether we like it or not, but we like to call them producer marketing boards, and we believe that the people should be duly elected and that they should know what's going on, and that they shouldn't be government appointed people that's really controlling these boards. And this is what seems to be going

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) on in the Hog Producers Marketing Board and this is what seems to be getting under people's skin, and especially the fact of having this super board imposed over top of them which can veto anything they done and then having to swear themselves to secrecy.

Now, there's another thing that's bothered me considerable and it hasn't been spoke of yet, but it's the government and its land lease policy, and I know that the Minister of Agriculture has criticized people on our side for stating some of our views and the way it appeared that the government was going to take over this land and not sell it back to the people. And I have here a copy from Hansard, it's on April 10, 1973, and at that time we were talking about the Farm Credit Corporation and its new policies, and we started to question the Minister. He was questioned at length and he was kind of beating around the bush about it a lot and we weren't getting too straight answers, there had been questions asked by the Member from Arthur, and here's a part right here, and I was questioning him myself on this particular thing, and I said in the end: "Are you saying, then, that they are not offering it for sale, that they are leasing it out, and that after this that the land is staying in the name of the Crown?" And his answer is "Yes". That's on page 1591 of Hansard.

So if he thinks that they were misrepresenting his policy, it's because he gave that impression at that time when we were talking about this particular aspect of it.

MR. USKIW: . . . let the House know what subject matter he's on, because I think he is applying an answer to a different matter to the land lease program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: We were dealing with supply in agriculture last year at that time, but that was just at the time when your land lease program was being talked about and we were concerned about the government going into the ownership of land and just leasing it out and not selling it back to the farmers. --(Interjection)--This is on repossessions, yes. But if you wouldn't sell on a repossession, why would you sell on any of the others? So it shows that even then you were considering getting the ownership of the land and keeping it in the name of the Crown. Not only the land, you want the oil rights besides. So if we got the impression it's because you gave us that very impression at that time.

Now I have here your ad on the back of the Manitoba Co-operator, an ad that incidentally cost the taxpayers of Manitoba \$615.00 to put out an ad like this. And actually the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs could almost prosecute you for coming so close to misleading the people. You know, it's just one of these things. You talk about the companies and their sales ad; you've got an ad here that's just about as misleading as the ads that you see on any product that's for sale.

A MEMBER: What colour is it?

MR. HENDERSON: It's green.

A MEMBER: Green?

MR. HENDERSON: Green. They usually use red, but they've got the green one here. And it says here, just like as if nothing could be wrong with it, it says here, the people that can use it: "People who want to sell their land, people who want to retire, people who want to get out of debt." And then, "You may buy the land and lease it. At the end of five years you could choose." You know, it's laid out just so nice, all the good things about it, that you think it had no bad things about it. It's just telling the one side of the thing. But this ad does not tell how hard it is for a farmer to get ownership afterwards, because if a man had this option for five years and he wants it back, he doesn't get it back at what he paid for it; he doesn't even get it back at--you rent it out at five percent to him, invested amount, but he doesn't get it back even for making up the difference in the interest because he gets it back at whichever is the highest, its assessed value at the time he wants it back or that, and with the inflation going on he has no chance to get this back. We had a far better policy before when they supported young farmers with loans. So the chances are that any of these farmers who'd get this on this deal will never get it back by paying up that difference of interest because it's the higher of the two and with inflation the way it is they're not going to be getting it back except at your appraised price.

MR. USKIW: What does he mean by getting it back, since they don't own it in the first place?

MR. HENDERSON: Well, I'm talking about--supposing a father that sold it was thinking

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) of letting his son have it. He could have maybe sold it to him and the son could have borrowed the money and had possession of the land; but he thinks because he can get money from the government at five percent, it seems a very low rate, and so he's better off to have it at five percent because he can't borrow for less than nine--(Interjection)--7-1/2 if he's younger, but I mean so he thinks well, this is cheaper for me, so he takes it. But then when he thinks he can get it back he can't buy it back like that. He has to buy it back at the appraised value at that time.

A MEMBER: Government rip-off.

