

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

: 2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 4, 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 St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Special Committee on Professional Associations.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee on Professional Associations begs leave to present the following as their first report:

Your Special Committee of the Legislature composed of Hon. Messrs. Mackling, Miller, and Toupin, Messrs. Allard, Beard, Bilton, Boyce, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Molgat, Shaf-ransky, Sherman, Spivak, Mrs. Trueman and Mr. Turnbull was reconstituted on Thursday, May 14, 1970, at the Second Session of the 29th Legislature to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, and to examine any Bills respecting professional associations introduced in the previous three Sessions of the Legislature and not passed, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable.

Your Committee was authorized to hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable and to sit during recess or after prorogation and to report at the next Session of the Legislature.

Your Committee appointed Mr. Desjardins as Chairman and it was agreed that the quorum be set at seven members.

Meetings were held on: Tuesday, October 27, 1970  
Tuesday, November 24, 1970  
Monday, January 25, 1971 and  
Friday, March 5, 1971

Your Committee agreed to review the recommendations of the McRuer Report, and the specific recommendations in the report of the Manitoba Bar Association. It was agreed that a major in-depth study using resources people outside the Provincial Government be constituted to examine the principles involved in the establishment of self governing bodies and the Provincial Government responsibility as it relates to public interest.

The Acting Chairman, The Hon. the Attorney-General, reported that he had appointed Mr. Frank Muldoon, Q. C. to co-ordinate the study of a sub-committee composed of the Presidents of the Universities of Manitoba, Brandon and Winnipeg, also the Dean of the Law School. These gentlemen were convened by Mr. Mackling, briefed as to their terms of reference and requested that it would have to be a short term study.

Your Committee recommends:

1. That the Special Committee of the Legislature be reconstituted to investigate the role of professionals, professionalization and self governing bodies and make recommendations thereto.
2. That it be authorized to hire persons required to perform duties as assigned to them.
3. That the Committee have power to sit during the Session, during recess or after prorogation, and to hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable and to report to this House on matters referred to it at the next Session of the Legislature.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Churchill, 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 Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): 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: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Radisson. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared. I'll let it go; I won't bother holding it up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had some notes prepared. I didn't realize that it would be that fast. I expected -- this is on the report of the Committee to set up committees, and I certainly have some complaints to register in this connection.

I don't see why this has to happen every year. Certainly there is no need for it, to have criticism levelled at the government every year when these committees are set up. Certainly this year any contacts that were made were made at arm's length through other parties. I still don't know who the chairman is of the committee to set up committees. The report is not signed, at least not the copy that I have here.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that other parties were contacted and involved; why did they not contact me personally? Why wasn't I made aware ahead of time that meetings would be held and why did I have to register my indications secondhand? Certainly this leaves much to be desired and I certainly find, Mr. Speaker, that I am now called on to serve on three committees of these several committees that are being set up - Public Accounts, Agriculture and Regulations. Last year I served on the Utilities Committee as well as on the Economic Development Committee. These are committees that I have a particular interest in and I still fail to see why I was taken off those two committees and not be able to retain my membership on those committees. Is it because some of their members don't want to serve, that they want smaller committees? Is this the reason for it? Sometimes I just wonder why or how they still allow me to sit in my seat. I think if they had ways and means of removing me here I think they would have done it. --(Interjection) -- Well, I wouldn't want this to apply to all members on that side; I know there's some very good people in there but I also know that there's some in there that really have it out on me.

Mr. Speaker, this makes it very difficult for me. Under the rules you're not supposed to amend the report; reports are not to be amended. How can I bring in a recommendation then? In other years we see that the concurrence motions are not brought forward. This has happened a number of times and I think this is a responsibility that you, Mr. Speaker, should look at and make sure that concurrence motions are brought in so that members on this side who are not directly involved can make amendments; otherwise we are barred and I don't think this is fair. Certainly they have already asked for certain members to switch from one committee to another and we had no objections; I certainly didn't raise any objections - I approved it. But I would like to see that we have co-operation both ways and this not just be a one way street. I certainly would like to have my name added to these two committees, Utilities and the Economic Development. These were the same ones I served on last year. I never indicated that I wanted to serve on Agriculture this year. I'm positive because I know what I marked. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I definitely marked Economic Development and Utilities Committee; I know that too well.

