

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, May 15, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could now deal with the report from the Committee of Supply.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$777,034,00, Resolution 1 and 2 for Legislation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969. 2. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,020,469, Resolutions 3 to 6 for Executive Council for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969. 3. The

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, while concurring in Resolution No. 3, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that this House regrets that the government has by Order-in-Council deprived the Treasury of needed revenue. Now, my reason for . . .

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of April of this year the Executive Council of this government passed the following: "That Whereas subsections 1 and 2 of Section 52 of The Treasury Act provides in part as follows: 'that upon the recommendation of the Treasurer, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may authorize the cancellation, discharge and release in whole or in part or extend the time for payment of any claim, obligation, debt or moneys due Her Majesty; and 2. An Order-in-Council under subsection (1) shall be sufficient authority for the Treasurer and the Comptroller-General to make proper entries and adjustments accordingly in the accounts of the government . . . ' ". And then it goes on to refer to this specific matter: " 'That Whereas the Winnipeg Supply and Fuel Company Limited during 1965, '66 and '67 removed sand from Crown land situated on Black Island on Lake Winnipeg south of north latitude 53 degrees; and Whereas the said Company has submitted evidence that operations on Black Island resulted in a net loss during the years 1965, '66 and '67; and Whereas it is considered to be in the public interest to forgive the royalties fixed by the regulation until such time as the said operations show a net profit,' 1. that the province forgive the royalty payments owing in the amounts of \$6,994,35, \$4,560,30 and \$7,149.67 for the calendar years 1965, 1966 and 1967, respectively."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I raise this matter at this particular time because this was an act of the Executive Council and I do feel that it is regrettable; in fact it's deplorable, that the Executive Council did see fit to take action such as this. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that any debt owing the province is a debt owing to the people of Manitoba and as such it should be a first charge against the assets and the operations of any business enterprise. This generally is true insofar as taxes on a property is concerned, insofar as income tax is concerned, insofar as the payment of any other tax, licence or fees that one must pay and I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, why any exceptions ought to be made in this case. No exception is made with respect to anyone else. I'm sure that no one could use a loss position of his business as an excuse for not paying sales tax; I'm sure that no one could use a bad financial statement as an excuse for not paying any other licence or fee which the law states that he must pay.

Now I know that the amounts in this case total to 18 or 19 thousand dollars but I do feel that there is a principle involved here which ought to be brought to the attention of the people of Manitoba. If this is indicative of the manner of operation of this government then I do feel that once again this substantiates a statement that we had made in this House last year and which has been repeated from time to time this year, that the people of Manitoba cannot trust

(MR HANUSCHAK cont'd.)... this present government.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, by way of some explanation to the honourable member's question, I would point out that under The Mine Royalty and Tax Act, which most mining operations fall under, there is a period of time during which a waiver of royalty is given, primarily because there is always an initial period of high cost, high capital cost, to get an operation into production.

The operation to which the honourable member refers is the silica sand operation located on Black Island, which the government gave this particular company considerable encouragement to undertake two or three years back, I don't remember the exact date. The operation doesn't fall under The Mine Royalty and Tax Act, the revenues from it fall under The Mineral Taxation Act and the company was put in the position of doing a high degree of development work in this particular operation. The province was most anxious that the silica sand operation on Black Island get under way, offer the job opportunity which was most needed in that particular part of the country, and as a result of that, since it did not fall under The Mining Royalty and Tax Act but fell under The Mineral Taxation Act, which is a similar category to The Mining Royalty Act, felt that it was well worth the concession that was made to in the initial period of its operation, offer similar incentives to those that exist to any other mining company which comes into Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on this ...

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): If the Member is going to speak, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister. Was this operation not in operation for a number of years, though?

MR. CRAIK: The operation, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I didn't know the exact date, two or three years ago, that it was set up on a large scale by Winnipeg Supply and Fuel, to which the Member for Burrows referred - Winnipeg Supply and Fuel has not been in operation that long under their particular size of operation.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE Q.C. (Selkirk): Could I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Was this the operation that supplied the raw material to the silica sand plant at Selkirk and is it still supplying that silica sand?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Black Island silica is barged from Black Island but it's not, I don't think - yes it could be barged to Selkirk; I'm not sure of the terminal point.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Minister's explanation with regard to this matter with interest because it does indicate that in certain cases where the government feels that some difficulties are involved that they will make a concession and in this particular case they considered the concession appropriate. I think, Mr. Speaker, it brings back to my mind in any event, the concession that the Hydro made with regard to the McNamara project when there was a mistake of some \$7 million which was forgiven in order to make up for an error that these people had made in an estimate. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that the government adopts the consistent approach of trying to relieve against an error of this kind or an allowance where, for instance the Winnipeg Supply and Fuel did not make the profit that was anticipated; and it would seem to be a plausible explanation, Mr. Speaker, except that it isn't followed consistently. I would ask the Members of the House to recall in another case that was brought to the attention of the House by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition where a small contractor built a perfectly good road, which the government asked him to go ahead with, knowing that he had made a mistake, knowing that he would go broke if he built it, the government took the advantage of that particular road, are using it and put this man into bankruptcy. They did it as sure as if they had themselves put the nails into the coffin Mr. Speaker because the error was demonstrated to them before the man went ahead with the job. The figures were almost identical to the McNamara project except the figures were \$73,000 instead of seventy-odd million. The next bid was over 100,000. The man found his error before he started on the job and the government insisted that he either proceed with the job on the basis of his contract or forfeit his bid bond.

Now, if, Mr. Speaker, this government had shown itself to be a hard, consistent government in dealing coldly, coolly and impartially with the public purse, then they could give the kind of answer that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has given, but they haven't

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... done that. They did it with —(Interjection)— My honourable friend laughs. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this particular road contractor who's probably been to every law office in the city trying to find out what can be done for him, he isn't laughing, his family isn't laughing; and yet the government will relieve Winnipeg Supply and Fuel of \$18,000 due to miscalculations or to the fact that they didn't make profit.

MR. LYON: That's a mining operation.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, they are relieving royalties which would be payable to the government in that amount. They relieved McNamara's of an error of \$7 million.

MR. LYON: That's a contract, as opposed to a mining operation.

MR. GREEN: Those were exactly the same, Mr. Speaker...--(Interjection)--.

MR. SPEAKER: honourable gentleman must use illustrations to make this point and I think he has done that on two occasions and I wondered if that wasn't sufficient in order to keep with the item under discussion, and that is the one that was brought up by the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the decorum of the House was quite at a normal level until the Honourable the Attorney-General started to make remarks across the House.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I believe I mentioned this the other day to the honourable gentlemen and asked their co-operation in keeping to the subject at hand in order that the business of the House may proceed reasonably well.

MR. GREEN: With respect, Mr. Speaker, do you say that I am not discussing the subject at hand? Is that your impression of my remarks?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe for a short while, as I was listening that he used - he gave an expression of opinion of other illustrations, of possibly where the government was wrong, and I wondered if he would keep it to those two illustrations in order to reinforce his point, that's all.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'll keep it to the two but only because I only know of the two. If I knew of others, Mr. Speaker, I, with the greatest of respect to yourself, I would consider them in point and I would deal with them, but fortunately for the both of us I only know of those two illustrations so I'll stick with them.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General started to say that the McNamara case was a contract. The case of the road contractor was identical, on all fours, with the McNamara case; it was a tender; they both tendered. One tendered \$70 million, the other tendered \$73,000. Both —(Interjection)— the McNamara contract wasn't a mining contract. --(Interjection)--. Both of them demonstrated to this government that an error was made, and significantly, Mr. Speaker, the error was the identical type error - was a question of the site of the hauling to the site of the location of the work. I think that my honourable friend and my colleague the Member for Burrows has brought up this subject to demonstrate that in certain cases where people are able to exercise a certain amount of a different kind of pressure, the government yields and in other cases it didn't yield, and I think that the motion is very well taken, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take part briefly in the debate on this particular motion which is a very interesting one, in my opinion, because here we are depriving the government of certain revenues when we're already skimping, as we've been told in trying to make ends meet, and yet we have money to spare when it comes to this kind of a thing. As has already been pointed out, this would amount to roughly between 18 and \$19,000. I'm just wondering how many more deals of this type are pending. If these kind of arrangements are being made, how many more are there that will come to the fore probably a year or two from now. During this session or earlier this year, a certain man here in the city was put in jail because he didn't pay his hospital premium, a very minor amount compared to the eighteen or nineteen thousand dollars. The government will go ahead and do a thing like that and yet on the other hand it will turn around and give away moneys of this type. How inconsistent! Certainly we could have excused several hundred people of this type for that kind of money.