MR. HENDERSON: So you see it's not very easy. So if he couldn't buy it in the first place how is he going to buy it back later on? Another thing that's wrong about it is that it really discourages people from owning land at all and renting it out. So they want even the people that are renting out land to only get five percent because whoever's renting will compare that rate of interest to what they can get it through the government, so it discourages people from owning land and renting it out at all. So you want to do away with anybody like that. You want to own it yourselves. They want to own it. And the taxpayers of Manitoba by giving this low subsidized rate, that the people of Manitoba, whether they like it or not too, are all helping for the government to become the biggest landlord in the province. And that's just what it is.

A MEMBER: They don't know how to farm.

MR. HENDERSON: They really don't know, they really don't know just what's going on, because it's in the back of your mind and the other members on that side that they want to own the land that we're working. There's no use of beating around the bush about it. They want the mineral rights and they want this, and I think that this here thing right here is a very serious thing because we're going to discourage ownership on the farms; the people that have any land and are retired they won't be able to rent it out at a rate that's proper; people will use the thing because they think they can get the money for five percent and that they can farm, but just watch out after a number of years; that five percent can be changed and other conditions can be changed and the government has got the land.

This land lease program that you brought out, as far as I'm concerned, I feel is one of the biggest things that you've done towards taking over state ownership of land. Now the Minister might laugh and think this is a joke, but he's got it through now and I don't know what we can do about it. But it's a bad policy for Manitoba because I never saw a person working yet that didn't prefer to own his land, but he's getting trapped here. It makes me think of the Member from Sturgeon Creek when he told the story about the man that had the wild pigs. Because you've offered him money at the five percent you've got him lured into something but you're going to capture him and you're going to capture the land.

So this is mainly all I have to say on this but it's one of the things that has hurt me the worst. I can go for some of your other programs in diversification and livestock, but I certainly can't go for your land lease thing and I feel it's something that the people of Manitoba have been accepting without realizing the ultimate results of it. And I would certainly hope that some time later on we can do something to get this changed but I don't know what it will be. It's one of the things that's hurt me most. And if the Minister thinks that we were misquoting him and it's just because of the reasons that I have stated here, taken it from Hansard, that he was already telling us that anything that they got in the name of the Crown would only be leased out again and would not be sold.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, let me respond to those comments because I think the Member for Pembina is not fully aware of the implications of his own remarks. I should like to point out to the honourable member that he is quoting from an answer given to him in this House some several months ago on what the Credit Corporation is going to do with those seven or eight farms that were repossessed at that time, or during the course of a period of time. And the question was whether or not those farms would be put up for sale. And my answer at that time was that no, first of all we would consider whether the original owner would want to lease them back, because maybe they want to carry on in agriculture, notwithstanding the fact that they were financially in great difficulty that they could exercise the option of leasing those farms back on a preferential basis. Secondly, any lands that were leased, or are leased, which were repossessed, the lessee has the same option to purchase as under the land lease program. True, the land isn't offered for sale but the person that leases it has an option to

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) buy after five years. The Honourable member wants to put a question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: I understand that anybody that has a lease has a chance, an option to renew it, but if he didn't renew it then it goes in the name of the Crown and is not ever offered for sale again, and that's what you said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, that's not correct, Mr. Chairman. Every lessee under that program has an option to purchase after five years, so the only part of the answer that my honourable friend should be addressing him to which is correct, and that is that no, we are not offering land for sale even if it is repossessed at this point in time, but a lessee, after five years, could seize on the opportunity to purchase. So that is the only difference between the understanding of my honourable friend and what the true facts are.

I should like to now take issue, though, with my honourable friend from Pembina, because he bewails the fact, Mr. Chairman, that private land owners find it difficult to compete with the rental rate and that this is somehow bad for the people of Manitoba. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am very much concerned about the reverse, that too few private owners will have too much land and they will want to lease the land in order to get their rewards on their investments, Mr. Chairman. And I related to that, Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago, when I said that was the system in Europe not so very long ago and that is something--(Interjection)--it is never better than the government leasing the land, Mr. Chairman. If there is going to be a lessor of properties for agricultural purposes, Mr. Chairman, I would much prefer that that be the public system rather than the private, because at least, Mr. Chairman, the people have access to the system of government to amend policy, to change policy, but have no access, Mr. Chairman, to the decisions of private individuals who accumulate huge masses of land and will become very substantive landlords within the province. So let's not make any apologies, Mr. Chairman, for my preference, because I'm prepared to shout that preference from the rooftops, Mr. Chairman. There is no way in which we as legislators in this country, in this province, should ever allow the kind of system to come back as what our parents left behind in Europe 50 years ago, Mr. Chairman.