Another thing, I think, Mr. Speaker - and I don't think you should allow this to happen - according to the rules, reports are to be read out by the Clerk. We find that so often members call for dispense. Members on this side, members who are not members of the committee do not know what the report entails or contains and so it necessitates on occasion for us to adjourn debate for this very reason. We heard the Honourable Member for St. Boniface just bring in a report this afternoon. What happened? The Clerk started off to read it and there were calls of "dispense" and the report was not completed, so the only way we can participate in debating that report is to amend it. Had we known what it contained we could probably have spoken today without adjourning debate, but this is not the case and Rule 72 points this out very clearly. Rule 74 also mentions that reports are not to be amended. However, I would suggest that you bring in a motion of concurrence; otherwise I am unable to move an amendment. I know this has happened on previous occasions but certainly I could be ruled out of order if I did so, and once more, I think, to bring in a report like this is a shame when members desiring to serve on committees are not even properly contacted, are not given the right to indicate firsthand, to have this go through other channels, through other means, I think this should not happen in this House.

I still would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that the name of Froese be added to the Public Utilities and to the Economic Development Committee. The motion is seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must advise the honourable member I cannot accept his motion to amend on a motion of a report of a committee; a report to be received is not amendable. The only motion the honourable member can make is to refer it back to committee. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness to the member who has just spoken and also to the government side, the member who was on that committee should say a few words at this time. My recollection was that taking into account the three Liberals and the three individual members of other parties, the government members of the committee proposed and other members accepted the proposal, that committees be slightly reduced in size this year, the reason being that in the previous year there were a number of members who served on a number of committees and there was a conflict of meeting dates and also members could not take full time away from their part-time earning of a living arrangement that they have had when the session is not in session. So a decision was reached amongst the seven members - and I think it was unanimous - the Conservative, the Liberal and the NDP members of the committee, that this proposal be accepted so we proceeded to reduce slightly the numbers of all committees in the House. I believe the Law Amendments Committee went from 49 down to 40 -- from 56 down to 29, and there was no dissension on the committee on making this decision.

Now, I appreciate the feelings of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, but when we did make the decision that was unanimous, then we decided to decide what was the fairest way to allot the positions on the committees, taking into account the strength of the parties and the independents in the House. It was also recognized that there are some committees that members find more desirable to serve on than on others. Some of the committees meet briefly or they meet once or they meet twice and that's about it; other committees, like the Public Utilities, Economic Development and Agriculture, are considered to be the active committees and perhaps the Public Utilities and Natural Resources, so that in the allotting of the members to what we considered the more important committees, I think I made the suggestion that the Member for Rhineland would appreciate being on the Agricultural Committee because of his intense interest in that particular field in the province. As a matter of fact, I can recall him following the committee around the province on several of their meetings and taking an active part in the proceedings, so we thought that if we put him on the Agricultural Committee then he should have to give a little ground on one of the other committees, taking into account again the fact that committees were reduced in size.

So I'm not defending the government; I'm saying that the decision was made by a group of people working in goodwill from all parties and there was tried to be a fair decision reached with respect to the number of committees that each member of this House would serve on.

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 130 students from Grade 7 and 8 standing of the John Henderson Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Marchildon, Mr. Partyka, Mrs. Pottruff and Miss McTavish. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister and the students are also students from my own constituency. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

#### REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (Cont'd.)

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the report of this committee includes three bills. Two of them are involved in connection with education and one has to do with the assistance to farmers. I don't intend to dwell on all of them. I think I would like to direct a few remarks though at this time to the Chair and the Minister of Education who is very much involved.

Yesterday, when the committee met, the people of the department were present. No doubt they were there, called to be there to give information when needed, otherwise I wouldn't know why they would be present at these meetings, yet when asked for information, information was denied. This is very hard to accept. I requested information twice and it was denied on both occasions, yet we find other members of the committee asking for information which was acceded to, the information was brought forward. — (Interjection) — I just want to point this out

(MR. FROESE, cont'd.) . . . . because this is fact, and I think the Honourable Minister of Labour, if he wants to know that, he should attend these meetings so he'd find out, if he wasn't there.

Bill 13 provides various sections and various principles. The bill was voted on on a previous occasion when you accept a bill in principle and I was rather amazed to find the people to my right, the Conservatives, to vote for the bill when they fully well knew that the principle of extending or handing over regulatory powers to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Cabinet, to make changes in this legislation henceforth, that they would subscribe to such a principle. This was probably one reason the matter was raised in committee yesterday, but once in the hands of the government your control is lost, and an amendment was brought in which was to restore some of that control that was in it heretofore.

But, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this amendment does very little or nothing, because what is there to prevent the government from budgeting for a large surplus under this formula and then bringing in a homeowner grant to homeowners. Once you've passed the authority to them there's nothing from preventing them from doing so. And this can be done quite readily once this power is passed on to them. I certainly wouldn't mind a homeowner grant, but we heard the representation that was made by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce representing the business people of this community and that they took exception to removing the 24 point differential between the residential tax and the commercial tax that is to be levied for this purpose. The committee approved an increase for the coming year from 24 to 25 1/2, and under the amendment this is supposed to be rectified, that from here on the differential will be maintained. But I certainly don't believe that the amendment will do that, I certainly can't subscribe to the bill and to giving these powers to regulate under the Act to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The other matter, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the student grant. I spoke on this when speaking on second reading on the bill and I certainly don't intend to let the opportunity go by without raising it again because it is so unjust. Why the differentiation? Why just pay this grant to certain students in this province and not to others? Why not differentiate on those who have blue eyes and brown eyes? This would be just as logical as the differentiation that the government is putting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to ask the honourable member to debate the point before us which is the adoption of this report. I realize he has to refer to what is contained in it, but he is starting to debate the contents of each bill separately and I think that's going to a greater depth than is necessary to either accept or reject the report. Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's quite simple. I am opposing the adoption of this report on the grounds that the bills contained in the report are discriminatory and I just pointed out to the Minister that why differentiate on these points, because certainly if you want to differentiate on that basis you could also differentiate on between male and female. That would be more logical yet than what they are doing right now under this piece of legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly would never subscribe to supporting a bill and the report that is before us at the present time.

The monies to pay the student grant comes from the Consolidated Fund and all people of this province are contributing to it in one form or another. When the unitary legislation was brought in a special tax, a sales tax was brought in at the same time and was tabbed an education tax when it first came out to support this program. All the people in this province making purchases are contributing toward the consolidated revenue fund in this way from which these funds will come to pay for these grants. The only reason that he calls it a grant that is only going to the unitary divisions is because he places it under this particular legislation, under the particular section that it is being incorporated with. That's the only reason. It could be brought in under another section and it could be applied equally to all students in this province as it should be.

In my opinion, this is daylight robbery, and when I say daylight robbery naturally it also means that we are passing out stolen goods to certain people and I don't think certain people in this province would like that, that we just contribute to the support of certain students in this province. The amount was given in committee. I asked for the number of students receiving it, or will be receiving it, and the number who will be ineligible. The information was not given. So we don't know in terms of the number of students that are being disqualified in this way. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I intend to bring in some recommendations when we will be

