

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, May 3, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Final Report of seven persons appointed to prepare a list of members of the Standing Committees ordered by this House.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee of seven persons appointed to prepare a list of members of the Standing Committees ordered by this House beg leave to present the following as their Final Report.

Your Committee met and prepared the following list of members to compose the Standing Committee of the House other than the Law Amendments Committee:

Privileges and Elections

Hon. Messrs. Doern, Hanuschak, Paulley, Schreyer, Toupin, Messrs. Einarson, Girard, Gottfried, Henderson, Johnston (Portage), Malinowski, McBryde, McGregor, Petursson, Weir.

Public Accounts

Hon. Messrs. Borowski, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Paulley, Messrs. Adam, Allard, Craik, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Johnston (Portage), Malinowski, McKenzie, Petursson, Mrs. Trueman, Messrs. Uruski, Walding.

Public Utilities and Natural Resources

Hon. Messrs. Burtniak, Green, Mackling, Pawley, Schreyer, Messrs. Barrow, Beard, Boyce, Craik, Enns, Gonick, Graham, Jenkins, Johnston (Portage), McBryde, Sherman, Spivak, Turnbull, Weir.

Agriculture

Hon. Messrs. Burtniak, Pawley, Schreyer, Uskiw, Messrs. Adam, Barkman, Boyce, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Gottfried, Henderson, Jorgenson, McBryde, McGregor, Shaf-ransky, Turnbull, Uruski, Watt.

Municipal Affairs

Hon. Messrs. Cherniack, Green, Mackling, Miller, Pawley, Messrs. Boyce, Desjardins, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), McGill, McKellar, Moug, Patrick, Mrs. Trueman, Messrs. Turnbull, Uruski.

Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library

Hon. Messrs. Burtniak, Hanuschak, Mackling, Miller, Messrs. Adam, Barkman, Barrow, Desjardins, Ferguson, Gottfried, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Malinowski, McKellar, Walding, Watt, Weir.

Industrial Relations

Hon. Messrs. Borowski, Green, Paulley, Uskiw, Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Enns, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Jenkins, McBryde, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Shaf-ransky, Walding.

Statutory Regulations and Orders

Hon. Messrs. Borowski, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Toupin, Uskiw, Messrs. Bilton, Froese, Gonick, Graham, McGregor, Moug, Petursson, Shaf-ransky, Watt.

Economic Development

Hon. Messrs. Burtniak, Doern, Evans, Green, Hanuschak, Pawley, Messrs. Adam, Allard, Beard, Craik, Gonick, Johannson, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Turnbull.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Jenkins as Chairman. Your Committee has agreed that, for the remainder of this Session, the quorum of this Committee shall consist of Ten (10) Members.

Your Committee has considered BILL:

(No. 3) - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered BILLS:

(No. 13) - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1).

(No. 14) - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

(No. 18) - An Act to authorize the Payment of Special Emergency Grants to Farmers.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I just wonder, without speaking, with leave of the House, whether I can find out whether the honourable member is thinking of holding this for some time because these are the bills that we were hoping would go through and got them to committee early for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'll be quite prepared to speak on it tomorrow.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, with leave of the House, whether we can revert back one step to the Report of the Committee establishing committees. There is some desire to call Public Utilities Committee fairly early, and if we could have the report go through with respect to that particular committee it would be very helpful. I wonder whether that is possible, whether by consent, whatever the Honourable Member for Churchill wishes to speak on the Bill in its generality, could we have it approved that the Report be accepted insofar as the creation of the Public Utilities Committee is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Would the House Leader consider tomorrow being too long?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: If I may speak on that point of order, if there is one. We on this side don't know who's on what committee. I haven't even seen the report so why should we -- this is certainly not hurrying it.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding, I should like to direct the members to my loge on my right where we have Mr. Adolphe Matella, MLA for Canora, Saskatchewan. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

(MR. SPEAKER, cont'd.)

In our gallery we also have 25 students of Grade 11 standing of Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. H. Froese. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. We also have 25 students of Grade 11 standing of Windsor Park Collegiate. These students are under direction of Mr. Pitcairn. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson. There are 15 students of Grade 10 standing of the Westwood Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Pybus. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. This relates to Public Utilities Committee which will be formed in the next short period of time. I wonder whether the First Minister can indicate whether it will be possible for the directors of the Autopac Insurance Corporation to appear before Public Utilities to discuss the rates that have been tabled in the House and to allow the members of the insurance industry to also appear to present their information in connection with those rates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I think the arrangement that can be possible, and will be followed in all likelihood, is to arrange to have that Crown agency appear before the Law Amendments Committee or the appropriate committee in the same way as any other Crown agency.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can redirect my question to the First Minister. Will that corporation present its rates and its information concerning its rates to the committee and allow the private insurance companies to present information to the committee for its consideration as well?

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is aware of the procedure that is followed in cases such as this. It's a matter within the discretion of the committee to determine and I would assume that there would be a predisposition on the part of members of the committee to have this information brought forward, but I don't want to pre-empt the role of the committee.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I omitted mentioning that we have 50 upgrading students of the Red River Collegiate in our gallery. These students are under the direction of Mr. Harvey, Mrs. Larson and Miss Burkert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I also welcome you here today.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I would like to file a Return to an Order of the House No. 12 in response to a request for an Order filed by the Honourable Member from Roblin on April 7, 1970.

ORAL QUESTIONS PERIOD (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Where does an agent apply to be considered for appointment as an insurance agent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the information pertaining to the application of agents will be forwarded out shortly; I would expect within the next two weeks, which would clearly indicate where he is to apply and the basic preliminary information that is required of that prospective applicant.

MR. MCGREGOR: A supplementary question. How many appointments have been made to date, if any, and how many are to be made?

MR. PAWLEY: Insofar as the number that have been appointed to date, I know of no actual appointments having been made to this present time. Numerous agents have been in contact with me in regard to this matter and the terms of qualification have been outlined to them.

(2) As to the numbers that will be eligible, the statistics and figures that we have available would indicate that approximately 500 to 600 would be eligible if they should apply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): A supplementary question to the Minister. I wonder, could I submit my application and the application of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, they can certainly submit their applications, Mr. Speaker. I do have a slight suspicion that they might not be eligible. I would suspect that their insurance income might be less than the percentage required from all other sources, including their MLA indemnity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can he advise us on the results of the Ottawa meetings last week with regard to the CAE question?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The government delegation met the Honourable Mr. Richardson, the Minister in charge of Supply and Services, which happens to be the department responsible for contracts which CAE is undertaking apart from those of Air Canada. We received a commitment from Mr. Richardson that he would take a personal interest in this matter and would give a commitment to do everything he could to ensure that the CAE base, the CAE facility was maintained at a viable level.

However, the government delegation does not feel satisfied with the information obtained and therefore we are planning to call the all-party delegation, the all-party committee - I think it was referred to previously as the Air Canada Base Committee - together to discuss this question and we will be in touch with members of other parties and members of municipal governments, plus union, plus management, in the very near future to discuss this matter in some detail.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister advise us whether we might expect some action on it this week?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we were advised that by May 10th or May 11th or 12th - in that period - the Federal Government would be prepared at that time to indicate to CAE and ourselves the extent of work to be made available by various Federal Government agencies, and it would seem to us that it would be advisable for the all-party committee to consider this information. However, we do intend to call the committee together as soon as practical.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I had intended my question for the Honourable the Attorney-General, but in his absence I will direct it to the Honourable the First Minister. It relates to the Ternette case. In view of the recent Police Commission, Winnipeg Police Commission report in that matter, is it the intention of the Crown to proceed with the original charge?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can only take that question as notice at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I guess the Minister is aware that the bear-hunting season opened on Saturday. My question, is the Minister aware that bear-hunting licences can only be purchased from Conservation Officers; they can't be purchased from the regular vendor?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. I understand according to the Federal Minister Dube

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd.) that the Federal Government is ready to turn over the Deer Lodge Veterans Hospital to the province. Can he give us any progress report on it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I do believe that after the last statement that was made by myself that the Federal Government may have second thoughts insofar as the turning over of Deer Lodge Hospital. They do want to turn over the hospital to the province but under their conditions and we just can't meet their conditions. Now, we're still hoping that they come across with a half decent proposal to the Province of Manitoba and I should have an answer within a few days.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch the last part of the Minister's answer. Did you say you proposed a counter-proposal to the Federal Government? Is that correct?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, we have made many proposals to the Federal Government pertaining to Deer Lodge Hospital. We're only hoping that they accept our last proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister and relates to the contempt charges that were brought against the Minister of Transportation. Were the costs for the legal fees involved in the defence in the matter paid by the province or otherwise?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm just not in a position to answer that question offhand. My impression is that the answer would be negative, but I'll have to take that as notice as well.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Which one?

MR. SPEAKER: Page 2, the second one.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) How many residents of Manitoba were receiving welfare payments during January, February, and March, 1971?
- (2) How many residents were receiving welfare payments for the corresponding months in 1970, 1969?
- (3) What is the total monthly pay-out, including Provincial and Municipal share, for welfare payments for the years 1969-1970 and for the months of January, February and March, 1971?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker: this Order for Return is acceptable.

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

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing, with respect to the visit in September, 1970 to Manitoba by the Board of the Toronto Stock Exchange, the following:

- (1) Who paid for the visit?
- (2) Names and addresses of those who actually came to Manitoba.
- (3) Cost of the visit.
- (4) Purpose of the visit.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the proposed Order assumes that the visit was indeed paid for by the Manitoba Government which I believe is incorrect. The principle behind the Order, I assume, is what was the Provincial Government's participation in any part of the visit, and I must indicate that the form is unacceptable because the basis is incorrect, but if the honourable member would care to reword it to tie it in with what the Provincial Government had to do with the visit in terms of cost, then it would be acceptable. So if he would care to withdraw this and bring in another Order, we could look at the form of that. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd.) Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing, the members of the Executive Council who made trips outside of Manitoba on official or government business, since August 14, 1969. In each case show:

- (1) Names and addresses, occupation and title of each person who accompanied the Minister.
- (2) The Purpose of the trip.
- (3) Duration of the trip.
- (4) Itinerary of the trip.
- (5) Total cost of the trip including the travel costs, accommodation and personal expenses.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I've today filed an Order for Return giving this type of answer for the period July 15, 1966 to March 11, 1970. I would assume therefore that this Order would only ask for information from March 11, 1970 because there's no sense in repeating it.