Then too, I notice under this same resolution there's an item of \$15,600 for a Minister without Portfolio and a representative allowance, and is this going to be used? Why are we...

MR. LYON: I'm afraid that has nothing to do with the amendment that's presently under discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: It certainly has to do with the moneys, and the amendment has to do with money that is being refunded.

MR. SPEAKER: In order that there be no misunderstanding in the mind of the honourable gentleman, we are discussing the motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. FROESE: Could we have the motion read?

MR. SPEAKER: While concurring in Resolution No. 3, this House regrets the government has by Order-in-Council deprived the Treasury of needed revenue. That needed revenue was outlined by the Honourable Member for Burrows. I believe we must stay with that, at least that would be my thinking.

MR. FROESE: We're discussing that very needed revenue, in my opinion, and here the this is one way of recapturing it. Then too, this has to do with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, because the Minister has already spoken on behalf of the government, and why would he stand up and say that it had to — and you just mentioned by interjection, that this had to do with mining. Certainly that doesn't add up either then — and whereas the Department of Mines and Natural Resources doesn't get sufficient revenue to pay the cost of operating the department and here we're able to give away moneys from mining, which naturally ordinarily would have come to the revenue of the government. Then too — and the way the information has to be dug up. During the sessions, I asked for an Order for Return giving us the information, the dates and the nature of the various Orders-in-Council. This was refused, stating that the information was available to us as to the other members.

MR. LYON: I'm sorry to have to interrupt my honourable friend on another point of order, but he's commenting on a ruling of the Speaker that has already been decided, and that is not debatable.

MR. FROESE: I don't think I'm discussing your ruling at all.

MR. LYON: You're out of order.

MR. FROESE: I was discussing the Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say to the honourable gentleman in all fairness that I am quite willing to hear what he may have to say, but at the same time, I appeal to him to comply with my earlier remarks. And if he can at all possible see his way clear to discuss the resolution before the House and in particular the comments of the honourable gentleman that made it, and also his reasons for making it, and if the honourable gentleman would keep to that, I think we will get along very well.

MR. FROESE: The resolution before us has to do with an Order-in-Council and the Honourable Member for Burrows has dug this information up on his own. Certainly, we as members on this side, how are we supposed to know what kind of Orders-in-Council are passed and how are we to know that things of this type are happening?

MR. LYON: Go to the office and ask them.

MR. FROESE: Go to the office and ask for what? --(Interjection)-- This is the very point I'm trying to make. Here the government can cover up as much as they like and how are we to know?

And as I already pointed out, we did not discuss the estimates under this particular department of Executive Council and I deplore situations of this type when they have to come to light in this way and in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, unless the government has a better explanation than they've given so far, I certainly would support the resolution. I don't think it's sufficient for the government to say that they're dealing with a mining matter. This is not a mining company; this project was incidental to its ordinary business and I don't think they can use the mining yardstick in discharging an indebtedness in respect of a company which is a going concern today, it was a going concern then; and this was only of its business, which is building supplies. So, unless you can come forward with a better explanation, I certainly will support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

A MEMBER: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat,

(Standing Vote cont'd.) Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, and Vief-
faure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Steen, Watt, Weir and Witney, Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: YEAS, 22; NAYS, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I rule the resolution lost. At the same time I would remind the House that our page of last year, that that was his first effort to the . . .

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,020,469,00 for Executive Council for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1969.

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hamiota, that while concurring in Resolution No. 9, this House regrets that the government has failed to give effective leadership in the essential field of marketing of farm products.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Clerk.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that marketing of our farm products is one of the very important aspects of agriculture today. I don't think there is any other groups in our society that do put a product on the market and just have to expect what-
ever will be offered to them. And certainly in our changing time, we have to look at this very serious aspect of farming and it is certainly a duty of the government to make a study as to what kind of marketing, what kind of orderly marketing should be given of agriculture.

I realize that we have before us a resolution by the Honourable Member from Springfield, which I have adjourned, and I will not take too much time of the House at this time to go into the details of it. However, I wanted to bring on the records, our protest of the government of the day for having done very little in the study of our marketing problems in this province. This is why I have moved this resolution at this time so that we can record our protest for the lack of leadership from this government in the field of marketing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I don't at all hesitate to support the Honourable Member for La Verendrye because this is something that I'm sure most of us, if not all of us, agree that this government has failed to deal with. The problems of marketing in the farm community have been with us for a long time and this government has been in power in Manitoba for some 10 years and they have failed miserably to cope with the problems of marketing insofar as agricultural products are concerned. I'm sure that we will all remember the fact that many people in the rural community have made approaches to the government hoping that the government would in fact assist them in the development of various marketing plans, and rather than having some positive leadership over the years of this administration, Mr. Speaker, we had nothing but chaos in the marketing place and fiascos of one sort or another, and certainly this is something that one cannot commend this government for, and therefore Mr. Speaker, I certainly endorse the motion before us.

I only want to add that there is a resolution on the Order Paper that this House give consideration to, namely, that we should set up a committee to study marketing. And if this government has any idea about its responsibilities in this field, then I would hope that they approve of that resolution when it comes before us. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I too, consider that marketing is among the very chief of the agricultural communities concern in these times. I have said in the House on many other occasions that even though the farmer has to contend with a great variety of problems, he has to run many risks, he still is usually able to meet all of those and even to deal with the cost-price squeeze which seems to become ever more tight, if at the end, he has assurance of a good market at a reasonable price, but when he's faced with a case of either poor price or a weak market, it's a very difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, I still consider that the greatest single question before the farmers of this province, is the question of wheat marketing. I know that that's something that the Manitoba Government as such, does not have main concern in. Thank goodness we have in the House

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... the Honourable Member for Wolseley who esteems himself as an expert on this subject, and I would think this would be a good opportunity for him to develop his plans. Because I notice from the Winnipeg Free Press of Thursday, May 9th that my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley, when he was speaking at his nominating convention, gave quite a discourse on this timely subject. And I would think it would be advisable if he could share his wisdom with the House on this occasion.

I would like to read from the Free Press report. I have the Tribune report here as well. I'd be glad to read both if it wouldn't be taking too much of the time of the House. This is the report of the nominating convention where my honourable friend received the nomination in my constituency, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, so I have a particular right as an elector to be interested in the views of the candidates who are running there. I'm reading now from the Free Press report: "He also bemoaned the Liberal Government's failure to take care of the year-end carryover of wheat sales this year, noting that the same situation prevailed when the Conservatives were first elected in 1957. Pointing out that the present Minister in charge of wheat sales, C.M. Drury, is a Montreal businessman, Mr. Roblin called the appointment extraordinary. He said it appeared as if the new Prime Minister had the same old blind spot that afflicted his predecessor about the problems of the west. 'We need the old Progressive Conservative push again. We need to put a western man in charge again as we did 10 years ago when Gordon Churchill and Alvin Hamilton got things rolling again'." And let me say, Mr. Speaker, to all that applause, that that last paragraph is in quotes, so I shall read it again. "We need that old Progressive Conservative push again. We need to put a western man in charge again as we did 10 years ago when Gordon Churchill and Alvin Hamilton got things rolling again."

And the other report - the Tribune one - mentions the fact that the Honourable the Member for Wolseley who is the candidate in that constituency said that "the wheat choking western granaries will be sold by a western base trade and commerce Minister who has the willingness to try to innovate, to promote, to sell, to hustle."

Now, those of us who are interested and acquainted with my honourable friend's oratorical ability, can just imagine what a fine display he made at his nominating convention dealing with this question. Mr. Speaker, it really pains me to have to put the facts on record once for the sake of my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley. I had to put them on record, slightly, for my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne this year; I had to reiterate them to some extent for the Honourable the Minister or Urban Development and Municipal Affairs; but I'll have to give them again because evidently my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley is not acquainted with them.

I said, in answer to my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne and in explanation to my honourable friend the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs, I said that it was a fact that in the last three years, every one of the last three, that the present government — my honourable friends insist that it's the government; all right if you want it to be the government, let's take the government — that in the last three years, the present government sold more wheat every year than was sold during Diefenbaker's administration in the highest year that he had. Now this was only part of the story, Mr. Speaker. I want to give it in a little more detail.