(MR. FROESE, cont'd.) . . . . . debating the bill in Committee of the Whole and I am opposing the bill, or the report of the Committee at the present time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motion, Introduction of Bills, Orders of the Day.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has he come across any information on the Naval Base at Churchill yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I should advise the honourable member that there is staff actively pursuing the matter. While I'm on my feet, if I could advise the Honourable Member for Churchill in connection with his other question about the expected level of employment at Gillam this summer, I've made a formal request for specific numbers and information and as soon as I have that I will pass it along to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I understand now, Mr. Speaker, that — well, I'd like to address a question to the Premier again. I understand that there are five VIP's at Churchill today inspecting the Naval Base and four other buildings including SAC. I wonder if he has any information on that. I understand they're from either NORAD or NATO.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't have any information on that, but the honourable member's information makes me very curious and I'll make an effort to check out just what is lying behind that.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to table the Annual Report of the Department of Industry and Commerce for the year ending March 31st, 1970, including the Manitoba Design Institute, the Manitoba Export Corporation and the Manitoba Research Council.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation. I understand the Minister just returned from a Federal-Provincial Conference of Highways Ministers. Can the Minister tell us whether or not the matter of studded tires came up at this meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I did return from Ottawa last night. I was there to discuss the implementation of Part III of the National Transportation Act. Studded tires were not on our agenda but I did discuss it with some of the ministers. I did discuss it with the new Minister of Ontario, Mr. McNaughton. He's stubborn like we are and he insists that they're going to stick with their rule, or the rescinding of the studded tire law. He insists that it's not only expensive but also it's dangerous. I don't know how he arrives at that conclusion, but their position is that it's a hazard and they're not going to change their law. Quebec has indicated they may take some retaliatory action and we have indicated that we won't sit on our hands but we didn't say what we're going to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the Minister plans on some retaliatory action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's question period at this time and I'm sure the honourable member will find an appropriate time to discuss and debate the issue. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in connection with CAE. I think it's the government's intention to reactivate the Air Canada Policy Committee. Can he table in the House or tell us who the members of this committee will be, because I know that quite a few members of the previous committee have moved away from this province. I wonder if the Minister can tell us or table in the House who the members will be.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to provide such information to the honourable member as soon as it's available. We are presently working on the constitution of the committee. We want to have it as broadly representative of the Manitoba community as possible and we're working on it actively right now. As soon as we have this information we will be writing and communicating with you orally as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder would the First Minister consider making arrangements for having the House, all MLA's visit the Forestry Complex at The Pas sometime during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that has occurred to me and I'm not sure whether the Minister of Industry and Commerce is making the enquires as yet or whether this has yet to be done, but certainly that will be taken under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and ask him whether he has received any complaints that persons wishing to do so are not being allowed to take the written parts of their driver's examination in the French language.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question. Would the Minister undertake to assure the House that no person so wishing to take their examinations in the French language are denied that privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think I should make it very clear to the members opposite that one of the keys to safe driving and in fact to holding a driver's license is to be able to understand what's on that sign. No use having a stop sign if you don't know if it says stop, which means that you must know English. We have had some of those problems. There are people that come from Europe that are excellent drivers but they don't know if it says slow or stop or 60 miles an hour or whatever, and until they learn that they cannot get their driver's licence. That rule is one that's been around for a long time and we do not intend to change it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. SHERMAN: I wish to attempt to rephrase it, Mr. Speaker, I may have some difficulty. Would the Minister undertake to assure members of this House that people can take their written drivers' examinations, the written form of them in either of the official languages of this country and province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the member of the Opposition, who's had an opportunity to do these things for eleven years, we've no intention of making a dual system in Manitoba where we have to duplicate every piece of paper and all our clerks and all our filing has to be duplicated so a person could come in and say because I'm French, I want it all done in French. We have no intention of doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a subsequent question to ask of the Minister of Highways. How shall our senior citizens then obtain their driver's licence, those who are unable to speak the English language, or those that are unable to properly read the English language and also to write the exams.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's a problem we in Canada have probably more than anyone else because this is a melting pot for people from all over the world, and it's a problem that can only be overcome if they learn to read. We don't really care if they can write it or not but they must be able to read when they're driving if it says stop. So they have to be able to distinguish that and that means that they must learn something that's in their book about reading the signs. If they can't read the signs we can't possibly give them a driver's licence, and that's a problem that's been around since - I suppose since the car was invented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A further supplementary then. We have -- well maybe I should put it in another way. We have a lot of senior citizens who have had drivers' licences for years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member state his question.

MR. FROESE: Yes. How are they supposed to retain their driver's licence now that they are supposed to write exams?

MR. SPEAKER: I must rule that this question has been asked once, and a couple of times in fact repetitively. The answer has been stated. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. I'd like to know if the Minister who just enunciated a policy, is that a policy of his department or the policy of all government departments?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Policy enunciations are not under course during the question period. The Honourable Minister for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister just enunciated a position of the government and I want to know if it's the government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not going to debate the question with the honourable member. -- (Interjection) -- Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Just so that there is no confusion on the matter, questions relating to policy determination that have to do with language policy, either as it relates to the nation or to the province, are matters of policy that are determined by the government as a whole and in negotiation with the Federal Government at Constitutional Conferences and ratified here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can inform the House as to whether he has received a legal opinion on whether the Province of Manitoba through its agency has a first mortgage -- (Interjection) -- My question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister has received a legal opinion as to whether the Province of Manitoba through its agency has a first mortgage on the assets of the Churchill Forest Industries.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the whole subject matter that the honourable member is referring to is sub judice, it wouldn't be proper to give that legal opinion even if we had it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he's been able to uncover the policy in which the Federal Government are spending the \$15 million at Churchill - port facilities.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, our detectives are still at work.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Member for Radisson. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that first of all I certainly had not intended to take part in this debate but some of the speeches made by some of the members of the Official Opposition I think made me realize that I couldn't sit back any longer and listen to some of the accusations and some of the statements that were made.

The Leader of the Opposition, I think it was on Friday, accused the government of being intellectually dishonest and corrupted. Now it's an odd thing when you have to listen to these people when they're in opposition and when you remember some of the things that were said when they were on this side and on your right, Mr. Speaker.