Secondly, I point out that the Order would require the government to give information beyond its knowledge, in that there are persons who may have accompanied Ministers at the expense of other than the government. I can say freely that my wife has done me the honour and pleasure of accompanying me and I'm sure that the House is not concerned with whether or not she was with me or how much it cost me or my wife. So on the understanding that the Order would be limited from March 11, 1970 until now, and only to the extent of costs involved at Manitoba Government expense, on that basis we would accept the Order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage is away. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of a report from Dr. Tulchinsky, Special Consultant to Mr. Toupin, concerning proposed Health and Social Services for Community Clinics.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return, or Address for Papers is precisely the kind of privileged documentation information that I referred to and which is so well cited in Beauschne and Bourinot, the kind of information that is privy to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, if I may take issue with the First Minister on the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. If you wish debate it has to be transferred. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Could we move this to Private Members Day? (Agreed)

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading - Government Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the House Leader wished to proceed to the motion standing in my name on Bill 9, which is now in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being prepared on Friday when this bill was called, but I have tried to do my duty and be in a position this afternoon to carry on the debate with regards to Bill No. 9. I appreciate the comments of the Minister in wanting us to urgently consider and give this bill our earnest attention as quickly as possible. I also appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the debate that has already taken place in the House and around the city with regards to this matter of one-city concept, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we in our party are trying to co-operate to the best of our ability to the wishes of the Honourable Minister.

(MR. McKENZIE, cont'd.)

What does this Bill spell out to me, Mr. Speaker. To me, it is part of the plan for the urban reorganization of the Greater Winnipeg area and of course the purpose of the legislation, as I read it, is to try and enforce budgetary review and control over the municipal budgets in that particular jurisdiction, and to try and control the dissipation of accumulated assets and to impose certain controls on the municipalities within the province - or within the Greater Winnipeg area. And it's interesting for me to find now that I guess most of the budgets are in and the Minister has approved them. Some are up - he nods that he hasn't approved them all. Well, I'm sorry, I apologize, that was a misunderstanding on my part. The biggest one then, the Greater Winnipeg one has been approved because I have read certain comments with regard to it, but no doubt the other budgets will likely be, if they're not on his desk, will be forthcoming likely very shortly.

Of course the Minister has asked us to prepare, with this type of legislation, for a sort of a smooth, efficient process of electoral movement within the legislation of this particular bill. And of course we thus, by this particular bill, eliminate 12 different enumerators or enumerations in the year 1971 and we will provide one enumerator at the expense of the province. Of course the question was asked the other day if this is going to be a precedent of this government whereby government, big government is going to take over the enumeration process of all the jurisdictions in the province, because if this is an example of what we are going to have with this type of legislation, I suspect that it's just around the corner when the government starts to organize the municipalities of the rural part of the province into one jurisdiction, and I suppose that if I were to go around and check these jurisdictions today I would find that those enumerating lists are already likely prepared, because this is about the time of year that the enumerators are working and preparing their lists for the municipalities; and no doubt they are well prepared.

The other thing that the bill seems to indicate to me is that it will postpone the municipal elections that are usually held in the fall and the present councils will continue to operate until the end of 1971; and I find no fault with that, but I find that I will have difficulty in supporting those budget control sections of the bill. The bill seems to indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government doesn't trust the 12 municipalities within the jurisdiction of Metro as they administer the business of their jurisdictions, and that again is a concern that I would like to put on the record. I am again concerned of course, as I say, with big government telling people - small, little jurisdictions, the municipalities of the Metropolitan area - that they know better how to run their jurisdictions than they do and the centralization philosophy alarms me.

There's one other section of the bill I note whereby the Minister is granted permission to draw the boundaries, the ward boundaries in his office rather than through the normal procedure. And again I become most concerned, Mr. Speaker, with these type of powers being asked by the Minister. The one that concerns me, rurally speaking, is the one the example of the Minister of Municipal Affairs who spoke in Dauphin last fall at the annual meeting of the Union of Municipalities, where he said that he was giving serious consideration to the development of regional government in Manitoba. So rurally speaking, and coming from a rural constituency, I become most concerned by these powers being granted to Ministers of the Crown, and in this bill I am wondering if the Minister of Urban Affairs, is he not sure that the municipalities of Metro are in good faith today as it would abide by the legislation that's on the statutes today and that we basically maybe didn't need this bill at this time. I wonder has he any evidence, or has he any proof to show me that they wouldn't have carried on to the best interests of themselves and to their people without this type of bill that we have here before us at this time.

I'm also wondering, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister any communication between himself and the departments of government to indicate that the municipalities within the Metro area wouldn't carry on in good faith while we debate in this House the one-city concept of government. I don't think that the jurisdictions would have got bogged down themselves without this direction from the Minister. I think they would have carried on quite well and we could have proceeded in a sort of a - how would I say - a slower pace. I can't see the urgency of this is that important. We're making a tremendous decision in this legislation and the bill which will prepare us for the one-city concept. So therefore I don't see why we should hastily move into this, impose all these regulations and sections of this bill on the municipalities of Metro. Let's take it cool and let's take it slow and easy, and let's make sure that we do it right this time so that everybody is reasonably happy with the legislation that we pass in this House.

(MR. McKENZIE, cont'd.)

The other thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, about this legislation, is that it's bad legislation because it's retroactive. I become more and more and more concerned every year with a retroactive type of legislation, and I think, as I said a moment ago, I think it's basically unnecessary because I think the municipalities in the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg are co-operating beautifully without any need for this type of legislation at this time. And of course the precedent that we are establishing by bringing in a bill of this nature and debating it, this to me seems to give the Minister of Urban Affairs a sort of a veto power. It's something now that he could even move into The Municipal Act with the powers asked in this Bill and possibly he could take the new Metropolitan Act when we are finished with it and possibly have the veto powers in that legislation as well.

The Section 12 of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, to me - and I'm not a noted legal mind - but to me Section 12 casts doubt upon the future of the Metro organization bill and it seems to show a lack of confidence by the Minister as to its future and as to its worth.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I am concerned about in regard to Bill 9, something that it does - is it legislates this problem that we have created by this type of legislation being brought into the House. Possibly the legislation was for the benefit of the bureaucracies who have done quite a bit of work no doubt already; possibly this bill was brought in for the benefit of a firm of chartered accountants who no doubt have done some work for the Minister; possibly this legislation was brought in to the - well, I say to the disadvantage of some of the taxpayers at the local councils and their staffs.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that, like the City of Winnipeg today who I understand worked feverishly all through the weekend after they got their budget approved, that this has created a lot of burden for the City of Winnipeg. It cost the City of Winnipeg I understand some ten, twelve thousand dollars a day by this type of legislation coming in; whereas if we hadn't had this bill that expense wouldn't have been created at all. Think of the interest on the overdrafts that the city is facing at this particular time, all because of this type of legislation, and the overtime that was used by the staff on the weekend as it prepared their tax bills, which no doubt I understand will likely be going out in the mail early this week. Actually, I can't see that any good has been accomplished by this type of legislation at this time.

Let's face it, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Minister possibly is embarrassed by this type of legislation at this time, possibly by this whopping increase in Winnipeg taxes that I find in the paper on the weekend and by the mill rates I suppose in Metro Winnipeg. It's quite evident now that the ones in the city are too high. It's also evident to me as a rural member that likely the ones in the suburban areas are too low, and I don't know, anyways the bill I think -- somehow I get it that this bill will provide the Minister with the authority to try and cover up some of these embarrassments that seem to have come about at this particular time.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity to the Honourable Minister, that I don't think we basically need this legislation at this time. I submit again to the Minister, let's not get in too much haste with legislation at this time. I'm all for reviewing the Metro concept, reviewing the whole matter, but let's take it step by step; let's take it very carefully; and let's not get ourselves in with unnecessary legislation such as we have in this particular bill. Let's go slow, let's go careful and let's not get involved in what to me appears to be a precedent that was unnecessary.

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

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could you call Bill No. 15, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I wonder if it would be okay, Mr. Speaker, if I said a word or two in connection with this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): There are no objections to that at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I may say, Mr. Speaker, I've enjoyed very much the discussion that has taken place on Bill 15 dealing with the Lotteries Act. I have been somewhat amused by the

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd.) approaches that have been taken by various members of the Opposition, and I hope and trust that before too long that they'll get the right side of their cheeks sort of reconciled to their left side in order that their utterances may indicate some thought of a progressive nature when they take part in the debate.

Members opposite invariably have referred to my participation in the debate which took place last year dealing with the Centennial Lottery, which bill, Mr. Speaker, was introduced by a private member of the Assembly, the then private member from Elmwood who is now the Minister without Portfolio. I expressed at that time my personal opinion that I was opposed to lotteries as such and objected generally to that proposition and announced the same to the House. And I make no apologies for the stand that I took at that time, but at the same time that my honourable friends opposite were making references to my stand on a private member's bill, they were taking the opportunity of cajoling this government because of the fact, in their opinion - and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in their opinion alone - that there were splits and division in the administration and particularly in the Cabinet. My honourable friends who are wont to address this House as to the requirements of unified Cabinet conduct forgot that very very conveniently in making references to me personally and also to the conduct of Cabinet.

Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friends that they better get ahold of a few documents dealing with the traditional position of Cabinet authority, for surely my honourable friends should know, and apparently they do not know, that when a Minister of the Crown introduces a bill for the consideration of the Assembly that that represents not necessarily the unanimous decision of the administration or Cabinet but the consensus of Cabinet. I'm sure that my honourable friend who is now occupying the position as Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition had on occasion had to support certain resolutions that were put forth by the previous administration, and I think that's very very evident by the change in approach of my honourable friend the Member for River Heights, because I'm sure that when he sat on this side of the House, when the government of the day rejected many sensible proposals for the well-being of Manitobans, he had to stand up with his then colleagues in Cabinet and reject them, and now that the boot is on the other foot, Mr. Speaker, and he's on that side of the House, he's now proposing things that he rejected slightly less than two years ago. And he would do it, he would do it, Mr. Speaker, because when he was a member of Cabinet he realized that once a government measure was introduced by a member of the Cabinet he had to support it and did support it. My honourable friend the Member for Riel is laughing too. I suggest to him the self-same situation prevailed.

I make no apologies in saying, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to support the bill that has been introduced by my honourable colleague the Attorney-General. This does not of necessity mean that I may have some differences of opinion but I am a traditionalist, and how else, Mr. Speaker, could government conduct itself otherwise. So -- (Interjection) -- you never mind, the Minister of Mines will speak for himself. I'm speaking for myself and I'm rejecting as utter nonsense the proposals that have been coming from my members opposite.