I can understand, Mr. Chairman, I can understand the sensitivities of those people who have already accumulated large holdings and are making a business of renting these holdings. I can understand the sensitivities, Mr. Chairman. But I want to point out that I have had many inquiries in the last three or four years from very large land companies world-wide, who want to assemble huge blocks of land in this province for that very purpose, Mr. Chairman, to assemble land in order to sublet so we can reintroduce the old feudal system. Yes. Private ownership of land, private ownership of land by a few, Mr. Chairman, not for everyone, not for everyone. That is what my honourable friend is advocating. Mr. Chairman, I can't accept that.

Not so long ago I had a letter from a land syndicate based in Sydney, Australia, Mr. Chairman, based in Sydney, Australia, with offices in London, and they were prepared to extend their offices to Manitoba, and they inquired whether we would look friendly upon that kind of proposal, upon them locating here in this province, and buying up huge blocks of land that they would then sublet. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to be able to say to these people that no, we would not welcome you to Manitoba. We have our own land program in this province that is publicly administered and we are not at all interested in you pursuing your proposal.

And then of course, Mr. Chairman, I had an interesting caller only two weeks ago, an interesting individual, Mr. Chairman, who happens to be in the real estate business in this province; a very interesting individual, Mr. Chairman, who came in only a few weeks ago, and I know the Honourable Member for Assiniboia might be sensitive about this point but a real estate agent came to see me only two weeks ago and said, "I am very much concerned about the volume of land that is slipping away into foreign hands." He said, "They are dropping a million dollars at a crack in purchasing blocks of land in this province right now," and he said, "I am only one agency buying for this company. There is another agency plus they have their own." And he said, "While I am making all kinds of money doing it, I don't think it's good for the people of Manitoba." That is what a real estate agent told me only two weeks ago,

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) Mr. Chairman, and he came to me, Mr. Chairman, with the point of view of government intervening to disallow that kind of thing, to disallow that kind of thing, because he was afraid that we were going to be repeating history all over again.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina is expressing a great deal of concern because he philosophically thinks that it's better if a few private individuals have control of all of our resources as opposed to the people of the province through their elected representatives. And that is the issue. And I would far sooner trust, Mr. Chairman, even my members opposite if they were the government, in the administration of a land program, than I would someone based in New York City, or Sydney, Australia, or London, England, Mr. Chairman. And that is really the choice we have. That is really the choice we have. So let's not make any apology, Mr. Chairman, for offering a new program to people that will hopefully make good use of it, and retaining control of lands which otherwise would fall into the hands of a few individuals retaining it for the control of many, so that we can distribute more equitably the land resources of this province so that as many people as possible can be accommodated in the use of our land.

Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to yield to a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina. A question.

MR. HENDERSON: Could the Minister name any number of large corporations that hold large tracts of land in Manitoba now that are harmful to the province?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I could; I don't know what value there would be. I know of blocks of land amounting to 5,000 acres in a block, 20,000 acres in a block, which are owned by outside interests, non-Canadian, and which we are now trying to buy back because of our local residents wanting access to those lands and which, Mr. Chairman, we are now paying a premium for, a substantial premium to get them back. A high price to pay, a high price to pay, Mr. Chairman, for mismanagement of those lands by the previous administration which allowed them to fall. Now I know, I know that members opposite will appreciate that there are differences of view as to whether there should be public intervention by legislation or not. I know that the step that I have taken and the government has taken in offering a land lease program, if not prohibitive it at least competes for those land resources with those other entrepreneurs that may want to locate in this province. And to that extent it is a beneficial thing. Whether or not we shall go further is yet to be determined; that is something that we have to decide before very long, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman.