Last Friday I asked a question of the Official Leader of the Opposition. I think I have it here. I asked if he was in favour or if he was against open government, and his answer was that you're supposed to be able to exercise a bit of discretion and he felt that in those contentious issues, well then you should produce the information, especially when it's paid for by the people of Manitoba. And at the time he quoted - the caucus chairman, I guess - anyway the Member from Morris, and he quoted the Member from Morris asking a question of the First Minister, and the question was this: "Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day are called, I wonder if

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) . . . . I may address a question to the First Minister. In view of his statement relating to the documents pertaining to Southern Indian Lake, I wonder if we could take it from him that this government now are going to table all department and confidential documents." Well, this is a valid question and there's no doubt that this is the Honourable Member from Morris as being at his best this session. He's been very good, he's been on his toes, but I can't help but -- and he spoke after on another debate, Mr. Speaker, and he was talking about the Minister that had oh, a change of conscience, and I think a conscience belongs to yourself and I don't think that you should discuss the conscience of others. Certain things change and you don't agree with everything that is said by a caucus I'm darn sure. None of the members here do, and I think that a member should be free to interpret the dictates of his conscience himself.

But the Honourable Member from Morris also said that the people were entitled to know, they have the right to know where the member stands, he said, and that kind of made me smile yesterday because I remember not too long ago when I asked a certain question of the Honourable Member for Morris and it was exactly on this, on the question of information, Sir, and I think it might be wise to quote him at this time to -- you realize that it's all right to take a stand and start accusing people of bearing with their conscience and so on, but it depends which way you stand, or which way you sit I should say. I'm glad to see that the Leader of the Official Opposition is back because I was answering the speech that he made last Friday. And I quote here in Hansard of 1969, and the Honourable Member from Morris:

"Mr. Molgat: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

"Mr. Jorgenson: Sure, sure.

"Mr. Molgat: Has the honourable member seen the studies to back up whatever losses are involved in the flooding?

"Mr. Jorgenson: I'm not privileged to see the report any more than you are. They are the property of the government, the government in this case happening to be the members of the Cabinet."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not -- I guess he's a little too busy but no doubt he's listening with one ear -- it's a little embarrassing I'm sure for a man who lately this session has been crying for more information, has been accusing the government of being internationally -- (Interjection) -- But the statement is -- (Interjection) -- I'll come to you later on. But the honourable member says, "No, I'm not privileged," he says, "they are the property of the government, and the government in this case happens to be the members of the Cabinet." Well, this is a new one. And then we'll go on, seeing that this is not clear enough.

"Mr. Molgat: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point . . .

"Mr. Cherniack: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question. I was just wondering, would the member not feel that he would be more able to deal with this had he had access to those reports, the secret reports?"

And we spoke about secret reports the other day too, Mr. Speaker.

"Mr. Jorgenson: The Cabinet made this decision, not me." Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, because this is quite important. "The Cabinet made the decision, not me. Under our system the government is entrusted with the power of making those decisions." You see, the opposition doesn't have to know anything.

"Mr. Cherniack: Well, the question was, are you not?

"Mr. Jorgenson: No, if they're right or wrong, they take the responsibility and are going to be judged on the basis of accepting that responsibility.

"Mr. Cherniack: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I can't force him to answer a question, but I was wondering if he would answer the question which as I recall it was, would he not feel better able to deal with this matter if he had access to those secret reports?

"Mr. Jorgenson: I'm quite prepared, I'm quite prepared when the matter is before the committee to ask which questions I think I must know, the questions I feel I would like to know when the bill gets to committee. I'm quite prepared to accept years of tradition in this Chamber, as in other Chambers throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the free world, in following the practices that are laid down for the smoothest passage of the business of a Chamber of this kind.

"Mr. Cherniack: Are you prepared to answer the question?

"Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

"Mr. Desjardins: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting that the role of the opposition is to take the word, vote on a question of principle only on the say-so of the



(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) . . . . government? This is exactly what my honourable friend is saying.

"Mr. Jorgenson: My honourable friend is at liberty to vote as he pleases on this issue."

So I think when he wants more information, he's right. I think that's what he asked for yesterday, but I think that he himself must have a smile on his face, and I see he has, when he gets up like he did yesterday and talked about dishonest and what was it? Coward, coward, power. By the way, my friend from Lakeside wants to get into this and I think that I could say a word or so to him. He's felt -- now he's crying, he wants all kinds of information -- and you know the information that we never got on this when my friend was the Minister. Well, I also asked him a question and that could be found on Page 6 -- I mean May 6th, Page 1974: "Would the honourable member permit a question? Would you deem that we received, that the members of this House received enough information to make a fair and reasonable decision or assessment?"

"Mr. Enns: Yes. Yes."