My honourable friend from Charleswood just shook his handkerchief. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, you happen to be, you happen to be by the luck of the draw a Member of this Assembly, and I don't think that you'll be as lucky in the next lottery that takes place. So maybe, maybe I suggest to my honourable friend -- (Interjection) -- I would suggest to my honourable friend that he take a very close look at the results of the draw of June 25th, 1969 because that was a terrific gamble that the people took of his constituency in electing my honourable friend to this Assembly. But it was a lottery and he won, and I wouldn't be a bit surprised, Mr. Speaker, in the lottery that emanates as a result of this legislation that he'll be lucky enough to put his shilling down on the line and maybe come out with a buck. That's the modus operandi of my honourable friends opposite; no responsibility - and where did I hear those words before? From the likes of the Leader of the Opposition when he sat over on this side, to me when I sat on that side, and by jiminy Christmas you know, by jiminy Christmas, Mr. Speaker, I recall that, I recall that very very vividly. And they are proving to me that such a statement in respect of -- at least some in the Opposition was so right then but far more right today because they did have, at least for ten years, an opportunity of being a responsible government and they failed and they failed miserably and that's why they're over there today. And again talking of a lottery, they'd better just consider that they collectively were lucky as far as the draw was concerned that they're there.

But again, Mr. Speaker, we're dealing with Bill 15 and my only purpose in standing is to reject as asinine the remarks of some of my friends opposite in reference to the position that I

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd.) took a year ago. And I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I accept the responsibility, I accept the responsibility of holding a position in Cabinet; I am prepared that once a decision is made of consensus in Cabinet supported by caucus, then I owe to this Assembly, to my electorate and to the people of Manitoba, agreeing to a position of responsibility. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear my friend's remark. No, he shouldn't have made it, he's not even sitting in his chair, which is indicative of the approach of my honourable friends to responsible government, chirping from seats they're not even supposed to be in.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to place it on the record -- (Interjection) -- regressive tax? My friend the Member for Lakeside in order to put it on the record has indicated, or made a statement that I'm in favour of regressive taxation. And these characters have the presumptive gall to talk that way when they're rejecting in total the propositions of Benson that'll get a few extra bucks out of their friends for the purpose of equitable taxation in the Dominion of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is straying a bit. I wish he'd get back to the topic. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I accept your admonition, but the matter of regressive taxation has been a component in the debate on this particular lotteries bill because they reject it as being regressive taxation. I say that it is not taxation, it's a recognition, it's a recognition -- (Interjection) -- Oh will you please keep your cotton-pickin lips closed for a little while. You'll have an opportunity to speak my friend on this, and as a matter of fact the adjournment was in your name but of course as usual you weren't in the House at the time it came up.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to take my stand and my position to those who have supported me and I suggest, Sir, to all and sundry that there's a difference, an entire difference between the proposition of last year of a private member and that of a Cabinet Minister this year. So therefore, recognizing my responsibility as a Member of the Executive Council, I am going to support my colleague the Attorney-General in this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition wish to speak this time?

MR. SPIVAK: No, I would like the matter to stand but I would like to ask a question if the honourable member would submit to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Labour can indicate to the House whether he'll have as an enlightened position as he has now with respect to aid to parochial schools.

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

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I just had one question for the Minister. Is he still opposed to lotteries as a matter of principle and conscience?

MR. PAULLEY: I will answer the latter part of my honourable friend's question first. It may be that in answering it the way that I am that I am bragging. I doubt if there's anyone else or any other member who has a greater conscience than the Minister of Labour. As far as that is concerned my private opinions, as I indicated now have been, and as a result of that we have this bill here and it's no business of my honourable friend what my private inclinations may be when a government is sponsoring a bill of this nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this has been a most interesting interlude. Although the Minister of Labour is hoping I have spoken on this bill but I haven't, and I intend to make a few comments at this time based on the very interesting speech made just now by the Minister of Labour who is attempting to point out to the House that the position that he took last year isn't really the position that he takes at all, and I think that it is very useful at this time to place on the record just once more the comments made by the Minister when he spoke on October 3rd, 1969, and I ask you, Sir, to compare those remarks with the remarks that he has just made today. The only rationalization that the Minister has made is that last year it was a private member that introduced the legislation and so that makes all the difference.

Well, Sir, where are the principles? These, Sir, are the people who talk about intellectual honesty and I ask where intellectual honesty is in the position now taken by the Minister of Labour. This is what he said last year and he said this in stentorian tones with a great deal of feeling, if I remember it correctly, and I quote the Minister. "I don't believe in lotteries, period, as a matter of principle." Sir, there was no equivocation at all last year. "And it doesn't matter" -- and I must give the Minister credit here because the Minister uses language that is acceptable to the House -- he says

(MR. JORGENSEN, cont'd.) "and it doesn't matter a continental to me whether they are under the auspices of an agency" - presumably of a government; "it doesn't matter to me the foundation of the lottery; I am opposed to lotteries and always have been as a matter of principle and conscience." And today he stands up and says the principle doesn't matter any more. The conscience somehow or other has disappeared. Today it is just sheer expediency. The government finds itself short of cash and it looks as though they expect they're going to be able to replenish the coffers somewhat by the introduction of this legislation and that's the sole reason for its introduction at this time.

But I go on. The fact is the Minister didn't leave it at that. "My sole point in rising," says the Minister of Labour, "and I say, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to really take part in the debate at this time" - and Oh, how he wishes he hadn't, I'll bet - "but I want to make it amply clear to all the members of this House and to all Manitobans, irrespective of how this House votes, if eventually the vote is a 55 to one and I am the only one, I am not going to support this measure as a matter of principle, as a matter of conscience, because I don't believe that any operation should be conducted in the manner in which this is proposed." I ask, What is the difference today? The principle is the same, but where is the conscience? The conversions that are taking place opposite are truly amazing. Almost every day we see one of them converted to one belief or another.

But the thing, Sir, that prompted me to rise at this point is to reiterate a point that I have made once before in this session and I'll make it again because apparently it has escaped my honourable friends opposite, and that is that the people of this province expect of a responsible government statements that they can believe in. They expect intellectual honesty. And what are they getting? They're getting statements contradicting one another. On no occasion have we found gentlemen opposite able to agree on anything other than one thing, Sir, and that is their capacity and their ability and their desire to get their hands into the taxpayers' pockets; they'll agree on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to remind the honourable gentleman that there is a principle involved in the bill. We are not debating the merits or demerits of the government members. Will you stick to the principle of the bill?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, I always want to abide by your rulings and I will do my best to abide by your ruling on this particular matter. I do not want to stray from the principle, but in my opinion one of the principles embodied in this bill is the principle of Cabinet solidarity and the right of the people of this province to know where the Cabinet stands on certain issues.

Well, my honourable friends say they do know. I ask him to compare some of the statements that have been made by the extreme left and the extreme right. For example, the statements made by the Member for Crescentwood or the Mines and Resources as opposed to the Minister of Highways and they'll get an idea of what I mean about extremities. I think that in the principle of Cabinet responsibility and solidarity the people of this province have a right to know where this Cabinet stands, where this government stands, and that they don't confuse the people of this province by making statements that are in contradiction to one another, because in my opinion the people have a right to be able to have a government that knows what it is going to do and sticks by their principles and have some intellectual honesty.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think the last day that the debate left off, it left off - I believe it was the Member for Churchill - who finished his discourse with the prayer, I have to call it, because it was a prayer. He said, God bless the government; let them go ahead and proceed with the program that they want to do. Mr. Speaker, this was quite a prayer for something that I thought was rather undeserved and put us somehow in the same category of the Government of British Columbia that has some type of link with the divinity, only this time through the agency of the Member for Churchill who made this statement in the close of his speech.

I had almost intended to take the floor at that time but the debate was adjourned by the Leader of the Opposition, and then we had of course two speeches today so that the circumstances under which I had sort of been prepared to speak with generally good feeling on my part and good feeling on the part of the rest of the members of the House and for which I had prepared, of course has vanished with the hard-hitting speech that has been made by the Member for Morris with respect to intellectual honesty and intellectual dishonesty and Cabinet solidarity and the notion, somehow, that you can gather 14 people together who think the same way, as he

(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) . . . is suggesting that his party, led by the Honourable the Member for River Heights somehow, if they ever got the chance, is going to have 14 people sitting on this side in these benches who think the same way, say the same thing and never differ on anything. He says "never". Well, if he says never then we are coming down to reality.

The fact is that nobody on this side and nobody on that side and nobody in the public expects any government of any Cabinet or any group of legislators or any two people to think exactly alike, and if what he is asking for is a declaration that the 14 people on this side of the House don't think exactly alike, then he's got it. He had it before and he's got it now because certainly he's right. The Minister of Transportation and I, although we can agree on many things, when it comes to matters involving tradition and morals and the way of modern youth and what have you, there is just probably much greater agreement - and I hesitate to even venture in this field - between myself and the Member for River Heights than there is between myself and the Minister of Transportation. And you know it and I know it and everybody knows it, but if you enjoy hearing it said again, it will be said and I don't think that it changes matters.

But what the Member for Morris bases the better part of his remarks on - and I hope that the Member for Morris will not leave the Chamber or leave my hearing because there are some things that he said that are worthy of note - what the Member for Morris seems to suggest is that any member of a Cabinet who has once expressed an opinion which is in opposition to a government measure which is coming forward, is somehow intellectually dishonest for having done that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I expressed an opinion a year ago; I expressed an opinion on acreage payments which I indicated that I felt I had said nothing inconsistent last year than what I am saying this year with respect to my view of acreage payments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Minister would take cognizance of the fact that I asked the Honourable Member for Morris not to stray from the matter of Bill 15. I don't think we're discussing the honesty or veracity of members; we are discussing Bill 15.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the attack that was made by the Member for Morris on other members of this House has been made during the last seven or eight speeches, has been with regard to the honesty of members on this side of the House. I have a perfect right to challenge those statements and I intend to do so, because I have no doubt, no difficulty at all, Mr. Speaker, in saying that there was nothing inconsistent between the manner in which I spoke last year on acreage payments and the manner in which I voted, and I have no difficulty at all in saying this year that the manner in which I spoke on moneys raised by lotteries and the manner in which I am going to vote are entirely inconsistent. My expression last year was that I thought that this was a form of regressive taxation; I still feel that way; I make no change in that statement at all. If honourable members are astonished to hear that, then let them know that I make no attempt to rationalize my position away. I believed, and members can read it back if they wish, that for a government to attempt to raise money in this way is to embark on a form of regressive taxation which is probably worse than taxation by means of premiums.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that in every government there will come times when a person's single view is overcome by a majority of opinions, and at that time it becomes a question as to whether that person's individual view -- because what is the nature of the politics we are in? Each of us have certain objectives. We align ourselves with a group of people who have similar objectives. We hope that in aligning ourselves that we will be able to achieve certain things, and we know when we do that that certain compromises will have to be made between our individual views and our group thinking in order to achieve a greater good. And we also know - and let everybody understand that this is true - that sometimes it is impossible for an individual to reconcile his personal views with the group opinion, and when that happens - and it's happened in other jurisdictions, it could happen under the previous administration and it could happen under this administration - when that happens it is necessary for a person to either say that my views can be reconciled, I'm willing to go along, or I leave the government. And I suppose that what is troubling the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for River Heights and the Honourable Member for Charleswood is that nobody has left the government because they've decided to go into a lottery. That's what's bothering them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if my commitment, if my commitment to politics and to the things that I want to do, and to the things that I believe this government can and will do, were so unimportant that I would resign the administration on the basis of this bill, then they have no understanding of what kind of a commitment I have to the political process. Because I don't like this bill, I agreed that I don't like it, but there are other things that I don't like. I don't

(MR. GREEN cont'd) agree with raising money through the parimutuels. I don't agree that the tobacco tax is as good as the sales tax. I don't agree that the liquor tax is as good as the income tax. There are numerous measures on the legislation and in our existing law which I, as an individual, don't agree are exactly good, but I believe that we are doing better and I am prepared to operate within this government as long as I believe - and I have no doubt that I will continue to believe - that we will continue to do better. If this comes as a remarkable thing to the members of the Opposition, then let them examine themselves. Have the courage to know thyself.