If you take the five years when Mr. Diefenbaker's government — because my honourable friends over here, Mr. Speaker, insist that it's the government that does this. My honourable friend for Arthur made this very plain, plain as far as he was concerned, yesterday. So we'll say it's the government to accommodate my honourable friend. Well the years that Mr. Diefenbaker was selling the wheat, and Gordon Churchill and Alvin Hamilton — and I won't elude again to that trip that Alvin Hamilton made to pretend that he had something to do with the signing of the contract with China. I mentioned that the other day, but it's too painful a subject.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Lakeside permit one question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Certainly, certainly, I'll permit several. I'll be glad to have my honourable friend ...

MR. ENNS: Could the Honourable Member for Lakeside ...

MR. CAMPBELL: I'll wait until I'm through and then I'll take all that my honourable friend — and I hope that my honourable friend from Wolseley will ask some too. That he will make a contribution to this debate. Now if we take the five years when Mr. Diefenbaker was

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... selling the wheat - assisted by Gordon Churchill and Alvin Hamilton and applauded from the sidelines by my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley - he had an average sale of 320 million bushels, plus - 320,680,200 if you want to be accurate, average sales in that five year period. If you take the five-year period since that time that the Liberals - if you insist it's the government - have been in charge of the sales, the average sales in those five years has been 485 million bushels, plus; more than 50 percent more than in those years.

So, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that what are my honourable friends talking about? What are they talking about? They are talking about this year, because there is some wheat piled up now, but I thought they were talking about how Mr. Diefenbaker sold the wheat. I thought that the quotation I read from the Honourable Member for Wolseley was that "we need the Old Progressive Conservative push again" - are you applauding now; you applauded before -- we need that Old Progressive Conservative push again. We need to put a western man in charge again." As we did ten years ago.

Well here's what happened ten years ago. These are the sales as reported by the latest report of the Canadian Wheat Board. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the five years since Diefenbaker left, the sales have been more than 50 percent higher than they were in the five preceding years. What's the answer to that? And that's not all the story, Mr. Speaker; it's interesting to look at the production figures. I'll tell you why it was so easy for Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Gordon Churchill, because we were having comparatively small crops, in addition to the fact that the purchasers over there . . .

A MEMBER: He financed the sales.

MR. CAMPBELL : Ah ha, that's the thing, he got out and sold. But the average was still 320 million bushels . . .

A MEMBER: A big improvement over what they've had.

MR. CAMPBELL: Not even that my honourable friend. That's where you're wrong again. I didn't go back into that time, but you're wrong once more.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman but I'm wondering if we are not straying away from the activities of the government.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are you really wondering, Mr. Speaker, about that? Are you really?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I realize the impact. . . . We are talking about another government's business . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Do you not think this is marketing that I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No question about it, but there's a good deal more too.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but the good deal more comes from the interjections that I'm receiving from my honourable friends, but I'm glad to have them.

The other point I was going to mention, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that in the Diefenbaker years, taking those same years, the production average was just over 400 million bushels a year in Canada. Do you know what it's been in the five years since? It's been more than 670 million bushels per year. You could argue that even the production is much better under the Liberals. The crops even grow better. And that's no more stupid than the argument that's been used that Diefenbaker sold wheat. In other words, the production in these years has been 66 percent higher on the average than it was in those years.

Now I ask my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley how can he talk about these folks selling the wheat better than the succeeding government when he has figures like these to deal with. That's what I'd like to know and I'll be glad to have the answers.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, just on this one point. The serious feature that of course the Honourable Member for Lakeside forgets, and which we so well remember on this side of the House, is that the government of the day under the leadership of Mr. John Diefenbaker, authorized the sale to China and Russia over the dead bodies of the then Liberal administration. And furthermore, and furthermore, the further point is I would ask - the one question that I wanted to ask was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: Who authorized the extension of credit for these sales?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm quite confident the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture does not wish to provoke an argument and I would appreciate it if he doesn't use statements . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend is asking a question of me, and he couldn't

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... provoke an argument with me if he tried, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but I would remind the Honourable Member for Lakeside that there are other members in the House too. I'm trying to protect the . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes. Yes I know. I can't think of anyone over there that would want to provoke an argument with me, but there might be. Well, yes, this I'm quite willing to concede, but even with the provision of the credit, which was the credit of all the people of Canada, even with that, this is still the record of the sales . . .

A MEMBER: It opened the doors.

MR. CAMPBELL: 320 million bushels averaged against 485 million bushels.

A MEMBER: We showed you the way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I would like to say that sometime in 1955 and 1956 a firm here in Winnipeg, the Northern Sales Limited, they exported wheat under the Louis St. Laurent administration to Poland and Czechoslovakia in pretty large amounts, so it wasn't the Diefenbaker government that started to export wheat . . .

MR. ENNS: I mentioned China and Russia.-(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the honourable member that put the motion in the form that it is before us, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland has the floor. Order please.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable member for bringing the motion before us and in the way it is formed too, because this makes it so much easier for me to support it. I certainly want to support it as much as possible, because I too feel that we are not getting effective leadership from this government in connection with marketing. Earlier this session I brought in the matter of inland storage, that we should provide, and the Minister of Agriculture misconstrued it so badly in speaking on the amendment or on the motion at that time and in my opinion did not interpret it at all the way it was reading and what it maintained.

I asked for storage so that farmers could deliver the greater portion of their grain to the Canadian Wheat Board and sell it to them and in this way get the ready cash. I still believe that this government should give leadership and provide more storage. This is the area that we can get into and where we can do something for the western farmer and especially the Manitoba farmer so that he can have a return for his grain, for his product at a much earlier date. The storage so provided need not be expensive, could be very inexpensive and this would certainly be a big help. The present government has turned it down and I just hope that this will bound them for the rest of their days, because this is in my opinion something that they should have certainly supported.

MR. LYON: I hate to interrupt my honourable friend again, but again I fear that he is commenting upon a vote of this House that's already been registered and that is entirely out of order.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about effective leadership and we are not getting it from this government. Look at the Manitoba Potato Marketing Board. Here we had a vote and the vote turned down the Board. And what does the government do? They sit back and won't make a decision and won't call the Board null and void. They're inactive; they won't make a decision. Surely let them come out and make a decision, this is what it's supposed to be and this is what he should do but he doesn't do this. Earlier this year when potatoes were imported into Manitoba there was a hue and cry from the Commission. Later on, what do we find? We now find that there is a shortage of potatoes; that potatoes have gone up from \$1.50 per 75 lb. bag to \$3.00 for a 75 lb. bag. This is what our Commission in Manitoba has been doing. First of all they were screaming when potatoes were imported, now we find ourselves short. Had they imported more we would have more potatoes on hand now and the farmers could sell their potatoes at a higher price. This is the decision the Potato Marketing Commission made and certainly in my opinion it wasn't too wise at the time. And yet when we have a decision made under law, and a vote held and a referendum and a decision is made, yet the government will not come forth and make the decision formal and make it operative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, the government of the day over there are trying to produce figures or words to establish the fact that the Federal tory party at

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)... least are better salesmen, that's what they are trying to imply, than the Liberals. Now I'll bet you between now and June 25th they will repeat this story daily, daily and almost hourly, on every stage in western Canada at least. And this is not a fact. I have done nothing since 1932 but sell. That has been my job. I am still a salesman, I am still a salesman, I have been a salesman for 35 years and if there's anyone over across the floor that thinks he's a better salesman than I, let him produce the facts, like we are producing the facts.

Now if I have heard this story once from my honourable friends over there I've heard it 40 times, that they don't know what we'd do with the DBS figures, they don't know how we would get along without them. Well what's wrong with the DBS figures? My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture yesterday was just delighted in using DBS figures to say that Manitoba was the only province in Canada last year that showed an increase in the net farm income. You were using DBS figures. Okay, what's wrong with using DBS figures?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my honourable friends across the road, is there any one of you that's got the annual report for the Canadian Wheat Board in your desk right now? Is there a single, solitary one of you? Or have you got one in your Caucus room?

MR. LYON: If I could raise the point of order again. I hate to be interrupting my honourable friend but as I understand the resolution that is before us, is that this government of the Province of Manitoba have failed to give effective leadership in the essential field of the marketing of farm products, and I was just wondering if perhaps my honourable friend could confine himself to the activities of this government.