Now the Member for Pembina indicates that he doesn't want governments to control marketing boards, and I thought we'd been through this so many times that it doesn't need any further repetition. But he should read The Natural Products Marketing Act, Mr. Chairman, which has been there for many many years, and he knows that ultimately the government is responsible--well not directly on a day-to-day basis but ultimately the government of the day, whether it be a Conservative Government or a Liberal Government or a New Democratic Party Government, has to administer that Act, has to provide for regulations of various commodity groups who want to function under that Act and ultimately must answer for whatever regulations they pass empowering these boards to do certain things. So that is nothing new, Mr. Chairman, that is nothing new excepting that more democracy was brought into the picture since 1969 than we had before, and that is the only change. That is the major change.--(Interjection)--Well, my honourable friend the Member for Morris is still wondering, or still questioning the brand of democracy as practiced by this government, Mr. Chairman, and I can stack up, Mr. Chairman, volumes of evidence where I can show that we have been much more democratic in those fields than they have ever dreamt of being. At least, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba pork producers were not controlled by the processing industry since we've been in office, Mr. Chairman.

Now, some of the members opposite wanted to know why we have a different attitude to milk marketing and I think it's fair to say, Mr. Chairman, that there are many obvious reasons why we must have a different attitude there, and that is that the industry grew up over the years in a way which now has created many problems for us; that is, we have from time to time shortages of whole milk for the fluid milk market, while at the same time we have people that are shipping the same quality milk for lesser uses at a lower price, and that should not occur, Mr. Chairman, because surely we should optimize our returns on our milk production. We have processing plants, Mr. Chairman, that pay different prices but the milk is used for

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) the same purpose. That is not equitable, to be fair. We have to do something about those anomalies that have grown over the years. We have Silverwoods, for example, paying more money for milk for the manufacture of ice cream than, for example, Modern Dairies. That's not a very fair proposition to say the least, and we have to deal with it in such a way that will bring about a greater degree of integration of the milk industry so that we can achieve a number of things but among which would be more equitable returns to the producers, and that's the producers of both kinds of milk, Mr. Chairman, as well as equal treatment to the processor, which we haven't had now for some number of years and that's part of the ongoing process through the milk studies that are under way and have been under way for some time, and indeed the negotiations that are now taking place within the industry producer level in particular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: I just wonder if the Minister could tell us, the producers of the industrial milk who get the lesser price, do they have to meet the same standards of production - I mean sanitation and storage and bulk tanks and what not - as the fluid shippers do?

MR. USKIW: No, I believe they don't, Mr. Chairman, but many of them do provide an equal standard of product but get much less money for it, while at the same time the consumer is unable to get the product, and that is a very sad situation where we have to resort to mixing powder and water in order to satisfy the daily consumer needs. That should not occur unless there was no alternative, Mr. Chairman. I'm wondering whether the Member for Fort Rouge had a question.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in the Minister's remarks to this House outlining what he sees as the imminent danger of large scale takeovers of farmland by foreign-owned corporations and groups outside the boundaries. Now I gather from your remarks that you indicate the response of the government to this point is to try to compete with these corporations through the use of public money in terms of purchasing land. Now according to the reports that I've also seen - and I agree with your analysis, that that is a very clear and present danger - the amount of capital available to these large groups is of an extremely large amount and with high surpluses. Now that raises the basic problem that are we going to ask the taxpayer of Manitoba simply to continue trying to compete with large consortia or corporations which have large amounts of capital, or is the Minister prepared to consider other measures that would control the purchase or the activity of large corporations on the purchase of land in the Province of Manitoba, and particularly to look at the question of reviewing such purchases and determining the size and location and seeing to what degree restraints can be applied on those purchases as a way that we don't simply get ourselves into an ever-spiralling competition using public money against the large amounts of oil capitals and so on which are being put into the province right now?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, that is a matter of concern obviously, and how we are going to deal with it is a matter yet to be decided, but I should point out to him that if I had my personal preference I would not legislate against nationalities or countries, but if I was going to have any restriction at all I would have it on the basis of an absentee ownership system, which would mean that the Member for Portage la Prairie might not be eligible to own a tract of land 50 miles away unless he's operating it, unless he's operating it as a farmer. I would accept that kind of restriction personally, but I would never legislate against purchases only on the part of foreign people, either from the United States or Europe, but rather against anyone that doesn't want to use it for the purchase for which we deem it should be used. And that is quite different. In other words, the investment houses of Winnipeg should not be involved in land banking as well. That's the way I would look at it personally. But that is a matter yet to be decided, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not prepared to at this point indicate any definitive policy.