Is it not a fact that at least two and possibly three members of that administration got up during the last session of the House - I'm sure of two and I'm almost sure of the Member for River Heights - and said, Yes - well when this business of raising Medicare premiums came up and going for a Medicare premium instead of a consolidated taxation in one form or another - I was against the Medicare premiums. That's what the Member for Riel said; that's what the Member for Lakeside said; and I'm almost certain that's what the Member for River Heights said -- and he's shaking his head up and down indicating that's what he did say.

Mr. Speaker, you can hardly find one amongst them, you can hardly find one amongst them who agreed with the Medicare premium rather than a consolidated taxation. It is a wonder that a majority of that Cabinet introduced that measure because not only did they do it and I say that they got up in the House and declared that they did it; they voted for that measure; they disagreed with it. The Member for Riel disagreed with it; the Member for Lakeside disagreed with it. He announced in the House that he disagreed with it. The Member for River Heights disagreed with it. He announced in the House that he disagreed with it. He voted for it.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that it is true that a member of the Legislature, a member of the government benches can not maintain forever or in all things a posture before the public. If he says that he agrees with one thing in principle but he has to go along, and there comes a time and may come a time when any member on this side would have to say, Well, at this point I can no longer go along. But do you expect that that will happen on the question of lotteries?

I agree that it is a regressive tax, I don't think we should be raising money in this way, but the fact is that the money that is now raised for educational and cultural purposes to a great extent is being raised this way. I think it's wrong, but to a great extent it is being raised this way and what the government is saying is that rather than have an innumerable number of these things going on at the same time, let us facilitate it by having the public do it. I still don't agree with it, but the fact is that it is now happening, that the government sees it happening and the government is trying to regularize it.

Furthermore, the amount that is raised, or was raised last year, I think amounts to less than \$500,000. I think that it amounts to something like -- well, the Member for Elmwood says more than that, but I think it is around \$500,000 which is one-thirtieth of one percent of the sales tax, for each point of sales tax raises \$15,000 - \$15 million, so if we're talking about \$500,000, I believe we're talking about one-thirtieth of one percent of the sales tax and I believe that we shouldn't raise any regressive taxation. On that basis I would have to throw out the parimutuel tax; I'd have to throw out many other taxes; possibly the amusement tax, but members on that side are asking me to declare my determination not to continue as a member of this government because I happen to feel that one-thirtieth of one percent of the sales tax is being raised in a regressive way which I disagree with.

Now anybody who did that couldn't operate in any government and what you're really trying to do is suggest to us -- oh the Member for Morris is laughing. Well, let the Member for Morris then have the courage "to know thyself." Have the courage "to know thyself" then, the Member for Morris. The Member for Morris voted on a bill last year that was introduced by his colleague the Member for Brandon West that had to do with bottles, had to do with returning bottles. The Member for Morris came over to me, to this side of the House - and let's say I did it openly - and he said to me I hope you people are going to oppose that bill because I can't vote for it. Let the Member for Morris deny that. He then told me that he would not be in the House when that bill was brought to the floor. He not only was in the House but he stood up and voted "aye" in favour of that bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on a point of privilege?

MR. JORGENSON:

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am telling the truth. The Member for Morris came over to me with a letter which he had received. He told me that either a brother or a relative of his was in the bottle business. He was hoping that we would -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is true and I say it

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I am certain that the Honourable Minister of Mines will get to the subject we are discussing. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I am on the subject, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Morris has charged myself and the Minister of Labour with intellectual dishonesty because we happen to be willing to support a government that is going into a scheme which we don't entirely agree with - we are getting up here and saying we don't entirely agree with it. The operations of the government depend on solidarity in this type of scheme. I am not prepared to give up every reason that I have been in politics because this government happens to be raising one-thirtieth of one percent of the sales tax in a regressive manner. He laughs. He says that that's the most ridiculous rationalization that he has ever heard of. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, let him say that it is not true. It is true. He walked over here last year on the Member for Brandon West's bill. He told me he hoped that the government would vote against it. I asked him what he was going to do. He said that he would not vote for it, that at he would be out of the House. The fact is that he was back in his seat when the bill was called, he got up and voted for that bill. I didn't criticize him; I didn't say a word about him; because I know that politics are made by group opinion and I wouldn't have criticized the Member for Morris for it, and I wouldn't have tried to make a fool out of him for it, but when he gets up and grins all over his face and says that because what is happening here is what he knows happens with every government, and the people know it, and you know it, and it'll happen if you ever - and I shouldn't even use that supposition because it is so unrealistic. Whatever government happens to sit here, no Cabinet has ever fourteen people in agreement, and the fact is that that's all you're bringing out; and if that's a big point you've brought it out. And if I do not resign from this government because it happens to go into this particular form of legislation which I had voted against, I have to answer to my constituents for that, and if they think that I should have got out rather than support this measure, then I will have to pay for it as other Cabinet Ministers have had to pay for it in the past.

But I rather think, Mr. Speaker, that the people are more realistic, and I appreciate that one cannot do this type of thing indefinitely; that if one has to continually get up and support measures made by group decision which they can't wholeheartedly be for, then it's true we will lose a little bit of our credibility. That's true. I admit that, I'm prepared to do that in the interests of proceeding with this government to do the kind of better things that they are prepared to do from the point of view of passing legislation. I hope that my constituents will recognize that. If they don't, c'est la vie. Every single one of us has got to go back and answer. I'll try and answer for what I did, you try and answer for what you did, and let's see where the support will come from. I know that there are also members of this side who don't regard this in the same way as I do. I know that the Minister of Finance -- but I don't have to make a speech necessarily putting his view, but I think that there are members of this side who do regard the raising of money through a lottery to be a form of regressive taxation and yet don't regard this as a tax measure. Because I don't agree with them doesn't necessarily mean that they're not right; it could be that they're right and I'm wrong; but the fact is that they say that this money is not going to go into Consolidated Revenue, that the money is going to be set aside for educational-recreational purposes. And when we get to Law Amendments, if that is not now clear in the bill, that will be made definitely clear that then the kind of suggestion that was made by one of the other members as to some board distributing this money from one source to the other, that that can certainly be handled.

All of these are things which make other members feel that this is not a tax measure, that this does not materially change the progressive form of taxation that this government has brought in, and I say that I respect their opinions even though I disagree with them. I happen to feel that if you take money and relieve Consolidated Revenue of payments to others, that that becomes in itself regressive. And I can't get out of it. I am forced to admit that I stand here voting for this measure solely because, on the total balance, I think it is not something which would make me get up and walk out about. And if people need precedent, you've got your precedent. The Member for Riel, he was opposed to Medicare premiums, he voted for it, he paid for it. The Member for Lakeside, he got up and told us he was against Medicare premiums; he voted for it, he paid for it. The Member for River Heights, he did the same thing, and Mr. Speaker, maybe I'm doing the same thing now. I don't know what the political process will say about this particular action, but in my judgment what I am yielding here is far less than what I am gaining by

(MR. GREEN cont'd) remaining a member of this government and doing the things that we set out to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I had asked for this matter to stand. I would now enter into the debate, if I can.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the reason for asking for the matter to stand was to allow our caucus to deal with this once more before determining a final position on this and to present it to the House in the interest of seeing this matter through. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, quite a bit of solidarity but on the other hand there has been some rethinking as a result of some of our members discussing it with their constituents. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that we will probably have someone from our side adjourn the debate after my remarks are concluded, to give us this opportunity and be able to present it tomorrow evening. But I have to rise in this debate, to a large extent motivated by the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources reminds me very much of a jumping bean that, when you put it down, it bounces here and you try to grab it, and it bounces over there and you try to grab it, and it bounces over there. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has been known in this Legislature and throughout the province as being probably the best debater on the part of the government in any given issue, as the natural House Leader in Manitoba for the party, and as being one of the most logical thinkers. And we've had a presentation today of probably the most irrational and illogical explanation of a position on an issue. He's made reference to Medicare and he's made reference to the fact that there have been statements made by members in this House on the Opposition side as to what happened with respect to the Medicare issue. I may say, Mr. Speaker, for myself - and I think I'm correct, I know I'm correct in my position and I think I'm correct in what I said to the House - I indicated that in terms of a decision that was arrived at in secret without a public discussion, which is the normal process in which Cabinet and caucus operate, at that time I expressed my views, and my views were contrary to the majority and I accepted the majority view and I presented my own position, which isn't basically even the position, Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I've allowed a tremendous amount of latitude. I've requested the last three speakers on the same proposition not to stray from the principle. I'm just going to have to say that I'm going to enforce this. I thank the honourable members for their cooperation but I must enforce the rules of this House, which is your Assembly.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the principle involved is very simple. The principle involved is whether we accept the bill and what it contains, and what we are discussing is whether statements that are made by those who have some authority for government have any meaning in a context of a consensus that has to be arrived at by caucus, and I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the accepted position and the position in which we have operated, has been that statements are in fact made; that decisions are reached by a consensus in caucus and that decision is not necessarily communicated other than as a decision of Cabinet and caucus. It's not presented in a fragmented way, and that's understood and that's the way in which our whole parliamentary system operates.