Well, the three people that I'm answering to are in a caucus now so maybe we'll have an answer later on. But these are the same people. They're right when they're in opposition and they're asking for all kinds of information, this is the duty of the opposition. And I know that you have an awful lot more fun on the opposition; you don't have to be as responsible and this is what they used to say in those days and that's true -- but when you make certain statements, I suggest that you should be a little more careful when you turn around just a year or so after and say that this is not an open government and that they should give you all the reports, they should go on and give all the reports, and when you refuse to give the reports, when a member says, "Well no, years of tradition," they said, the Cabinet Minister this side, "if they're right or wrong, it's none of my business, because I'm ready to accept years of tradition and that'll be up to them."

Well, I don't remember any election that only the Cabinet Ministers had to run to get a mandate. -- (Interjection) -- They said what? Well, this is fine. I said that you're entitled to ask for it, but don't be "holier than thou" and say that they're corrupted by power because they don't give you everything right away, that you're searching for everything; and when some very important documents that you've refused to say it, and one of your members says: Well no, tradition says the Cabinet Ministers, that's their baby, they're the ones that run the show. I think that this is wrong, because the -- (Interjection) -- I beg pardon? But then you complain that they're spending too much money and now you want some more money. No, I think that if we want this open government that they promised -- and the Leader was vague on that, he said, Well you use your judgment. In other words, they might think they're giving open government and the Leader of the Opposition might not be.

But I think that in closing -- I want to make this very short -- I just thought that I'd give these people on the other side a little material to think and not be ready to make wild accusations any more. I think that in part there's some -- part of the Official Opposition has to change an awful lot if they're going to do their work, because they are going to hurt this province. They're hurting this province because they minimize all accomplishments made by this government and they are also, by innuendo, trying to say that there's something wrong, especially in the Department of Industry and Commerce, and in their enthusiasm I think that they are doing a great disservice to the province. Take when there are some firms that are interested in coming to Manitoba, with these people scaring, saying what's going to happen, then I think that they are not doing their job but doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba.

Now I think that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has been trying to interest some firms, and the First Minister has been trying to interest some firms in setting up here in Manitoba, but with the innuendoes from the Leader of the Official Opposition, the innuendoes and blaming everything on the government, I think he's doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba. I think that he is doing this. Now what I've been saying, Sir, is that the Official Opposition is doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba in making these innuendoes -- and I see by some of the looks that I'm getting that they are very anxious to get up and get into the debate because they feel that this is the job of the opposition, it is their duty, and I see the Member for Lakeside and the Leader of the Official Opposition -- but actually what I was doing, Sir, the last few minutes, was quoting exactly the Leader of the Official Opposition who was the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, and you will find there that when he was in opposition he didn't want anybody to criticize the government. He was saying, well you're scaring industries if you say anything at all, and I have one quote from him. He says: "But there is a state of mind that

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd.) . . . . exists on the part of the opposition that has to change, and unless it changes - I repeat it again and there may be some who dislike it - you are going to be hurting this province. Your intention is not to hurt it, but in your desire to try and minimize the accomplishment of the government, and that's your function, or to expose them . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A point of order by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition?

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member can relate those remarks to any reports that were refused by me or requests that were made for information.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, my honourable friend might think that he has to be the centre of attraction all the time, and I don't necessarily have to relate anything I say to him. I'm saying that yesterday he told us that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order was not taken since it was a question and had nothing to do with the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: I can't hear you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on his point of order, would he state it again; I didn't hear it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Honourable Member for St. Boniface's remarks relate in any way to the matter before us.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would ask the honourable members not to reflect upon the decisions of the Chair. I think I am capable of realizing what is going on in this House. I should like to say to him on that particular point that I asked him yesterday as well, in the same vein, to stick to the principle of what we were debating, and I'm trying to get all members to do that. I'm sure that all members will co-operate. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your remarks and I certainly agree with this. All I was trying to introduce -- on the same debate I was answering the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who made certain accusations of irresponsibility, and what else - dishonesty and corrupted by power. This is all I was showing. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I agree with some of these things; I think that the Official Opposition should get the information, but before the Leader and some of his members try to preach a lesson to the members they should read Hansard also, not only quote it like the member did yesterday. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, very briefly to this adjourned debate on the proposed motion before us. Earlier on in the question period we got on to the subject matter of communications and understanding, particularly between our two official languages, and from the remarks just made by the Member for St. Boniface it became very evident that we indeed have a difficulty here. Mr. Chairman, all his comments and all his remarks were completely beside the point, did not at all . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is casting reflections upon this Chair, in that I'm not adjudicating as to what is being said. I wish he would start on another tack.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly accept your advice, and let me assure you that I was not in any way attempting to cast reflections on the Chair. I was very definitely casting reflections on his interpretation as to how he read the subject matter before us, and let me for your sake read it into the record; "That an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information: A list of all reports" - a list. We asked for no contents of reports, no subject matter of reports, we simply want a list. We have feeling, and have been watching press releases and news releases emanating from that government in the last 20 months which gives us reason to think that we should be satisfied at this stage of the game simply asking for that list to be tabulated, to find out just how many concurrent studies are taking place that have been authorized by this government; what they are all studying and whom they are all studying; and some idea of what cost is involved.