MR. SHOEMAKER: My honourable friends over there, did you ever promise that you were going to do anything to alleviate the cost-price squeeze, because certainly selling wheat is the only way you can do it or one of the ways you can do it. Now let's get back onto that subject. If you want to talk about that one --(Interjection)-- Pardon? You don't sell wheat? Are you interested in selling wheat? --(Interjection)-- Certainly, because if you are then why are not you negotiating with somebody to get the show on the road? --(Interjection)-- Did you ever promise that you were going to --(Interjection)-- Did my honourable friends keep the promise that they

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I would like to remind the honourable gentlemen that I haven't the slightest intention of allowing this to become a three-ring circus and I wonder if the honourable gentlemen will co-operate with me in order to get on with the business of the House. I want to be the last to interrupt, but at the same time, if I must interrupt, I will interrupt, and I would hope that everyone will help in whatever way they can. As far as I'm concerned I wish June 25th was somewhere else right now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House at the moment is that this government across the way has failed in leadership to do anything about selling the wheat or providing markets. Is that not the motion? I haven't got it immediately before . . . Let me have a look at the motion. We'll read it again and see what it says: "Resolved that while concurring in Resolution No, 3, this House . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): No, that's not the . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: Where's the motion. --(Interjections)-- It doesn't make any difference --(Interjections)-- They have failed miserably in so many fields to give leadership but the one we're discussing now is that they have failed to give effective leadership in the essential field of marketing of farm products. Well have you, or haven't you? You're going to say - when I sit down and the division bells will ring - you're going to say that you have showed leadership. We say that you haven't showed leadership and we gave the Honourable Member for Wolseley ample opportunity to declare what the government policy is in this respect. Mr. Speaker, this government promised that they were going to give leadership. That's the thing.

MR. DESJARDINS: They didn't say when.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They said 10 years ago when I fought the election that they would. They said Campbell abandoned the farmers to the cost-price squeeze. He said there was little that could be done in the field of marketing. You people said you were going to do it. That's the point, and you haven't done anything about it and now you're saying that this isn't your responsibility. That's what the Attorney-General just said, it's not his responsibility.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I said, my honourable friend was out of order and he still is.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then my honourable friend is admitting that he made a promise

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)... to do something about it and we say he did nothing about it.

MR. LYON: You're still out of order - in more ways than one.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose I'll win any points with my honourable friend the Attorney-General on the point of order, but I'll certainly win some points by charging that the government across the road promised hundreds of times they were going to do something about it and they have not done anything about it and now they are saying this is not their field.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hamuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: YEAS, 22; NAYS, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,323,682 for Agriculture, Resolutions 7 to 18. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,576,841

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, while concurring in Resolution 26, this House regrets that after 10 years in office, this government still allows to exist the disgraceful, bestial and totally inadequate detention facilities for juveniles at the Vaughan Street Detention Home.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. I didn't get your seconder.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, because this has been debated at some length this session already, but I feel that this government must be severely reprimanded for allowing these conditions to exist for as long as this government has been in office, because I feel many of these youngsters and kids put in the present facilities that we have now, they are exposed to such conditions that does not help these youngsters one bit. As a matter of fact I think that the conditions that they have to put up with more or less influences them and makes them criminals. I think our problem is we should get at this problem right now which will cost us much less money at the beginning instead of later on which may be at the point of no return and may be too late.

Mr. Speaker, I think that our youngsters today are living under conditions much different than what we were probably exposed to 10, 25, or 35 years ago. I would say the young people today are very good youngsters except that they have problems that - people many years ago have not been exposed to problems that they have today - and I think that we have to get to the problems immediately instead of having these people live in the conditions that they have been doing at the present facility. So I do feel that this government certainly needs to be severely reprimanded for allowing the present facilities to exist as long as they did.

I know the Minister has on many occasions said we did not have any money, but if we look, we have spent over \$300,000 on the present Boundaries Commission, we are spending hundreds of thousands for Information Services, and some of it has been nothing else but government propaganda, I feel there is no reason why the present Vaughan Street Juvenile Detention facilities should have remained in the condition that they are today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of the Member for Assiniboia. The Vaughan Detention Home has been talked about, we've heard about it, we've heard of the urgency of replacing this facility, we've heard of government plans for at least the past five years, if not the last 10 years. There's no question that the facility is antiquated; there's no question that it's short of space and that it only can provide for a small number of the young people who are kept there. There's no question that it lacks recreational facilities, lacks library facilities, lacks educational facilities. There's no

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)... question that we need two facilities at least; one for those who are held temporarily before they're appearing in the courts and one for wards of the Children's Aid and other organizations who have nothing to do with crime or even suspicion of crime. There's no question that it's a disgrace, and that the public has called repeatedly for a new facility and for some action on the part of government. This government talks about priorities. All I can say is in regard to the Vaughan Street Detention Home it has no priorities, or has the lowest possible priority. I think they stand condemned for their lack of inaction.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that we would at least have some reply from the government. The Attorney-General I think should give the House some explanation on this matter. It isn't as if he didn't know about it. It's been discussed on many occasions in this House and promises have been made on different times something is going to be done, and the next year the money has been spent for some other purpose, either flood fighting or some other purpose the government claims the money was needed for and nothing has happened. The situation is at the moment still the same as it was. The Minister apparently intends to do something this year, but it's 10 years, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister first said himself that it was a totally inadequate, antiquated facility and this is still what's going on.

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

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,576,841 for Attorney-General, Resolutions 19 to 28 for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$135,931...

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, while concurring in Resolution 33, this House regrets the failure of the government, which after assuming financial responsibility for construction of school buildings, has delayed the construction of new schools, resulting in staggered classes having to be operated in some areas which may lower educational standards and disrupt pupils and parents lives.

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

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. --(Interjection)-- There are one or two vacant chairs I notice. I've been caught on that one before.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$135,931,648.00 for Education, Resolution 29 to 33.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... Member for Selkirk that while concurring in Resolution 34, this House regrets that this government has abdicated its public responsibilities in the field of health by 1. Increasing hospital premiums by 80 percent . . .--(Interjection)-- Oh, I thought we'd passed, I'm sorry.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$78,839,903 for Health, Resolution 34 to 35.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk that while concurring in Resolution No. 34, this House regrets this government has abdicated its public responsibilities in the field of health by 1. Increasing hospital premiums by 80 percent without taking into consideration the principle of ability to pay; and 2. By failing to provide an acceptable Medicare plan for the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to make a speech, I think that we've covered this, if we've covered anything during this session, I think that we've covered both the increase in premiums and also how this came about and also the lack of Medicare. I thought that before seeing the bill, I think it's Bill No. 102, today I thought that maybe the government would come in with some alternative plan, Medicare plan, while waiting, as I say, the decision from Ottawa, but apparently this is not going to be done and the Minister of Health has told us that they will definitely stay out for at least a year, and this is the reason for the resolution. I don't think there's any reason to rehash everything that has been done so far.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us is one that is two-pronged and as members will know that I do not support a compulsory medical or medicare scheme and this has been our basic policy - not only in this province but in Alberta - where they have payments made by the government on behalf of those that are unable to pay, and also those that have lower incomes. I do not subscribe to a compulsory Medicare scheme. However, this resolution does not necessarily point out whether it is voluntary or compulsory so that it leaves itself open to interpretation, and if I should vote for it, it would be on that basis that it would be interpreted as a voluntary scheme and not a compulsory one.

In connection with the hospital premiums that will be increased, I have previously supported the government on premiums, I feel that a certain portion of these costs should be borne by the individual taxpayer so that the people will know that these services are not free, that they do cost a lot of money and that they have to be paid for by someone and certainly it cannot all the time be those people that have larger incomes; it has to be borne, I think by all those people that have the means of earning an income and can contribute to such a fund, such as the hospital premium fund.

Now, I don't mean to say that we should impose too heavy a premium on those with meagre incomes. I think the same holds true that what I stated before in connection with Medicare, that those with lower incomes should be supported but certainly those that have the means whereby to pay for it, should pay.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland would permit a question?

MR. FROESE: If I can answer it, I'll be quite happy to.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable member the question as to - in the provinces of which he spoke, that is Alberta and British Columbia - where does the government get the money to finance the premiums of the people who can't afford to pay?