We have a different situation. We had a Private Members' bill last time and we had the specific declarations by many people of where they stood, and their language was strong, Mr. Speaker. Their language was extremely strong, because it dealt with things that we have to be concerned about in this House, with principles on which we operate, and Mr. Speaker, this is where we have some difficulty in understanding the logic and the rationale of the presentations that have been made. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we were to believe anything we were to believe that those people who believe so strongly on principle would be in a position to impress their colleague in connection with something that's one-thirtieth of one percent of the sales tax. It couldn't be that important. We had four members of the present Cabinet vote against this resolution when it came for third reading, and that's interesting, Mr. Speaker, because you would think that in a consensus that had to be arrived at, particularly the Ministers involved, that they would have enough influence to be able to convince their colleague -- (Interjection) -- Well Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll answer to the Honourable Member from Elmwood, the Honourable Minister without Portfolio, when I vote on the bill this time. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the Honourable Minister of Labour and he wasn't prepared to answer whether his enlightened view, and even the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' enlightened view, will be expressed in the aid for

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) parochial schools, because if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, I will up the ante of three to two, but I suggested that the Premier would win on but the schools now say it'll be ten to one now, because if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can stand up and now express this position, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we will have aid to parochial schools and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not going to win. Because it's obvious that if a majority in his caucus and in his Cabinet feel accordingly, he is going to then weigh out the position and he's going to weigh out whether what he's doing is better - that is what they're doing better for Manitoba - and if that's the case he's going to stay with them. And Mr. Speaker, if he can't come to any other conclusion because he's already made his mind up - and then I say, Mr. Speaker, "know thyself" to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - that he's convinced, and he's said this publicly, that they are the only ones that can do anything better in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, then we can see that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will have other occasions in this House in which he is going to have to bend his principles a little more because there's been majority Cabinet support or majority caucus support. And if this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then I have to say to you, to the people of Manitoba, we now very seriously have to look at the credibility of the government when they make their statement of what their intentions are, or when they indicate their positions and postures on the fundamental issues, on taxation, on civil liberties, on what have you, because we can't be sure, because we do not know that any given time when a bill comes in that they won't suggest that they can change it because the majority in the caucus and the Cabinet decided otherwise. Because obviously the criteria now is the majority consensus that's arrived at. This becomes critical. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know the Minister of Finance suggested in his statement on October 10th, 1969 - on Page 15 of Hansard and I'd like to read it - his basic position. I think this has been expressed before by the Honourable Member from Brandon West but I would like to put it in the record once more. "I want to make it clear that I reject any thought that moneys raised by lottery or other forms of that type should be used for the proper and normal provision of services for the people of Manitoba. I think that they should be raised by taxation in the proper way." And yet we do not have the Budget, Mr. Speaker, but obviously contained in the Budget is one-thirtieth of one percent of the sales tax which has been allocated and earmarked for a specific purpose, which is in fact normal provision of services for the people of Manitoba. So the Minister of Finance has in fact placed it in the Budget; the Minister of Labour will be voting for it; the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will be voting for it and -- (Interjection) -- I will tell the Minister of Labour later on whether I'll be voting for it. They're going to be voting for it in contradiction to the statements of principle that they enunciated before.

Mr. Speaker, this goes to the heart of what I said the other day when I talked about the touchstones that characterize the present government and will characterize it in the decade of the Seventies: the question of it being an open government, the question of it being intellectually honest or dishonest. -- (Interjection) -- You've heard that speech but it's obvious that is has to be said again, because Mr. Speaker, I suggested that the government would in fact

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I've asked the honourable member to get on the topic on the principle of Bill 15 and I certainly don't wish to debate the point with him. Would he continue, please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated before that the government has been judged and will be judged on the basis of whether it would have been better for the government to be still in opposition or government. Because, Mr. Speaker, if they had been opposition, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources would have been able to stand up and make a speech that he made last year; the Honourable Minister of Labour would have been able to stand up and make his speech, and in opposition that would have been wonderful. In opposition we would have had the righteousness expressed by people who are principled. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. Oh yes, you're principled but not that principled. You're principled a little bit. You know, it's like government, open government. A little bit more . . . less, but not open government. -- (Interjection) -- Who's being a phoney? Mr. Speaker, the phoney is the person on the other side who now tries to reverse his position and tries to give an explanation for it. "Know thyself," Mr. Speaker, "know thyself" would have been for both of them to have sat quietly and let it pass, you know, as a bad dream rather than try to -- (Interjection) -- honest? You haven't given us an honest answer. -- (Interjection) -- No you haven't. You think you've given us an honest answer but I'm saying: know thyself. You haven't given us an honest answer. You've simply said that in order to reach a consensus, if it's necessary the majority will -- when

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) majority will is expressed and it's against our position, then anything we said in the past we forget about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has said in this House, in his first address on the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and said, "You know, we've been elected because we carry out what we've undertaken, because we do what we've said, because we live up to those things that we stand for." -- (Interjection) -- Oh, we have a distinction between a party and what the individual members suggest. Mr. Speaker, you know -- let me put it this way. Today, probably in a more real manner than in the past, the government has been exposed and it's vulnerable. And the two members are vulnerable, but so is the total government, and they're vulnerable because the statements, as pious as they were, as righteous as they were, as principled as they were, really -- really do not count in the final analysis. What finally counts, Mr. Speaker, is in fact the need and requirement of trying to balance a budget that is already extended to its limit, that is already programmed in a way the consequences of which we do not yet know for the years to come, and the desperate efforts to try and balance the position at this time, to balance the position at this time to be able to offer, at least in an artificial manner for the consumption of the people of this province, the belief that somehow or other, through good management, the government has been able to handle the affairs in such a way that taxes are going to be controlled and that government programs that are promised can be committed and can now be undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, in reality this was a sham and that sham will become apparent as we deal further in the estimates. It'll become apparent as we examine, in the days and years to come, the programs that have been announced by the government and the programs that have not been carried on as announced, and as we deal with the reality of our tax situation in this province. And Mr. Speaker, when I say "know thyself," the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources should have devoted a lot of his time and energy to recognizing that reality and trying to deal with that reality than to try and justify the jumping bean position that he's taken of trying to go here, there and everywhere to get himself out of a bad situation.

Mr. Speaker, my point is very simple. The members opposite are basically no different than any other government; they have had to operate in the same form as every other government; they've had to bend their principles as has every other government in different situations. They are neither more pious nor righteous; they are as intellectually dishonest or as honest as anyone else -- (Interjection) -- Progressive -- they have introduced a form of taxation which the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says is retrogressive but not that retrogressive, and still it's overbalanced by the other features which he thinks are progressive, because he knows, because he believes we are doing better. It's his belief that we're doing better and it's his subjective position, a given right to be able to compromise his principles as he sees fit in this given situation. And that's all he's really said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that speaks and augurs, that at least reflects, I think, a fundamental change, a fundamental change in the political posture of the New Democratic Party and of its credibility, because if they now can say that, then they have come a long way -- they have come a long way, and they've been concerned about our position in ten years in power -- and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in a year and a half they have to all the complaints that they had that we had in ten years in power when they could look back at the speeches made ten years prior and said, "we said this and now we change that." They've gone a long way, and Mr. Speaker, for that reason I, and I'm sure many of the colleagues opposite, in fact all of them, are not prepared, nor will we stand here to hear from the other members on the opposite side, the righteousness, the pious statements of principles. We'll examine your programs as we have in the past but we are going to take most of what you say with a grain of salt and we are going to take this position to the people of the province and let them understand how pious and how credible you were at one stage and how you could bend your principles so easily at another.

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

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Paulley, Page 6 of the Order Paper, held in the name of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BEARD: The honourable member isn't here, Mr. Speaker. Could we have the matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 6, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Recreation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather simple piece of legislation. First of all, I might say that the changes will make the Act conform more closely with the ideas and operation of the Executive Government Organization Act in its revision. The Act no longer establishes the department as such but merely sets out the duties of the Minister who is in charge of the administration of the Act. The other portion, or the other part that we have been concerned with, and this has been brought to the attention of our department and perhaps rightly so, is the part on outfitters. I think that this has been something that has been before this department in the past. As you know, the Manitoba Tourist Association have been bringing in, passing resolutions and bringing it to our attention that the outfitters ought to be licensed. There have been many complaints that some of these people who are calling themselves outfitters have not been licensed; the equipment that they have been leasing has not been of the best quality, and in some cases when some of this equipment to these people, to the tourists, have been rented out, they found that this equipment has been of inferior quality and they had nobody to come back to and do anything about it. Therefore, if they're licensed they would have to set a higher standard on their equipment that they're licensing, and in all due respect to the outfitters, they would give the tourists a lot better service. So this, in short, is simply what is involved in this particular Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I wonder if the Minister would permit a question? Is the Minister suggesting that the man that may have two or three boats and a canoe or two must take out a license to be able to rent those boats - rowboat or whatever?

MR. BURTONIAK: Yes, if he considers himself to be an outfitter. This doesn't apply only to canoes and boats; it also applies to motors and other equipment, and if he is in that line of business, therefore we feel that he should be licensed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if he would submit to one other question? Has the Minister any idea of the revenue that would be brought by this licence that would be sold to those people?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, that question - I'm afraid I couldn't answer this at this point in time. I don't imagine it would be an excessive amount of revenue. I don't think that the licence fees would be that high. I'm sorry, I can't answer this question at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): I would just like to ask the Minister another question, Mr. Speaker. Are there any licences for outfitters at the present time being sold, or is there any requirement at the present time as to size of organization or anything of this nature? Or are there -- well briefly, Mr. Speaker, are there licences being sold outfitters at the present time?

MR. BURTONIAK: I believe your question, if I understand it correctly, you're asking if there are licences being sold now for outfitters. No, they're not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'd like to ask the Minister another question. Will these outfitters be allowed to take people out to a wilderness area and then leave them and call back in a week for them?

MR. BURTONIAK: There will be certain provisions provided that if, as you suggest, that

(MR. BURTNIAC cont'd.) if they are taken out into the wilderness area, that these people should have the facilities whereby they can come back periodically and check out to see if everything is in order, and they should be prepared that in case somebody is lost, or for any other reason, that they would be responsible to find them and so on. I think that's what you were asking, am I correct?

MR. BEARD: I just wondered whether it would be mandatory for these outfitters to provide a guide to assure people that they would get back to a given point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: One more question, Mr. Speaker. I believe that some of these people will act as hunting guides, or fishing guides and so on, in different areas. How will you qualify these people? Will they have to live in the area and know the area or there must be some sort of requirement before he can even go and get a licence. I'm sure that there must be some requirement.