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

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

MR. ENNS: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Was my honourable friend in the House and listened to the speech his leader made last Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to direct myself specifically to the subject matter that you, Sir, will allow me to debate, and what other members may or may not have said, I would grant you that they have the same possibilities and probabilities open to them of straying from the subject matter as did my honourable friend the Member from St. Boniface just now. And I would also want to indicate to him, Sir, that while he took occasion to speak on this particular matter, that he really no longer has to be an apologist for the government. You know, there's a chap sitting right behind him and another fellow right behind him that have taken that particular role away from him. I would look forward to him portraying himself in this House in his true independent spirit that he has indicated to us that he is prepared to do, and I rather felt disappointed that he found himself for a moment slipping back into the past and carrying on that role that he undoubtedly liked or became very much enamoured with during these previous two sessions.

But I just want to indicate to him that there is a specific difference between asking for information and contents of a specific report or simply asking for a list, and that's what this Order by my friend, my deskmate the Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney is asking for, simply a listing of the various studies that have been commissioned by this government. So with those few comments, perhaps Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, I've attempted to bring back on course any future discussions that may be involved on this subject matter. I would certainly hope so.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, let me also say that I find it shocking that the government would consider, even consider rejecting this simple, straightforward request. We are not asking for the reports themselves, we are not asking for the conclusions arrived at in those reports; we're simply asking for a list. And talk about open government.

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, without attempting to cover the same ground that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has covered, which is a point that I think should be reiterated, and that is simply that the honourable gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this motion have attempted to cloud the issue by creating the impression that we are asking for the tabling of all those reports contained in the request of my colleague the Member for Souris-Killarney. That is not a fact, and my friend the Member for St. Boniface - and we're happy to see him back in his place and participating in debate; we missed him and we're always happy when he can make his contributions in this Chamber - but again, most of his contribution was a re-reading of excerpts from Hansard in which - (Interjection) - Well, my honourable friend says that I didn't like it. On the contrary, this is the reason I am rising at this point, because in reply to a question, if I can recall the answer correctly, I did state that I didn't expect, as a member of the - I wasn't a member of the government because a member of the government, I narrow that to mean the members of the Privy Council or the members of the Cabinet - and so I, as a backbencher was not privy to the reports and to the information that a Cabinet Minister does, coming across his desk from time to time either from reports compiled by outside consultants or reports compiled from within his own department or inter-departmental reports.

I stated then and I state now that it has been a long-standing tradition of parliamentary governments that those reports are not made public except at the specific initiation of the government. The government have the responsibility of deciding what reports they feel can be transmitted to the House, and I don't want at this time or any other time to take away that responsibility from the government. It is they, when they were on this side of the House, that asked for something different. They asked for reports that were privileged; they asked for reports that they knew full well they weren't entitled to. And while they were on this side of the House they made a big fuss about not getting those reports. Now that they occupy the treasury benches - and again I bring up the question of intellectual dishonesty, again I bring it up - on this side of the House we were asked to do things that they refuse to do today. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not forgetting tradition. They're the ones that are talking about breaking traditions, they're the ones that are continuously telling the people of this province and this Chamber that traditions are made to be broken and that they are going to break them. That's one of the traditions that they have.

(MR. JORGENSEN, cont'd.)

Well, Sir, if they insisted that such reports be tabled when we were the government and they were in the Opposition, then surely, surely, Sir, there is not a great deal wrong with asking just for a list of the reports that are being compiled by this government. And I can think of only one reason, only one reason why they refuse to give us that list of reports, and this is they're hiding something, Sir.

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman who has just spoken has indicated that he can only think of one reason why we are refusing to submit the reports, and rather than that demonstrating the efficacy of the reason, it really demonstrates that he can't think very much if he can only think of one reason. Well, it's just an indication, Mr. Speaker, that his capacity to think is limited; that's all that it indicates, because if the honourable gentleman will look at the Order for Return and if he will have listened to the replies that have been made with regard to the Order for Return and if he would have listened to his own leader in speaking to the Order for Return, he will find that that is not the problem at all.