MR. FROESE: Well, I think I have mentioned this on previous occasions too. That in Alberta they derive a major portion of their budgetary revenues from their natural resources. These belong to the people of Alberta, so it's natural that these revenues should be there to provide services for all the people in their particular province. And therefore, it is quite natural that some of those moneys - that those people that have meagre incomes, should be paid for in this way.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether any of the money that the revenues of the Province of Alberta and British Columbia come from taxation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if what's happening in Alberta and British Columbia has anything at all to do with the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface?

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)... Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for St. John's has the floor.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to speak, and I don't intend to speak at length but the last speaker gave the reasons by which he has found a devious route into voting for this resolution and I can't leave his speech rest in such a manner that it could be misinterpreted that he really knows what he's voting for and in favour of this resolution. So, I just indicate that I really feel he would be much more comfortable voting with the government on this because his thinking, I think has been in line with them to such an extent that they are now espousing his kind of thinking as is happening currently in Alberta on a national scheme.

I welcome the wording of this resolution; it clearly recognizes the ability-to-pay principle, which is one which I believe that both the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the Government of the Province of Manitoba have jettisoned, have rejected. I believe it is true, well it's not a question of debate really, that hospital premiums have been increased by 80 percent; it is true that they are across-the-board and I think it will stick in my mind for many years that analogy, that example given by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks which caught me so unaware, when he mentioned that asking all people in the Province of Manitoba regardless of wealth to pay the same amount of premium is like asking him and the Honourable Member for Churchill each to lose 10 pounds. And I think that was a very well put description of what this government is doing on the basis of setting the premiums as they have done.

The second feature, as to the acceptable medical care plan, I want to say only this, that this government has failed completely in my estimation to justify in a rational, reasonable manner the reversal which took place from last year to this year. The arguments that they have given, as far as I can see, are completely senseless because the only fact that they have stated is that the estimated cost last year has now been estimated at a higher level, and the only deduction that one can draw from that fact, if indeed it is a fact, is that it is all the more necessary to provide a proper medicare plan to take care of the cost to which people are being put, in greater amounts than we were told a year ago, and for this government to take the position it did, is I believe a reversal in policy without meaning, without justification, but one which they feel is an indication that they went too far in the direction which is really not in line with the policy which they espouse. So, I'm happy that we can support the resolution as it has been presented.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, once again I want to express the way I feel about the present administration because I think in the 10 years that they have been in office they have promised everything under the sun. And it is a failing of a lot of politicians to promise things, but having promised them, surely the electorate have the right to expect the government to carry out those promises. As respects the first paragraph of the resolution that is before us stating that "we regret that the hospital premiums have been increased by 80 percent without taking into consideration the principle ability-to-pay," the Honourable Member for Wolseley said at Manitou, I think it was, or down in that country three or four years ago when the hospital premiums did go up for six months, I think it was, and then they were put back. He said, that he didn't think that it was right for the people present - and I think the newspaper reported there were about 300 people present at the meeting - that he didn't think it was right that they should have to pay the same premium as he, the Premier of the Province should pay, and so they were going to do something about this. Well, they didn't do anything about it. We have an across-the-board increase of 80 percent this year and the people don't like it.

Now, did they or did they not promise a Medicare plan by July 1st, 1968? I want to ask my honourable friends that: did you make that promise or did you not make that promise? Because if you say that you didn't make that promise then you should censor your propaganda department, because on March 17th, a year ago, a whole sheaf of material from the propaganda department stating "Home office hospital medical service plan prepared insurance program slated for July 1, 1968," and then proceeds to tell you of all the things that you will be covered for on July 1st, 1968. A clear-cut promise that you were going to implement this plan. Well haven't the people got a right to expect that you're going to implement some of the things you promise, some of the time? It sets out here how they're going to collect the premiums. The plan is expected to cost \$34 million a year at the outset - 17 million from Ottawa, 17 million by premiums. It goes on to say how sorry they feel for the 30 percent who can not

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)... afford to pay for premiums and this will be taken into consideration. Well, there may be more than 30 percent now. If they felt sorry for the 30 percent a year ago, they should feel a lot more so now because the costs have gone up substantially in the 12-month interval. And why have they gone up? Because of the wait and watch policy that the government has adopted in respect to the Medicare plan, and while the governments had sat on their hands, the doctors were busy with both of their hands, and their heads, taking advantage of the wait and watch policy of the government. So you will have guessed by this time, Mr. Speaker, that it is my intention at least to support the resolution that is before us.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Resolution lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$78,839,903.00 for Health, Resolutions 34 to 39, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, on No. 40.

MR. SPEAKER: No, not yet.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$51,746,615.00.

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

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, while concurring in Resolution No. 40, this House regrets that the inferior road construction specifications called for by this government has resulted in the rapid deterioration of certain of our main trunk highways, namely No. 23, between Morris and La Rochelle, No. 12, and many others, thereby causing great inconvenience to our motoring public and the wasting of large amounts of taxpayers money.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel certain while I'm basically mentioning only two specific roads in this resolution and intend to speak briefly on one only, I wish to point out to this Assembly that I'm sure that most of you have roads similar to the one that I am going to mention, or have mentioned.

No. 23, for example, is only one of these so-called mis-built roads that have been built during the last ten years. I am not speaking of all of No. 23 highway, Mr. Speaker, I'm only speaking as the resolution points out, of the area between Morris, or west of Morris and La Rochelle. East I should say — I'm sorry — east of Morris to La Rochelle. This is exactly also where the constituency of Carillon begins and it seems as if the troubles begin at the point where the road, as we all know, the other side of 23, we don't need to discuss that tonight, there's some very good road built, but I am referring to this area and I believe this road, the way it's been built is a disgrace not just to this government, not just to the province, but also to all the people of Carillon and all the people that have to travel on it from day to day.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is one of those roads that are supposed to do for the present and hopefully forever, and if we get enough complaints, if we get enough complaints, then possibly we're going to get a completion of this road. I don't think people want to continue complaining about roads. I think we have a lot of people left in Manitoba, and not just in Carillon, I'm speaking of all the people in Manitoba that don't want to keep on complaining. After all, they are paying 17 cents tax on every gallon of gasoline that they're buying, and originally, surely we must agree that this money was then meant for roads only.

Mr. Speaker, this part of No. 23, is possibly one of the worst examples or situations of

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.)... any road that has been built in one year and is hardly travelable one year later. I can never forget what some of the roads that were built in the former years were called, but we could give some names to this road today if we wished to.

Surely this government must know that roads are and have to be built with good materials in the first place and surely we must realize that if the right materials have been used, surely we all know that frost, soil conditions, and the like, are factors that must be taken into consideration, but I believe on this part of No. 23 highway, I believe the first ingredient of the right materials, or lack of it, has not been used carefully.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson. I wonder if the honourable gentlemen, if they must talk, could they do it in whispers in order that the honourable gentleman that might have the floor might be heard.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to rise in support of this resolution because I do have complaints to make. I would agree with the Honourable Member for Carillon that many of our highways since this government has taken over have not been properly built - and I will refer to one which is not even in my own constituency, just to show that I am not going to be parochial. I'll refer to the road between St. Pierre and St. Malo which is entirely out of my constituency. This was built immediately after the present government took over and it is a shame the shape that road is at the present time.

Now, I will refer to one in my own constituency the famous 201; or the old Morden-Sprague. Some of it has been reconstructed last year; only a short piece from Letellier to Dominion City. But this spring that road is in the worst shape that it has ever been before the construction was attempted. Similarly, the same applies to the rest of No. 201, the highway that runs through the centre of Boundary School Division. On account of poor roads, poor construction material in the roads, how can you expect the people of Boundary School Division to stand this; how can you expect the people of Boundary School Division to accept the principle of unitary division as they have had - in spite of that they have accepted - but now there's trouble and the main trouble stems from the fact that there is no road for proper transportation. And I notice in the program we have been given today that we cannot hope for any improvement there unless there's another program coming out; there isn't anything that's going to be spent on that road. True to form. In the last election the electorate was warned if you don't elect a Conservative you will not have that road paved and they said it comes from the mouth of the Minister, the former Minister of Highways. It's true to form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would concur in what the resolution purports. Certainly we need more improvement in roads in southern Manitoba and when checking on the list that we received late in the afternoon I find that in my riding there will be 1.2 miles of road improvement. On that basis we would probably have around 70 miles of road to build for this year. However, that is not the case according to this sheet that we got here and therefore as I pointed out in the afternoon that people on council feel that the roads are not maintained properly and that they're in worst shape than when the government took them over. I feel that more should be done to improve the provincial roads and highways so that we would at least have them on the par that they were when the government took them over.