The Member for Portage la Prairie expressed a great deal of concern, Mr. Chairman, about the very high potato prices of the present time, and he wondered why it was so that we had a shortage of potatoes and the prices were so high when so many people would like to go into production. And I want to tell him that the problem is that we have a continental problem, a continental shortage. It's not a shortage in Manitoba. We have produced, according to the information that was supplied to me, more than 400,000 bags of potatoes above our quota of production for last year, and despite that over-production, which sometimes becomes a very grave matter of concern, we find that we have markets far beyond that that we could fill because

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) of situations prevailing throughout North America as a whole. So it's really one of those windfall situations for our potato producers of this year. It is, of course, a short situation in North America as a whole and we are shipping potatoes - and it's a very unusual thing - we are shipping large quantities of potatoes for processing to Grand Forks, a very unusual thing. The Grand Forks plants are offering much more money for our potatoes than, for example, the Carnation Food people in Carberry were prepared to offer, and I make no apologies, Mr. Chairman.

The Member for--(Interjection)--Well, the Member for Portage la Prairie indicated that there will be high prices next year too. I cannot predict, Mr. Chairman, the weather conditions of North America next year, and that's usually the basic reason why we have fluctuating prices. It's the amount of production per acre, and if that doesn't add up to the amount of demand for that particular year, we have problems, yes. On the other hand, we have the reverse problem when we have climatic conditions that are so suitable that we have huge crops simultaneously throughout North America, all growing areas, and we end up with a depressed situation. So that is the nature of the game and there's not too much, not too much that we can do to prevent those fluctuations.

The Member for Birtle-Russell was concerned about the Home Ec. program, and I want to say, although he's not here for the moment I want to say to members opposite that we have made changes in the Home Ec. program. We have moved towards more universality in the delivery of Home Ec. services; we are now prepared to include other areas and regions of the province through that service, and the base Home Ec. group - and that's about five or six people that develop all of the material for all of our Home Ec. programs which are located in Winnipeg - have now been transferred to the Department of Health and will be providing services, will continue to provide services to the Department of Agriculture but will also provide services to all of Manitoba and in particular, Mr. Chairman, to the northern regions of Manitoba which so desperately need that kind of service. So there has been some shuffling but it's to make the program more universal rather than to take away from it.

The Member for Birtle-Russell also wanted to know, or he didn't want to know, he expressed an opinion, I presume, that the ag reps' offices are no more than propaganda agencies and, you know, he makes statements of these kinds without trying to identify what he is really trying to say. There is no way in which I could quite understand what he is trying to tell me. I don't think they're operating any differently than they ever did before. They may have new responsibilities, they may have greater priorities in specific areas than the general area that they have been responsible for, but certainly it couldn't be interpreted that they are involved in some sort of promotional campaign as the Member for Birtle-Russell would allege.

He also took issue with the date of the announcement of the transportation assistance for the movement of hay. I should like to tell the House that we did not get any demands for assistance up until late in the year. Everyone across the province assumed that the hay supply was plentiful, all our reports indicated that the hay supply was plentiful, but very late in the year it was discovered by many that, while the hay supply was plentiful, much of it was not in good condition and therefore they were not able to use it for feeding purposes or got little value out of its use. And therefore where an animal would consume one bale of hay, of good hay, it would require two bales to get the same food value this year. And so we did find, very late in the season, that we might have some serious problems, but in the meantime very vast quantities of hay were traded interprovincially and a lot of hay did leave Manitoba to British Columbia and other areas, and the price of hay of course was very high and it was very attractive for people that are commercial producers of hay to respond to those markets at that particular time. And that is the nature of our decision-making process, Mr. Chairman. We don't control the decisions of thousands of farmers who may or may not have hay for sale, and we have to live with that, Mr. Chairman. That is the way we prefer it.