MR. BURTNIAC: Yes, I believe that it's only fair that whoever goes into this type of business as an outfitter must be familiar with the area that he is working in, and he also must be responsible to get the proper guides so that the people that are going out would have the proper protection - this is the whole idea behind this bill - as well as other equipment that they are going to be renting out.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary question. Will there be any protection for any outfitter? For instance, in some jurisdictions you may have at a certain lake just one outfitter. Would you allow another outfitter to come in and also be licensed for that particular area or would you allow some protection for some of these people? For instance, if they invest a considerable amount of money in an area.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I've allowed a lot of latitude in the question period. For clarification, I realize this is a little different motion than most of the others. I would suggest, though, that the honourable members could get a lot of this after they agreed to the principle in the Committee of the Whole when they're discussing it in detail. The Honourable Minister, if he wishes to answer that last point.

MR. BURTNIAC: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member could repeat the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The member will be brief.

MR. PATRICK: The question to the Honourable Minister is: will there be any protection for any certain outfitters in -- will they be given a certain area or jurisdiction that they will be licensed for, or are they licensed for the whole province?

MR. BURTNIAC: I think I can answer that, Mr. Speaker. It all depends on the area they're in and the kind of patronage they get in the area. It may be required to have more than one outfitter licensed in a particular area. It will all depend on the area that they service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 12, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 12, an Act to amend an Act to amend The Transcona Charter, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is in need of a guidance as to where it wants to proceed. We've been hopping back and forth and I would like to have some guidance from the House as to what the -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks) presented Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Public School Finance Board Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill simply clarifies the power of the Public School Board to accept funds which it may receive for educational purposes by or from a corporation, or an individual, or other governments, in order to administer those funds in accordance with the terms of the contribution which it is given. It was felt that the original section when it was

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) first, as it is now in the Act, it was intended to include the authority to receive and administer funds but I'm told that the Legislative Counsel feels that this authority should be stated in a more specific manner, and that's why this amendment is being introduced. I would want to say to honourable members opposite, and the one in particular who questioned me on this, that this does not in any way give the School Finance Board power to take from any school division any asset that it may have, or order them to be turned over to the Finance Board - I believe the Honourable Member for Emerson was questioning me on this. Rather, it's simply to make it possible for the Finance Board to accept monies which are turned over to the Finance Board for the purposes of operating or constructing schools, for example.

An example I might give is, in this case, monies which the International Nickel have turned over and that money is to be used to pay for the construction of a school in Thompson as well as to pay towards monies that have been expended on the part of the Province of Manitoba towards construction of schools beyond that amount which the original agreement called for, because when we took office we discovered that Thompson was growing considerably, new school construction had been undertaken, and in fact the company had pretty well met its commitments under the agreements which it had signed both in '56 and the subsequent letter of memorandum - I forget the exact year. We started negotiating, and as a result of those negotiations were successful in securing additional monies from the company, and it is simply to make it possible for the Finance Board to now use those monies to pick up the debentures that this bill is put before you.

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

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the explanations given by the Minister of Youth and Education, both privately and here in the Chamber, and because we have had sufficient time to review this bill, we feel that there is no reason why we would delay it any longer and you can count on our support.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Burrows) presented Bill No. 16, An Act to Amend the Government Purchases Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.
-- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is a little late. I'm sorry; I've already called the motion. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Let me assure honourable gentlemen that I'm trying to conduct the business of this House as expeditiously as possible and this is not a precedent to open up a debate after a vote has taken place. The vote has not taken place and so in the record we shall take it again.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this is a housekeeping bill which will effect two minor changes in the Government Purchases Act. At the present time, in the existing legislation, "Minister" means the Minister of Public Works or such other member of the Executive Council as may be designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Now, this bill proposes to bring the definition in line with other legislation by omitting all reference to a specific department and defining "Minister" as the member of the Executive Council charged by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with the administration of the Act.

This bill will also amend the Act to clarify the authority of a Minister to designate approval, authority for requisitions to officials within his department. At the present time it's only the Minister and the Deputy who are the only members of a department with authority to approve requisitions to a purchasing bureau. However, recently departments have been instructed to make appropriate alternate arrangements for a signing authority, something they were unable to do because of the present provision of the Act. So the amendment will allow the approval of requisitions by the member of the Executive Council in charge of the requisitioning department or his deputy, or any other officer or official of that department designated for this purpose by the Minister of the department affected. It will allow greater streamlining of administrative procedures within departments while still retaining control by the Ministers over how many officials of their department are allowed signing authority.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.)

So that, in brief, Mr. Speaker, is the intent of the Bill.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the increased changes that have been brought about by the initiation of a housing program in the last year or two have required a number of amendments and one of them is this. The old Act, Section 9 of The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act, permits borrowing on a temporary basis by the Housing Authority to an aggregate of \$5 million of principal outstanding at any time. The enlargement of the Corporation's program that was detailed the other evening to the extent that we are now embarking on the program which involves us in excess of \$50 million, means that the amount of temporary financing that is required from time to time is much greater than it has been in the past, so that we can no longer speak in terms of temporary borrowing not exceeding \$5 million, but rather in at least the doubling of the temporary borrowing that is required by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

In the development of any project, I should explain that when the project is mapped out, prepared to go, there is a time gap between the actual acquiring of the land in question until such time as there is an issuance of the debentures to either the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or to the Minister of Finance, depending on whether it's the federal or provincial authority that is putting up its respective sum. In some instances this has lapsed over a period of months and thus the need for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to enjoy certain temporary borrowing capacity.

This borrowing capacity for additional funds on a temporary basis therefore permits us to cover the purchases of land pending the formalization of the financial arrangements between either the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or the Minister of Finance, and thus the need for the change now, the proposed amendment before the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek,

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this bill. In fact, it's probably the logical thing to do after the legislation the other day.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK presented Bill No. 25, an Act to repeal certain Acts relating to certain corporations, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this bill too is a housekeeping bill designed to repeal 22 private Acts related to private corporations incorporated by this Legislature. The corporations are either dissolved pursuant to provisions of The Companies Act, or have not complied with provisions of registration under that statute and are assumed to be out of existence. Removal of these Acts from the statutes of the province and the files of the Companies Branch will simply bring our records more up-to-date.

Now I feel that the provisions of this bill will certainly not cause honourable members any difficulty and I would urge its passing as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I see the Honourable Member for Rhineland is now here; I

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) wonder if he would be willing if we called this motion on rules again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite ready yet with my remarks. I have some of them but I haven't got them completed.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have only the Supply Bill to call and -- well, we can call Bill No. 8 and Bill No. 21. Bill No. 8 first.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

PUBLIC BILLS

MR. MCGILL presented Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Brandon Charter, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Optometry Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief. I asked -- (Interjection) -- All I do is stand up and they start.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader has a point of order?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Radisson wished to adjourn the debate on Bill No. 8. He was leaning over talking to me when you called the question. With leave of the House, I wonder if that debate could stand adjourned in his name?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? By leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: We seem to have moved very expeditiously today. I had hoped that this bill would not be presented until after we had had the report of the Committee on Professional Associations. The intent of this bill is that section which we deleted last year, an item that has been presented to the Legislature year after year, I think for the past four or five years. It is relative to the use of the term "Doctor of Optometry" in conjunction with the person's name.

Now there was much debate offered last time on this particular issue and I think that if any members want to peruse the record they can see my position and every other position of the people in the House. So, Mr. Speaker, that's all I intend to say at this time.

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

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I guess we are at the point where we would be calling the Committee of Supply. The difficulty is that the Attorney-General is not well but will be back tonight. We could proceed with the Supply motion on the basis that we would call the Minister of Agriculture to present his estimates, if that's agreeable. (Agreed)

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter under consideration is Resolution No. 8. The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I want to say that it's indeed a good opportunity so early in this session to review the performance, if you like, of

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) the Department of Agriculture for the last year, and to make one or two observations as to what lies ahead.

I want to begin by stating that I would hope members opposite have had an opportunity to take a look at the estimates to recognize the importance of the amount of money allotted to the Department of Agriculture, which to me would indicate that the importance of the department is very much pronounced in the budget for this coming year. And so it should be, Mr. Speaker, because we have indeed many problems within the industry that need resolution and support on the part of many levels of government and certainly from the Government of Manitoba. We are not in a position to relax our efforts because of the economic conditions that exist in rural Manitoba.

I want to take a few moments to indicate to the House that over the last year we have had a number of very important meetings between the provincial and federal governments with respect to policy considerations and no doubt many of you have been reading the various press releases that were issued and the various discussions that were aired through the media as they related to the dialogue that was going on between the governments of the provinces and the Government of Canada and indeed as between all governments and the farm organizations of Canada.

I might make some quick reference to the fact that we have had more involvement in dialogue or discussion in the last year than we have had in many many years, as I understand it. We have had a number of discussion groups throughout Manitoba that were involved in looking at the question of the grains proposals, that were looking at the question of Bill C-176 and we have also had the very active committee, the Committee of the Legislature, which held some 18 meetings throughout rural Manitoba between the months of November and March. I'm sure members that were on that particular committee would appreciate the importance of that kind of dialogue and communication with our rural people and would recognize that legislation that will be forthcoming as a result of that dialogue will be to the advantage of the people of Manitoba and in particular the rural people in Manitoba.

This is something that is somewhat new in the system of government, something which I would hope that we would want to continue with to assure that we have our ear to the ground and to assure us that we are indeed responding as we should to the needs of our people in Manitoba and whether they be rural or urban and in this case of course we are talking about our rural client.

In our conferences at the federal level we have spent many hours trying to persuade the Government of Canada and other governments to certain positions with respect to income security on the farm. The need to try and bring about some sort of income stability based on some system of price mechanism that would have regard for cost of production, labour inputs, the need for vigilance in the area of controlling cost of production. We have spent many hours and days debating those points.

One of the glaring things that appeared at the Outlook Conference last November was the fact that we experienced a very bad year as compared to the last three decades; in fact, the lowest net income year since 1936, as I recall the figure, although that doesn't reflect the true cash position because of the major reduction in inventory that took place but in any event it didn't look like a very healthy position as far as our farm income was concerned, and it did indicate that there were very serious and radical moves that ought to be adopted by government to try and cope with the situation, unless, of course, it was the opinion of government at the federal level at least, that the situation ought not to be changed and that a policy of massive depopulation of our rural areas would be the order of the day.

I might point out to the members opposite, Mr. Chairman, that I'm very fearful of that particular approach because it seems to me that it is indeed the approach of the Government of Canada that they are not that willing to provide any massive support to our rural people by way of price mechanism or marketing systems which would improve the prices on commodities because they are dedicated to the concept of urbanizing Canada to such an extent that it would result in massive rural depopulation. I don't know whether it's an intent on the part of the Government of Canada to promote that or whether they have sort of resigned themselves to the fact that that's the way things seem to be shaping up so we have to sort of go along with the tide and not try to challenge it.

Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that many of us, and certainly the Government of Manitoba is very concerned with that kind of prospect because we feel that in Manitoba we

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) have somewhat of an awkward situation in terms of our population balance, that is, urban versus rural, and from our point of view it does not look desirable or reasonable even to promote the further urbanization in Manitoba; that we would rather promote more development outside of the major urban centres and that urban centres ought to be developed outside of the Metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg; that there is a need to spread out our population across this province of ours in order that we may provide the kind of environment, human environment in such a way that we would not be forced into a position of spending huge sums of money in years ahead to try and control the uncontrollable and that is the situation that would exist when you have urban sprawl to the extent that we see it in other jurisdictions and in other countries, in other provinces.

There is a price to be paid for massive urbanization and therefore in that light it ought to be considered that perhaps it's worthy of the price to keep some people out in the countryside.

I might point out that that is one of the reasons which prompted the Government of Manitoba into taking a good hard look at our rural policy, what is needed in the countryside to encourage people to stay in the rural areas and that is one of the reasons why we came up with the much needed sewer and water program which had been indicated in recent months. It's a question of trying to update the quality of life in rural areas in order to stimulate further the environment, the healthy environment of our country folk, something which has been long overlooked.

I may point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have a number of concerns in the area of income stabilization and in the area of marketing and I simply want to make short reference to it because Manitoba was extremely active in these two fields in its dialogue with our federal counterpart. The Government of Canada produced what is known as the Gross Receipts Income Stabilization Plan known as the Grains Stabilization Plan which, from my point of view, is something that is not going to meet the needs of our grain producers. The plan that has been proposed has many shortcomings, mainly that it is not designed to guarantee returns on investment and labour; merely it's designed to guarantee a certain level of cash flow to a region, notwithstanding what may happen in any part of that particular region or to the individual - and that is one of the major shortfalls that we see in the program.

We rather would appreciate a program that would talk in terms of some minimum guarantee in net incomes which would be reflected through a price support policy in the price of the six grains and we have made our proposal to the Government of Canada, the proposal known as the Net Income Stabilization Plan and that, of course, has received a great deal of discussion and to this date I don't know whether we are far away from achieving that position or whether or not it is a hopeless task. I would hazard a guess that if there was sufficient support in the prairies for that kind of policy that I think we might be successful in encouraging the federal people to review their policy position and to bring about sufficient change in their stabilization program that would take our various points into account, various proposals.

One only needs to provide, in this country, a measure of minimum guarantees, nothing grandiose as they have in the United States. Minimum guarantees would go a long way in stabilizing the incomes of our rural people and it is not required to spend vast amounts of money far beyond the capacity of this nation to bring about that kind of result and of course many other changes that are required in concert to bring about the kind of stability that we're talking about.

The other area of concern to which we have expressed or made propositions by way of two submissions to the Standing Committee of Agriculture, the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture, and that is Bill C-176 which really, depending on how it's implemented, will determine the future development of our agricultural industry in Canada. I see in that bill a possibility of a much better and orderly system of marketing of farm products with increased benefit to the producers; on the other hand I see in it dangers to certain regions of Canada if indeed that piece of legislation is not acted upon as a measure or a tool of marketing and rather if it is acted upon as a political tool to satisfy certain regions or pressure groups in Canada.

So this is a problem for us and this is something that we have pointed out to the House of Commons committee that we would want some changes in the legislation to make sure that no one or two provinces are in a dominant position on any marketing agency that is set up and this, I would hope, would be recognized by the powers that be at Ottawa, that in fairness to

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) Canadianism, if you like, the concept of one Canada, that they have indeed a major responsibility in the implementation of that legislation to make sure that all regions of Canada in production of primary products have assurance that their position will be sustained, at least from the point of view of economics and that we are not going to move into the direction of denying the natural economic advantages the different parts of Canada have in the production and marketing of primary products by way of that kind of legislation.

And this is something that I would hope members opposite take a very hard and serious look at and attempt to influence the powers that be and whoever it is important to influence, to assure us that Manitoba and western Canada will have its place in the future in the production and the processing of primary products.

It is very evident to me, Mr. Chairman, that where the production of primary products occurs or will increase in the future there will also be an increase in the processing of those products, an increase in the services to the producers of those products and thereby the whole economy of that particular area is going to be stimulated accordingly and therefore it is not only a problem for our farm people: it is a question of marketing, a question of national marketing legislation and how it's implemented; it's a problem for all economic sectors within Manitoba and indeed Canada, but from our point of view it's a problem that ought to be fully considered by the Chamber of Commerce, because they have a real stake in this question, by the Department of Industry and Commerce, by all organizations that really are involved in the economic life in this province. This has to be something that should be considered as one of the most important things that we might involve ourselves in in the days ahead because whatever happens in this area will surely determine the rate of economic growth in Manitoba to a great extent and will determine whether or not we will increase our productivity in this province or whether we will shrink back and resort to a system of exporting our talent to areas of opportunity outside of Manitoba. This is something that should be of concern to all sides of the House, and indeed I would hope that I would have the support of members opposite in any suggestions that are made to assure Manitoba that this has not happened.

I know that it is difficult by way of federal legislation to satisfy every region in the sense of getting everything down in legislation, but I do want to remind our people in the House of Commons in particular, and the MPs that represent us here in Manitoba that they do have a major responsibility in this area, to assure ourselves that we are indeed developing a new and very important marketing instrument that will look, not from the point of view of restricting production to the Canadian market, but from the point of view of removing the interprovincial wars and looking farther afield for markets which would allow us to increase our productivity all across this land.

Mr. Chairman, that is a very large, a very big subject and I could go on and on. I am sure that members opposite got the point I was trying to make and will hopefully give us support in the proposition that we have made to the Government of Canada on that legislation. I might point out that support in a positive manner, constructive support, rather than a negative position to the whole concept of marketing legislation, because one can not make progress by being negative to an idea; and just as much as marketing boards or agencies perform a function in the provincial context they can certainly perform a very important function at the national level, providing it is properly organized and representative of all regions of Canada, providing no one area of Canada dominates such an agency. In light of those positions we have submitted our brief to the House of Commons Standing Committee on two occasions. I might point out also that we were able to get the - I would think I would be right in saying -- the unanimous support of all the commodity groups in Manitoba, unanimous support to our submissions in December and again in February of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out to the members opposite, to the House, that the policy of the Department of Agriculture has been and will continue to be one of constant review. I have not satisfied myself that we have looked in depth at all our programs, that we have a full and deep analysis of all our dollars spent in each program as to their value, as to their return to the economy of Manitoba and to the particular sectors; and we are continuing a review. We have made some changes as you may appreciate and have had knowledge of over the past year or so and we will be continuing to make other changes. One of the changes of course had to do with the splitting of jurisdiction in the Department of Agriculture as between production and marketing sector and the adjustment sector which shortly will be revealed to you by way of the appointment of another deputy minister to look after the production and marketing side of the

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) department.

One of the other areas that we have been looking at for some time and we have to some degree moved in that direction already is, in our opinion, the means to decentralize the Department of Agriculture, the need to move some of our personnel perhaps out of the Norquay Building to regional centres in rural Manitoba to bring about a quicker and more sophisticated delivery of services to the various regions in Manitoba. An in-House study and evaluation or report will be made shortly on this particular subject matter and it is my hope that within this year we will be able to regionalize the services of the Department of Agriculture and perhaps other departments which I'm not, at this point, able to comment on. This is something that has been very important in my mind and we are moving as quickly as we can in that direction. Wherever it is practical, Mr. Chairman -- one does not want to get to a degree where things are not practical -- but I think we have a number of very important services that can be co-ordinated in a much better way through a regional approach which would also bring government a little closer to the people of Manitoba, in particular those people outside of the City of Winnipeg.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that I am pleased to report that our Vet Services Program is well on its way far beyond our original anticipation for this time in history. It seems that the people in all municipalities have accepted the program as something that was long overdue. It is my hope that that particular part or cog in the wheel is going to do a lot for the diversification of this province that we have wanted for so long -- the fact that we have a very aggressive program in the area of stimulating the livestock industry, with the veterinarian services, the grants to veterinary students, the grants to the people that want to expand their breeding herds, the sewer and water policy, that is just a beginning -- that these areas will all provide for a rural people a real opportunity for greater stability of income.

Now it's not something that I expect some very immediate results on but then that kind of a program has to be a long-range approach and it is my hope that within a number of years we will reduce to a very significant degree the dependency on the grain economy and the "boom and bust" cycle that goes with it. Now I'm not that optimistic to believe that that's going to happen in a couple of years but I think with a bit of persistence and encouragement we can bring about a better relationship as between the amount of grain produced in Manitoba and the amount consumed in Manitoba, something like what they have in the Province of Alberta where I notice that the livestock industry in Alberta, as projected for this year, to bring in an income of some \$466 million -- far above the returns in their grain industry.

One of the happy notes in the activities of my department, Mr. Chairman, is in the area of manpower utilization. We have been able to use our Manpower Training Program in the building of our veterinary clinics and of course a number of other programs but in this particular area we have been able to launch a couple of teams that are responsible for the setting up of these clinics and the construction that goes along with it and it's become a very relevant thing to the trainees, knowing that they are performing a useful function and at the same time getting necessary training which will enhance their position in the years ahead.

One of the areas of controversy -- well, I shouldn't say controversy, controversy only in the minds of members opposite I suppose -- has been the policy of government in the area of weed control. I want to say to members opposite that we have and are recommending to the Weed Control districts of Manitoba that they may use 2-4D for this year but not 2-4-5T -- we are not so sure about that particular chemical but that both are being also referred to the Clean Environment Commission for a thorough analysis so that we have a report for us by the time we have to make a decision next year again. I'm sure that the people that are interested in the environment are going to be interested in that particular policy decision and I think it would be presumptuous on our part to indicate that we have, beyond doubt, really looked at the problem of pollution insofar as it's connected with the use of chemicals in the area of weed control, brush control and so forth. There is a lot of work to be done in that area and I'm sure that many areas of the world are looking at that question just as seriously as we are, if not more so.

I want to say to the members of the House that the marketing branch, which was set up this year, is in operation. It hasn't been in operation for very long but we have finally got a number of people on the road trying to develop marketing technique and marketing research, trying to bring about knowledge to the various commodity groups in Manitoba so far as the market potential is concerned and opportunities and where those opportunities may be. I

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) hesitate to report at this time any significant announcement related to that branch but it's my hope that with the passing of time they will make an important contribution to the producers of primary products in Manitoba.