Not only that, some of these roads get very dusty during the summer months and especially in the villages in southern Manitoba where you have a real dust problem and this too should be corrected. At the time that the access road policy, was discontinued that they were working on some years ago, just when the Highway 32 was ready and that all these villages were entitled to have hard-surface access roads to their villages, this probably meant a mile, two miles or so for these villages, then the government discontinued it and did not implement any further. As a result we have some nine or ten villages in southern Manitoba with populations running from 150 to 300 and so, and they have small industries, they have service shops and so forth within these villages and they need service roads that will be dust free and not maintained as poorly as they are at the present time.

The government at that time discontinued that program and today they're still with those poor roads that they must contend with. I for one deplore the situation that is there at the present time and I do hope the government will come across with a little more gravel this year and also do something toward dustproofing some of those roads.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, normally a matter of this I would consider, my group would

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)... consider, something that should have been brought up as a grievance because it's a local road dealing with a very specific area, in the members constituency I believe — I think it's Highway No. 23. We are waiting to hear what the Minister would have have to say on it because we didn't get to the details of his department during the day and in view of the charge made by the Member for Carillon I thought that the Minister would have something to say.

So we have to assume that the Minister's silence is really vindicating the position taken by the Member for Carillon and that by remaining silent he is admitting that the statements made by the Member for Carillon, the charges made, are valid; and in view of that, in view of that, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to us we pretty well will go along with the motion of non-concurrence. Although had the Minister come up with any sort of answer instead of just sitting there and listening and letting it go to a vote hoping that his majority would carry him, then I feel that this is certainly not the way to answer a specific charge of this nature. If there's any validity in it, then we should know, and if there's no validity in it, I think the Minister should reply.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I only wish to reply very briefly to the last speaker, the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks. I listened very briefly to the Honourable Member from St. John's berating the department for putting forward too great an effort in road building at the expense of other services of the government and I would perhaps suggest to him that they caucus the matter of road building with the New Democratic Party.

MR. MILLER: That's not an answer.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it's very nice

MR. SPEAKER: We're still speaking to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Carillon. I'm sure the Honourable Member for St. John's would appreciate that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that it was your impression that I was not going to speak on the resolution. I am speaking to the resolution which deals with specific road building in a specific area of the Province of Manitoba under the jurisdiction of the Acting Minister of Highways, where he was charged with not only failure to do it but an accusation that it was done inadequately and that had to do with how monies are being expended. I don't have the resolution in front of me but, as I recall it, it deals with bad workmanship, with inadequate provision of roads, and the Minister when challenged to speak, he was told that generally it was the impression of our group that this type of resolution was not one which would come in as a non-concurrence, as a matter of regret for the House, but was so specific that it could be debated and would have been debated in estimates, that we would not normally rise to the support of a specific item — and frankly I have not been on that highway, No. 23 between Morris and La Rochelle for some time, No. 12 and these specifics — so I would normally not be able to vote in favour of it. But the Minister sat there, the former Minister sat there, we don't have a Minister himself charged with Highways so he just wasn't there to sit, and they didn't answer, and then the only conclusion one could assume that they didn't feel it necessary to respond to a very specific charge dealing with inferior road construction.

Now the Minister glibly gets up — (Interjection) — now he says "Nonsense." He had every opportunity to speak and took advantage of it. He was invited to speak and he rose to his feet, and now that he has exhausted his privilege to speak he now purports to interject words which he feels are sufficient answers to an accusation. Had he had the courage to get up and say so whilst on his feet and in the right time, I would have paid attention to what he was saying as being something of validity.

But, Mr. Speaker, the accusation is inferior road construction, and to presumably cleverly say, "Well you fellows don't caucus and one says you're spending too much and the other says you're not justifying an expenditure", is to me just a wisecracking type of response from a Minister who should be responsible enough to deal with the motion whether it's one that he agrees with or not as to being serious. It's not frivolous, it was a very specific accusation, and he calmly says, "Oh well, these fellows, say — one says don't spend so much and the other says justify what you're doing."

If anything I said today to the Minister would make him feel that I justified inferior roads then I don't know why he is sitting in this House, because he should be able to understand what I said earlier as having nothing whatsoever to do with inadequate construction, with inferior construction. And the mere fact that he took this way out of dealing with a serious subject and now sits there and tries to interject comments which are not only not apropos but are out of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... order - and which I'm sure the Speaker would call out of order if he repeated himself that way - is to my way of thinking a completely inferior method of conducting debate, and if it's an indication of the way he builds roads, then it's an invitation for us to vote in favour of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for St. John's in keeping within the confines of the resolution and I would like similar co-operation around the House for the discussions for the remainder of the evening.

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

MR. BARKMAN: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. I wonder if I might appeal to the honourable members that when Mr. Clerk is continuing to read the concurrence report tonight if they would remain in their seats. It has on occasion happened where two or three have been up and it's been rather difficult to know whether or not they are moving an amendment. Proceed.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$51,746,615 for Highways. Resolutions 40 to 45.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, while concurring in Resolution No. 56, this House regrets the cynical misuse of public funds to supply our citizens one-sided news reports, nonsensical trivia ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On a point of order, I don't think that item ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if my honourable friend would just take his seat, we haven't reached that item yet.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I understood that you had recognized me, despite what the assistant speaker says.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. My difficulty of course is only hearing the member. I don't have before me the content of that particular item that's being dealt with, and it is for that reason that this little confusion has developed and I hope the Honourable Member for Portage will accept the interruption that was given in the order of business.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$51,746,615 for Highways, Resolutions 40 to 45, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,203,691 for Industry and Commerce, Resolutions 46 to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, while concurring in Resolution No. 56, this House regrets the cynical misuse of public funds to supply our citizens one-sided news reports, nonsensical trivia, and favourable propaganda for certain Cabinet Ministers to the news media of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson -- Order, please. Will the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne please take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be too long on this item; I shall not recount to the Minister the many publications for which he is held responsible; and before I start to quote from an article I would like to assure my honourable friend the Minister of Public

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... Utilities that I am going to read an article and I am going to give to the author full credit in case he is wondering before I start.

I have an item in my hand entitled "Coffee Break." The writer of the article, his name is John Robertson. It's a column that appears in the Free Press every — daily, I would say, and I quote: "The economic tragedy of the Manitoba Government's Information Services Branch is not the fact that its budget more than doubled to \$148,610 this year, the gut issue is that it isn't only a propaganda vehicle for the provincial Conservatives but an inept one. In other words, Industry Minister Sidney Spivak and Company aren't getting their money's worth. For example, how would you feel if you were trying to sell a product and paying your Director of Information \$17,316 a year, your Director of News Services \$13,572, your News Editor \$11,160, and three writers between them \$7,000 and \$9,000 each and then find that every piece of copy they send to the newspapers has to be rewritten or thrown away. Most legislative reporters I know would just love to have someone pitch in and help them cover the beat, but the bilge churned out by the Information Branch is so nebulous and so flagrantly one-sided that the newspaper reporters would probably be sacked if they turned in one of the releases as their own.

"Mr. Spivak has said he was dismayed that criticism of the Information Branch hasn't been specific. Well Sid, let's get specific. Item: Very little daunted were the early Presbyterian missionaries who rode forth on their circuits through blizzards and intense cold, through the blazing suns of the summer and violent thunderstorms." There's much more but it's ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if that is a quote from the department that he is speaking of.

MR. JOHNSTON: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a quote that he's reading now?

MR. JOHNSTON: Absolutely.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh dear dear.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I understand your doubt. It's unbelievable but it's here, it's true. "Item: Stinking River Settlement. This unusually named district about ten miles south of Headingley was a lush farming area with about 20 families along the banks of the River Sale. One of the early references to this area is contained in correspondence by early Catholic missionaries. Salt springs on its bank appear to have given the river a saline quality and a definite smell. If you were a city editor and one of your reporters (who probably makes one-third the salary of the man who sent out the release) turned in either of the above two items you might be inclined to throw a net over him and call for the men in white coats." That's here too, Mr. Speaker. "Tell me, Sid, was I exaggerating when I used the word nebulous?"