The member alleges that there were cries for assistance way back in July or August and that, Mr. Chairman, really flabbergasted me because, you know, July is a fairly early time; you've just had your first cut of hay; there is no logic to suggesting that there were cries for help in July before it was known what the second cut was going to bring. So I think the Member for Birtle-Russell is stretching the point quite a bit. We didn't get any representation whatever, that I'm aware of, until very late in the fall.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd)

The member also expressed some concern over what he alleges is a new policy in the Crown lands program. He indicated that we are not prepared to allow the sale of Crown lands, and I want to remind members opposite that that is not a new policy; that is a policy that existed within this province now since 1964, so that it's a continuation of the old decisions that were made and we've had no change in that respect, so I would hope that members opposite don't try to leave the impression that there's something new about that particular program.

The Member for Rhineland had a lot of concern, Mr. Chairman, about the sugar policy, and here I find my friends opposite in conflict, Mr. Chairman, because the Member for Rhineland suggests we should have an updated sugar policy at the national level and then we have the shouts from his colleagues that we should have no interference whatever on the part of government in the agricultural field. And I'm just not sure how to take my friends opposite because when it's popular to cry about sugar prices because the consumers are upset about the rip-off in the sugar industry - and rightly so, I think, Mr. Chairman - the members would like to seize on the opportunity to say we should do something about it, Mr. Chairman. Why don't we have a national sugar policy to deal with the problem? But when government moves in to deal with the problem, the Member for Morris would rise and he would say the problem is that we have too much government interference. So I would hope that members opposite, when they caucus their position, would end up being all together on those issues rather than trying to appear, trying to appear to be the answer to all questions, Mr. Chairman, and to all groups. And that's really what is coming across, Mr. Chairman, a lack of consistency. No policy, no policy whatever. You have the Member for Morris crying about the government intervention and then you have the Member for Rhineland saying, "Why isn't the government intervening?" That's nonsense, Mr. Chairman.

Now why don't we have butter? Why don't we have sufficient quantities of butter, Mr. Chairman? I think--well the question was put that we don't have sufficient amount of butter in this country and that is true for the moment. We are short of some 40 to 50 million pounds of butter and that is because the cream shippers and the manufacturing milk shippers are not getting enough money for their product. That is one of the reasons, and it is a subsidized area, Mr. Chairman, and the subsidy is based on the domestic requirement, and the only way you are going to get more production in those areas, Mr. Chairman, is if either you do one of two things or both: You increase the price for their commodities by way of passing it on to the consumer, or you raise the subsidy levels, or you do a bit of both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister's time has elapsed. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, in the few moments that are remaining before the hour of 5:30, I'd like to deal with some of the comments that the Minister has been making in regard to some of the questions that have been posed on this side of the House, and I cannot help but start dealing with the question that he raised at the very last, about the lack of cream shippers in this province. Well, after listening to the Minister for the last half hour I can assure him that there is no shortage of both shippers. He has proven that, because the statements that he has been making are an indication of the dearth of ideas that he possesses insofar as agriculture is concerned. So when the Minister announced in this province that he was going to, through his policies, create a new breed of farmer with his farm diversification program, I rose at that time and mentioned to him that he was going to run into difficulty and that he was going to be facing problems, because there is no such thing as an instant livestock producer and he's beginning to find that out.