The MACC Program is going on in a very aggressive fashion. It is very evident to me that they are not in a position to allocate as much money to the development of our industry in rural Manitoba as they would be in more normal economic circumstances. I am advised that the rejection of applications runs very high because at this point in our time it's extremely difficult to establish a cash flow position for many of our farm people, and our MACC Program, of course, is tied to a cash flow system unlike the previous program which really based its decision on equity or the value of property which was taken in as collateral or chattel. We don't believe in that approach. The policy is to try to establish in advance whether there is a cash flow sufficient to warrant the loan and of course one has to make some guesstimates especially when returns in agriculture in the last couple of years have become so marginal. So because of the cautious and selective approach that is being used, I would have to report that many applications are denied simply because it's thought there there is no point in financing people into greater debt when we cannot see the possibility of them paying off their loans unless the economics change in the industry. Interest rates have been reduced very substantially in recent months due to the changes in the money market and that should help or go some length in helping our rural people.

One of the things that I would hope that would bring about some sort of stability to our grains economy this year -- not this year -- next year would be the finalization of the federal proposals one way or another in terms of the question of marketing, in terms of the question of how they will finalize their stabilization program. I think it's fair to say that at this particular year there is a great deal of uncertainty on the part of our producers, not quite knowing what is in the minds of the government in Ottawa with respect to income stabilization programs, with respect to grain delivery programs, with respect to transportation systems, storage systems. All these areas are still in doubt because we have not had the finalization of the major overhaul that seems to be shaping up in that particular area at the federal level of government. And I know that there will be many meetings to attend and many conferences before these are all sorted out. But it's my hope that by the time another crop year rolls around that our people in the countryside will have much greater assurance as to the future and where they fit in to the economic climate of our rural areas in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure I can carry on for a couple hours if members opposite wish; I think I've given enough for the moment. I'm sure there are many questions that I haven't answered, I would appreciate members opposite pointing the areas of their concern so that I may subsequently give them the kind of answers that they're looking for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 8 to 10 were read section by section and passed) Resolution 11 (a)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (a)--passed; (b)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (b)--passed; The-Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On (b) there's an increase here in the total allocation. Does this mean that we have more ag reps in the province or is this just a matter of salary increase?

MR. USKIW: That looks to me like the natural growth or increase, the natural increment, Mr. Chairman. It could be perhaps one or two vacancies that were filled in the meantime but that's about all it would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)--passed; (d) 1--passed; 2--passed;

MR. FROESE: We were on (b) were we not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On (b) you said?

MR. FROESE: Oh I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c)(1)--passed; (2)--passed;

MR. FROESE: On (3) Mr. Chairman, on the Agro-Manitoba Development, I would like to have a further explanation from the Minister on this. Sorry that I had to miss his opening remarks and this is why I was lost when I came in.

MR. USKIW: I didn't touch on that particular area specifically. As you recall, last year we introduced a number of pilot projects to provide for rural development for greater participation on the part of our people in the countryside in the area of rural development. And just to cite a few examples we have a pilot project in a library system up in Dauphin which I believe is 100,000 of the 270. That's about the totality of that project. It involves a bookmobile and I'm not sure of all the different programs that are tied to it but it's to bring about a

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) new service to that particular area as a pilot study after which, if it's successful, it may be expanded into programs under their logical departments. We have a recreational director in another school division, Lakeshore I believe it is, yes. A full-time recreational director. Again, it's a sort of a pilot project to see whether these kind of people can stimulate the kind of recreational activity, catalogue the opportunities for recreation in the area, in the whole school division, communicate these opportunities to the various people whether they be adults or students, children, which again will serve as a basis for further recreational development in the province. At that point it will again be turned over to the proper department.

These projects were sort of designed in this department because of the capacity of the people in my department to communicate with our rural people and it was felt last year that we would be the best vehicle to stimulate these pilot studies. There are five projects in all and I haven't got them all before me. There's a number of other areas that I could mention if you like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution 11 was read section by section and passed.) Resolution 12 (a)(1)--passed (2)--passed; (b)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)(1)--passed; (2)--passed; The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Does this have to do with plant breeding when we talk of crops here, or just what are the monies going for when we indicate crops?

MR. USKIW: No, this would be your branch at the Norquay Building, Mr. Chairman. If you're thinking of plant breeding I would assume that would come under our university grant. You're talking of a university operation? Yes, that would come under our total university grant, Mr. Chairman, which is \$520,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Resolution No. 12 was read section by section and passed.) Resolution 13 (a)(1)--passed; The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On this resolution, I think there was mention in the Throne Speech that we would have a Statistics Act brought in. Will this have to do with agriculture and to what extent is this Act going to cover the activities of the Agriculture Department?

MR. USKIW: I don't think there's a relationship there at all, Mr. Chairman. This is Economics and Publications. As you know, we have a branch at the Norquay Building which runs a series of films for television, radio programs advising our rural people of the different things that are ongoing in the department, special programs for rural people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 13 was read section by section and passed.) Resolution 14 (a)(1)--passed? The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on Resolution 14, Marketing. I choose to rise and just make a few comments and agree with the Minister, in his opening remarks, that certainly marketing is probably the most essential concern facing us not only in Manitoba but in Canada, and he made several references to the position that he and his government is taking on a very important piece of legislation, namely Bill C-176. I choose to, Mr. Chairman, on this particular item just to indicate to you that we on this side will have many remarks to make with respect to marketing, Bill C-176 on resolutions that we are putting forward to the House and on other items.

I might also say that the key concern to agriculture at this time on such things as assessment, which of course comes under the Department of Municipal Affairs, and we still have drainage and conservation problems which come under the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, and I take this occasion simply to indicate to you that our ready acceptance of these estimates merely indicates that in this particular department we recognize that this government is doing much what we have done in the past and are carrying forward the same kind of program that we have instituted in the past and for this reason don't really see too much reason in examining these estimates. We essentially agree with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1)--passed? The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, too bad I missed the opening remarks of the Minister's so I don't know what area he has covered and what he has not covered. On this whole matter of marketing I notice that we're spending more money in certain areas -- market development, there's an increase there; the branch administration and also the research is being stepped up. Could we have some information on this point?

MR. USKIW: I did indicate in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, but I will repeat for my honourable friend. As you know, last year for the first time we had set up a marketing

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) branch within the department, contrary to the comments of my honourable friend from Lakeside, and we were not in a position last year to fully staff that particular branch because we were just in the process of setting it up, of advertising for people and so forth. The difference in expenditures is logical now because of the increase in the staff complement. We have, I think, five or six - I'm not sure of the total, but I can find out for you if you like - two of which are now overseas trying to develop markets, one in Japan and another one I don't know where, but we are involved in some promotional work at the present time. That pretty well sums up the need for extra funds; it's the additional staff requirement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 14 was read section by section and passed) Resolution 15. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this item is being reduced. Does this mean that we have fewer agriculture societies or is the allocation made to the societies being reduced? Surely many of the fairs have taken on a different show than what they were a number of years ago, and whether this is a contributing factor, that fewer prizes are being awarded, or just what are the implications in this connection?

MR. USKIW: The reduction's very minor, Mr. Chairman. I think it's only about what, 12,000? I presume -- and I don't know -- but I presume it's a projection that is made by the departmental staff based on what happened a year ago and what they expect to happen this year. It has nothing to do with any area of policy change, just the departmental projections as to their requirements, vis-a-vis the prize money that they expect to pay out and so forth. There's no change in policy there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 15 was read and passed) Resolution 16 - The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: The Honourable Minister mentioned in his opening remarks, he talked of decentralization and the like. I think in regards to The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation policies, I am sure that this will, in some way, help the position of individuals or persons employed with the Department of Agriculture, help them, perhaps. I fully realize, as the Minister said, it's very hard to establish a cash and flow system at this time, and to try to figure out what's going to happen in the future but I think perhaps this is the time when the farmer, especially the low income farmer, needs the help more than ever and the government should not just take the position -- I don't say they are -- but I think we should make sure we don't take the position that well, really they're not making any money now, how can we invest in these people? I think this is perhaps more the time than ever before to really take a close look at it regardless if we're going to lose a few dollars, I don't mean to throw it away or anything like that, but the farmer is in a position, we don't have to go into detail to that, but they're in a position today where if we don't have confidence they can pull out today, we must do something about it. I think we're all very concerned about this and I hope that part of this decentralization will even bring the people closer to the problems as far as credit is concerned.

MR. USKIW: . . . give me a minute to respond to that, Mr. Chairman. We are not being unduly restrictive, although we do have to take into account the various policy changes that are being made at Ottawa with respect to the grains area and the limitations which that is putting on a lot of our producers, vis-a-vis, their cash flow. One cannot ignore that because that is a fact of economic life, and I would think that that is where it is showing up most significantly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would like to know from the Minister, speaking of agricultural development and the Credit Corporation, there must be much more activity now than there was a while ago because at one time I think the corporation was just about dormant -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's so few minutes left, it hardly pays to get into this matter and then being cut off. I would like to see it called 5:30 so that we could get together later on and discuss it. Maybe if, speaking on the Agricultural Development Corporation, has there been a change of policy as far as new farmers being able to purchase smaller units, smaller farms, not necessarily a whole farm, because I find that this is one big difficulty that young farmers face, that they're required to purchase a considerable acreage before the corporation will consider extending them a loan, and I think this is a wrong policy. I think we're going in the wrong direction. I think we should, even if they want to start with a smaller acreage, we should give them an

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) opportunity. In this way they would not pile up as much of a debt and they would also get the experience. I find that -- and this is the complaints I get -- that if they want to purchase 40 or 80 acres they're not given a loan. They have to buy larger acreage before they are considered a viable unit and in order to get credit, and I feel that we're not doing justice to some of these younger farmers who would like to get started and where the parents would like to assist them, but they don't want to assist them to that extent either that they go heads over heels into debt, and they would like to see that their boys would probably purchase a smaller acreage and get assistance from the corporation. I would certainly like to hear from the Minister on that very point.

MR. USKIW: Well, the corporation has a long history of experience, Mr. Chairman, and they've got a very capable research staff that has been watching the area changes within the industry for the last ten or eleven years, and they are very capable in trying to assess the possibilities of entrepreneurship in agriculture and in particular with respect to the new people that are coming in. Contrary to what the member for Rhineland is suggesting, I would say that I think many declines are a real favour to the prospective entrepreneur because of the economics of the industry, and I think good advice is the best advice and if they are declined based on that kind of advice that that's probably the best thing that may have happened to them; and on the other hand I think the corporation is following a policy which gives every encouragement where they see some feasibility, but certainly they're not going to promote the development of units in which case there's no doubt they are not viable nor will they ever become viable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30. I am leaving the Chair. I will return at 8:00 o'clock.