"What about the treatment of hard news? Well, here's an example of how the Information Branch comes to grips with the controversial issue of redevelopment planning in Winnipeg. Item: A three level approach to redevelopment planning in Manitoba's capital city of Winnipeg was outlined Friday by the Honourable Thelma Forbes, Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. In her statement in the Legislature she said ..."

And then another paragraph starts, and this is not what the Minister said, this is still John Robertson's writing. "The rest of the story is a long dreary 36 line quote from the Minister culminating with 'the redevelopment of downtown Winnipeg will not be an easy task. It can't be done overnight. I hope I can report real progress in the very near future.' They could have at least started the item off, Thelma Forbes is going to have a pretty good story for us one of these days. The Information Branch has more editors than reporters. This is more unusual than having four foremen on a three-man work gang."

MR. SPEAKER: I do believe the honourable gentleman is paraphrasing someone that wrote that outside of this -- I'm sure he is and I wondered if he could refrain from doing that. He is giving an opinion of someone outside of this House.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on my word as a member I'm reading it word for word.

MR. SPEAKER: And he knows that is ...

MR. JOHNSTON: And I'm quite happy — you can have a copy of the clipping later on. I know it's priceless but it's all here. Back to the article. "Not content with turning out unusable newspaper copy, the branch now is going into the television business. If you want to interview Mr. Spivak, for example, the branch will ask him all the right questions and send your station a tape, and of course Mr. Spivak will give both the government and the opposition side of every issue in the House, won't he.

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.)...

"I think the Information Branch should be abolished. It is a headache and a nuisance to any city editor and a source of eternal embarrassment to the government. In view of other needy programs aborted because of soaring taxes, it is incapable of fooling even some of the pros in the news media some of the time. I really feel for the people who write for the Information Service. Unless they are passionately dedicated Conservatives they must be weary of sitting before their typewriters trying to write something nice about the government every day, or something nice and nebulous. Maybe this waste is just one of the many reasons why Manitoba isn't 'Going to Beat '70'."

Mr. Speaker, that's the end of the article and I know you find it very difficult to believe, so I would ask one of the pages to come and take it and deliver it to yourself. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've already spoken on this item before and again I don't wish to repeat myself. I merely wish to observe that apparently what the opposition has said has had little or no effect, and sometimes, although we note that the government members vote against us, we still think that possibly they go back and try to at least take into consideration some of the criticism which is not only directed by us but which is picked up by the media, and certainly this is an area where we would have thought that our clamor would have found some results, but apparently the situation hasn't changed.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it seems to get worse because it's largely becoming apparent to us that the lines between the government and the media are beginning to blur, so that they themselves don't even know when they are engaged in press reporting and when they are engaged in the government work, and I just want to cite two small examples.

I asked the Minister of Industry and Trade and Commerce whether any part of the cost of a Free Press supplement was borne by his department, and he distinctly answered that "we put an ad in the paper." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have reliable information that much of the material was prepared word for word by members of his department, submitted to the papers and printed in the form in which it was put. I'm sure the honourable member distinguishes cost by not realizing that the work that is being done in his department by these reporters at government expense, to him was not included in the cost of his department, and therefore the lines of distinction have become blurred to him as to where the government starts and where the news media stops.

And we saw an even more dramatic example of that in the House, I believe it was today or yesterday - the days are so long now that I can't remember myself where they start and where they end - but the Honourable Member for St. George asked the Minister of Education or asked the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether he was interviewed by a person in the Department of Information and the Minister said - and I'm sure he believed it - that there were three reporters, and I'm sure he regarded - and only later was able to correct himself - I am sure that he regarded Lee Sage as a press reporter, because a moment later he acknowledged that Lee Sage was the person who had interviewed him.

Now when this takes place, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that what I spoke about last year and what I spoke about earlier in the session this year would happen is happening, that the government is going into the propaganda business on a mass scale and are involved in the public expenditure of monies to perpetuate their own political machine.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very short. I just want to show an example here of the way this is being used. This is a new one of May 3, 1968. This was on hospital premiums. Well surely, Mr. Speaker, this didn't have to go out at all because we were debating the estimates of my friend the Honourable Minister of Health during that time and it was covered by all the newspapers. And I'm not going to say that it's wrong to give proper information, but this is slanted, this is more or less an editorial for the government. And here's an example on this one: "Hospital premiums to rise January 1, 1969. Present rate the same as at start of plan in 1958." Why this information? It's all right to say hospital premiums to rise on a certain date, it'll cost so much and so on; give facts if it's news, not an editorial.

It says, "Hospital premiums are the same today as when the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan went into effect ten years ago." It's not a lie as such - the premiums were the same - but it's certainly playing on words and misrepresenting facts to the people of Manitoba, because we had a special session of the House between 1958 and now and we decided to change

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) the rate, and in fact we reduced the rate -- the premiums I should say -- because we put on an income tax and we decided to change and say now we're going to use the ability-to-pay principle.

Now I'm not going to go all over this debate again, we had it, but on this, this is not right. If they want to give facts, information, but not an editorial and not -- you know they get around to this also -- Mr. Witney said and the Minister said and the Minister said and so on. Why don't they say, "Sid Green said," that "Saul Cherniack said," or "Mr. Campbell said." It's the same thing. Give facts: premiums are going to rise by so much on such a date; you pay your premiums six months in advance. And give more information. Say, well the cost is because of rising costs in the hospital construction and these things, the cost has gone up -- this is fine -- but not an editorial and trying to say, well the present rates are the same.

What do they think -- these people are not dummies. What are they trying to say? Well, all right, you haven't paid a darned cent more than you did in '58. Isn't that right, Mr. Speaker? I ask you -- this is exactly what it means. You wouldn't say it -- you wouldn't say "present rates same as at start of plan in '58. Hospital premiums are the same today as when the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan went into effect ten years ago."

You're trying to say to the people, now lookit, we managed, we held the line but now it's going to cost millions and millions of dollars more and you'll have to pay for this. And this -- I said awhile ago it's not a lie -- I mean you can't say this is not right, the sentence -- it's true that the premiums have increased, but this is the biggest misrepresentation that you could do to the people of Manitoba. We think this is wrong, especially when this government have the same people of Manitoba paying for this; they're paying to get this kind of stuff.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . hear from the Minister concerned. He has indicated in the past that he didn't believe that this was managed news, and yet every day there's more and more proof that that's exactly what it is, managed news; government propaganda; nothing else. I wonder if the Minister for example would tell the House if it is correct that he himself within the past two weeks appeared on a TV interview and the questioner was a member of his Department in the Information Services. This is the information that's been given to me. One of the Ministers today or yesterday when questioned said it wasn't so, but on refreshing his memory found that it was in fact one of the department employees. I'm told that the Minister himself responsible for this department has been on the TV interview within the past two weeks, interviewed by one of his own staff. Mr. Chairman, if that isn't managed news, if that isn't government propaganda, what is it?

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3, 203, 691 for Industry and Commerce, Resolutions 46 to 56.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1, 080, 983 . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, are we at Resolution 63? -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1, 080, 983 for Labour, Resolutions 57 . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that while concurring in Resolution 57, this House regrets that the government has failed to take the initiative to enact legislation which would eliminate discriminatory laws affecting employees, such as: (a) the unnecessary obstacles facing a union on an application for certification; (b) the unfair onus placed on an employee to assume responsibility for the administration of provincial laws relating to unfair labour practices; (c) the use of injunctions against employees in a manner entirely inconsistent with their use in any other area; (d) the law which has resulted in unions being held responsible for unauthorized acts of their members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Chair waits to read this. Would the honourable gentleman please take his seat? I've appealed to the House three or four times this evening. It's strictly out of order to be moving around the House when a speaker is addressing the House. It isn't necessary for me surely to explain these things to the honourable gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, each one of these areas of course could invoke a major debate and I don't intend to embark on any such a venture tonight. I think that the major objection which our Party has with regard to the present status of employees under the Manitoba Labour Relations Act is that these employees are placed in an unfair position vis-a-vis the people with whom they are bargaining, that is the employer. I wish to make it plain, Mr. Speaker, that this Party asks for no special status for employees and no special laws for employees. What we are asking is that the present laws which apply to employees and employees only be eliminated so that employees are treated the same as other citizens in our society with respect to their collective bargaining rights.