I'm sure, Sir, that when the investigation that is being conducted by the Minister is completed, he will find that the incidence of starvation of animals on farms at the present time, he will find that those incidences are those in which the Minister himself has encouraged people who have no qualifications to go into livestock have been forced into it by his policies--or I shouldn't say "forced" into it, perhaps that's not the word, but have been encouraged to go into it by his policies, people who have no qualifications and notwithstanding all of the advice that his experts, his so-called experts, may give them. The fact is that a person who is in the production of livestock is there because he wants to be, in the first place, and secondly, because he has some qualifications for being in the livestock business because he knows livestock. The Minister will find that no number of experts is going to make a livestock producer in this country.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

I also warned him that simply providing cash and grants to farmers to buy and purchase livestock would not be enough to guarantee that those people would be staying in the business, because along with livestock you require feed and you require water. I heard of nothing or nothing in the Minister's program to ensure that those people that he was putting into livestock would be able to stay there. In fact most of his measures, most of his policies have been counter-productive. Where he encourages farmers to go into livestock on the one hand, he discourages them with another policy on the other hand. And the Feed Grain Marketing Commission is a classic example.

Oh, the Minister is good at arithmetic. He counted the number of farmers in this province and found out that there were more grain producers than there were livestock producers, so he opted on the side of the grain producers, as he said, in order to ensure that the prices were equitable to those grain producers. Well, a lot of good he did to those grain producers when he destroyed their markets. The number of feedlots that have closed in this province as a result of that policy resulted in a loss of market for grain producers, a loss that may not be returned. Corn coming into this province from the United States at the rate of anywhere from 100,000 to 200,000 bushels a week. Feedlot operators and feed mills that I phoned and spoke to, indicated that they were feeding--their entire ration now was corn and they'd stopped buying oats, barley and wheat from Canadian producers.

Now how the Minister can say that that kind of a policy is helping our grain producers is more than I can understand. And now a policy that encouraged people to go into livestock who had no qualifications to go into livestock, we find that the RCMP have to go around to those farms and check to make sure that they're not being starved to death, largely because these people have not the necessary experience to detect problems when they first arise. There is one thing that is characteristic of raising livestock, the one thing that is important to any livestock producer is to be able to detect a disease or a problem at the outset before half the herd or half the flock has been lost. The Minister's policies, as I pointed out, Sir, are counter-productive. It isn't a policy that the Minister is promoting in this province as much as it is a hodge-podge of ideas endeavouring to curry favour with various different commodity groups.

MR. ENNS: How to win friends and influence people.

MR. JORGENSEN: He'll dash to the grain producers and announce a policy that ostensibly is intended to help and assist and protect them. Then he'll go to the livestock producers and he'll tell them something else. Then he'll go to another group of producers and tell them something else. And all of these policies working at cross purposes has produced no kind of policy at all.

MR. ENNS: And when that fails he takes out newspaper ads.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, the Minister's track record is not one that he can be proud of. He got on the wrong side of a lot of issues. He first of all, last fall, Sir, he decided that he was going to encourage the hog producers to get into increased production and he offered to pay \$5.00 per hog for every hog that was produced in excess of the 1973 production.

MR. ENNS: It was called the boar incentive program.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sort of a family allowance program for hogs, and perhaps the program might have had its merits, Sir, except for one thing. The Minister very stupidly announced the program two weeks before the new year. Now that timing had to be as disastrous a program as I've ever heard of, because all that was necessary for those producers who heard of the program and who were in the position to ship hogs in the last two weeks of December, just held them back. So what's the point of selling hogs in those last two weeks? We'll hold them over till the next year . . .

A MEMBER: And get our family allowance.

MR. JORGENSEN: That's going to increase the number of hogs that we produce over 1973, and without increasing the number of hogs by one, not a single one, the taxpayers are going to be picking up the tab for that \$5.00 per hog, because they were coming into the stockyards at the rate of about 19,000 a week the first weeks in January.

A MEMBER: That's family planning.

MR. JORGENSEN: Now that's the kind of family planning that honourable gentlemen opposite are engaging in. It had to be one of the dumbest things - and the Minister in my view has done a lot of dumb things - but it had to be one of the dumbest things that I've ever seen him do.

March 4, 1974

1021

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) But it's characteristic. It's characteristic of the lack of direction that the Minister has in attempting to provide a program for farmers in this province, and it's a very good reason, Sir, why I continue to suggest that the less this government has to do with agriculture the better that agriculture is. Sir, I see that you're looking at the clock. I presume that it's 5:30 and may I call it 5:30?

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