Now we've dealt, Mr. Speaker, with various areas. One, we say that there are unnecessary obstacles facing a union on application for certification. This is the only proceeding, Mr. Speaker, where the adversary somehow has a choice and a position to play in naming the agent of the person with whom he is negotiating. In this particular capacity to give the employer the right to in any way participate in the naming of the bargaining agent of his employees is the same as giving me the right to say which lawyer will represent the person who I have a dispute with. This, Mr. Speaker, is surely a discriminatory position as against employees.

Another position that faces employees when they apply for certification is that the Labour Board and management are entitled to go into the constitution of a labour union to decide who shall be members and who shall not be members. Now in no other area, Mr. Speaker, do we say who shall be members of a voluntary association. We certainly don't, and we wouldn't say that the unions had a right to say who shall be a member of an employers' organization and we say that the employers should not, as they have under this administration Act, the right to say who will be the members of an employees' organization.

A third rather anomalous situation facing employees is the situation which accrues when there is a vote for certification. Mr. Speaker, when employees are voting as to a bargaining agent, the Labour Board requires that that vote be the positive vote of over 50 percent of the people in the unit, which meant, Mr. Speaker, if there were 100 people in the unit and 50 of them voted for the union and none of them voted against the union, the application would be defeated because in this area and in this area only the people who don't vote are counted as "no" votes. They are counted as negative.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour would try to explain that by saying that a positive vote of over 51 percent is necessary, but it's not necessary and hasn't been found necessary in other jurisdictions. In other jurisdictions votes can be taken in different ways, and in this jurisdiction this type of vote, Mr. Speaker, betrays the secrecy - and this is a fundamental basis of The Labour Relations Act - betrays the secrecy of voting under The Labour Relations Act because the employer is able to know, because the voting takes place in his plant, that the employees who have not voted have voted against the union. And this, Mr. Speaker, is

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) a situation which is not supposed to be available to him, and yet our present government permits this legislation to remain in the way it is at the present time.

In dealing with the onus of an employee for assuming the responsibility for administration of provincial laws, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the only areas - and there are other exceptions which I'll deal with briefly - this is one of the only areas where, when a violation of a provincial statute is alleged, the person making the violation has to hire counsel and proceed to prosecute that violation at his expense before The Labour Relations Act. He has to make the investigation; he has to subpoena the witnesses; he has to hire the lawyer; and he has to go ahead and prosecute the offence either before the Labour Board or before a provincial magistrate.

This is equivalent, Mr. Speaker, to a person who has a complaint against -- or who knows about his neighbour bootlegging, being required to himself hire a lawyer and prosecute the offence. This is what presently occurs under our Manitoba Labour Relations Act. I know that we have asked the department to interview the people concerned and to do the same thing that they would do when any other offence is alleged, but they have refused to do this and they have insisted that the prosecution be continued by the individual concerned, which we think is contrary to the administration of justice or the principles of our administration of justice.

I mentioned that there were some exceptions. I understand that the government for some reason requires the dentists to prosecute denturists, and I think that one of the judges of our County Court has already commented on the unsatisfactory status of this situation but I'm not too familiar with it.

But in general, in general, Mr. Speaker, the -- (interjection) -- the Attorney-General says that the lawyer prosecutes their offences under the Act. I don't think he's correct. What the lawyers do is discipline a person within the Law Society and disbar him from the organization if necessary. But if he is embezzling, the prosecution is then conducted by the Crown. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I distinctly remember when Mr. Gingera was prosecuted, a Crown Attorney appeared and made submissions, and the same thing happened when the others were prosecuted.

MR. LYON: . . . his confusion. The Law Society prosecutes offences under The Law Society Act.

MR. SPEAKER: It's always a little difficult when two or three lawyers get together.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about offences under The Labour Relations Act. My honourable friend has indicated another exception. I don't remember any prosecutions under The Law Societies Act. I do remember lawyers being prosecuted, but I thank my honourable friend for his advice that there is another area in which the Crown doesn't administer its own laws, and I think that this is wrong.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, is the use of injunctions against employees in a manner entirely inconsistent with their use in any other area. I addressed myself to these questions in the House last year. The Minister of Labour wasn't able to refute a single argument, and didn't even attempt to, that was made with regard to the type of injunctions that have been issued in Manitoba. He has not done anything in the interim to change the situation. The law which has resulted in unions being held responsible for unauthorized acts of their members, when the government brought in the legal entity legislation, Mr. Speaker, they said that this couldn't happen, and as a matter of fact they went to court and got an opinion that the Court would not do this. But since that legislation has come in, Mr. Speaker, several cases have resulted where the judges have said, and referred to the British American -- (Interjection) -- No, not BNA Act, I'm talking about -- (Interjection) -- That's right, British American Construction. In that case, Mr. Speaker, the judge found that the union had nothing to do with the activities which resulted in damages to the company, but held nevertheless that the union was responsible to pay the company damages because what the members did three weeks later may have been inspired by something that the union did originally. So that the practice, Mr. Speaker, as predicted by the former Member for St. John's when he was in this House and denied by the Attorney-General, has certainly verified the position that we have taken, which we continue to take on this subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has ignored all of these areas and he's ignored them because he is waiting for the Woods Committee to report. We know that this is a committee that is composed of twelve employee representatives, 12 employer representatives, who report apparently only when they agree on everything. Mr. Speaker, we know that these

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) are subjects in which the parties are directly adverse in interest and on which agreement is not likely to take place soon, if ever. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we strongly would ask the House to censure this government in its inactivity to remedy some of the inequities in our present Labour Relations Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, are we going to hear from the Minister in reply to this?

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the resolution of the Honourable . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the least we should have is some explanation from the Minister in view of the fact that his estimates were not covered during -- (Interjection) -- What's your problem Minister of Welfare? If my honourable friend would like to make a speech he's welcome to make one too.

MR. SPEAKER: He doesn't have the floor.

MR. MOLGAT: He doesn't have the floor. Oh, he'd rather sit in the back and chatter. Well, he's in his normal position, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me in view of the fact that we have not had a discussion on Labour estimates that the least that we could have is a statement from the Minister on the comments made by the Honourable Member for Inkster. I don't subscribe to all of the things that the Member for Inkster says and I think there are some points on which he is giving one side only of the situation, but surely the Minister should be prepared to give the government position. I might say that insofar as I am concerned I don't subscribe to all of the points but some of them I'm in complete agreement with and I'm prepared to support the resolution on that basis, not all of the matters, but on the basis there are some of them there, I intend to vote for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm in the position of somewhat at variance with the position that's been stated by my Leader, because I take the position that when we get omnibus resolutions of this kind, if there's something that I do not agree with in there I think I have to register my disapproval of it. I can't go along with the whole amendment and I therefore would be afraid that I would be voting against my principles if I supported the resolution in general terms.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdame Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 30.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1, 080, 983 for Labour, Resolutions 57 to 63, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6, 979, 147 for Mines and Natural Resources, Resolutions 64 to 74, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3, 593, 159 for Provincial Secretary, Resolutions 75 to 85, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1, 865, 446 for Public Utilities, Resolutions 86 to 89, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5, 940, 871 for Public Works, Resolutions Nos. 90 to . . .

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that while concurring in Resolution No. 93 this House regrets that the government, through its arbitrary expropriation procedures, has created an atmosphere of insecurity by landowners in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable Member for Wellington please take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. LYON: I hesitate to interrupt my honourable friend but it appears that he is going to make some remarks on this and there was an understanding that we would adjourn at 11:00 o'clock, unless there is some disposition on the part of the honourable members to carry on. There being no such disposition indicated, I would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There is a resolution before the House and I suppose we must dispose of this resolution unless it is withdrawn. For that part of the concurrence report that has been dealt with, I wondered if this resolution might not handle it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, could not this matter be left open in the name of the honourable member who has introduced the motion and is now ready to speak on it, could it not be left standing in his name?

MR. SPEAKER: That isn't my point. I'm wondering if this resolution that I have in my hand will take care of the material that we have dealt with and a new one tomorrow when we come before the House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that we have an amendment to the resolution before the House, that the Orders of the Day tomorrow would indicate the same major motion that we are dealing with, that is the consideration of the report of the Committee of Supply, and that we would immediately resume back to consideration of the amendment moved by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and he would then proceed to make his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: All I want to know is if it is the wish of the House that I hold this in my possession until tomorrow. (Agreed).

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Thursday morning.