When this was answered, it was indicated that what is requested here in Item No. 2 is a list of all reports and studies undertaken within the government service since July 15, 1969, which means, Mr. Speaker, every single time that a Minister asked his deputy or asked someone in his department for a report on something or a study on something, whether that was farmed out to an outside consultant, whether it was a one-sentence report, whether it was a one-page report, whether it was a full-blown study, whether it was a hiring of consultants, that he would have to list these things. Mr. Speaker, first of all it would be an impossible task; and secondly, it would be inappropriate for the Legislature to know every time the Minister asked for a report on a subject and just list that report without any information as to what is being done. It could lead to numerous misunderstandings, numerous problems about what is going on when they need not — (Interjection) — Now the member says that I'm right; so now he's thought of another reason. The first reason that he thought of, the first reason that he thought of was that we had something to hide; the second reason that he thought of is that we are right. He says that we have learned something.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . the honourable gentleman with his capacity for misinterpreting . . .

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

MR. GREEN: We are learning, you know, and that's really nothing to be ashamed of. At least we are learning, and I repeat that's nothing to be ashamed of. The obvious fact is that the honourable gentleman hasn't learned what a point of order is because that is not a point of order, so the fact that we are learning is something that he could learn from and start learning himself.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if he had been here the other day — and I'm not sure whether he was or was not but I suppose it wouldn't really make any difference because even if he was he wouldn't have understood what his honourable leader was saying; that's what he's demonstrated — but the fact is that the Member for River Heights, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition got up and as much as said, without saying it but everything he said implied this, that really this Order for Return wasn't put in seriously, it was put in in order to demonstrate that this government was not an open government, that we did not have the compassion that we spoke of. He went on, Mr. Speaker, to speak about fisheries redundancy, the lack of compassion for fishermen — and he did an amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, he read from a quotation of the First Minister which was made in August of 1969 which indicated that this government would use its discretion in determining whether interdepartmental reports or other reports would be presented and tabled in the Legislature. He read that statement to prove that this government never intended to exercise its discretion or that we intended to do exactly what the statement suggested. I don't know how he came to that conclusion but nevertheless that was his basis for this Order for Return; that's what he indicated that the Order for Return proved. And the honourable member has pursued that today. He says that somehow when we were in Opposition we demanded things which we are now saying we will not give.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member at some future date, because he has spoken on this issue, to indicate when, where and what, to see just what comparisons they make because they make some rather odd comparisons. In the issue that my honourable friend

(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) . . . . . was speaking on that the Member for St. Boniface just referred to, the government benches were demanding that the Legislature as a whole grant a licence, something that usually a Minister does by himself, and in spite of the fact that the Minister couldn't do it by himself because of a legal impediment - and I know that the Minister would liked to have granted it by himself - but because he couldn't do so by himself because of a legal impediment, he asked the Legislature to grant the licence, and what we in the Legislature said is that if we are asked to perform an administrative function, then surely we should have available to us the evidence which supports the administrative function that we are asked to perform. And that's all that happened with respect to one of the reports.

We in the Legislature also asked the Opposition when we were on that side to give us information about the Manitoba Development Fund. We said that it's inconceivable that the public could turn over \$100 million or \$50 million to five people, and one of the former Premiers, Premier Roblin, justified this by saying these people were not the "Three Stooges", they were very respectable people and therefore you could give them \$50 million and not ask them where it came from.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, Sir, that we are now, having coming through the Hydro at South Indian Lake, we are now on the Forestry Complex; that we are a long way off . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to know the point of order.

MR. ENNS: The point of order, sir, is that we are not discussing the subject matter under debate at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: The fact is that the Member for Morris has just used the debate to demonstrate that and say that when we were on that side of the House we demanded papers which we are now refusing. The Member for River Heights used this debate and indicated he was using it for that purpose. Surely the honourable members, if their arguments are sound and they would like to put them and use the motion to put them, surely if their arguments are sound they will stand up to having those arguments responded to. It's not really good debate to be able to say that we wish to put an argument but then get up and stand up on a point of order and say. We don't want to hear the reply to that argument, because that's what my honourable friends are doing.

The Honourable Member for Morris has said that we repeatedly asked on that side of the House for information which we are now rejecting. I say to him he has not substantiated that. He has not quoted chapter and verse; he has not -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself. The honourable member has just made a speech in which he said that we did that. He did not refer to one specific case; he did not refer to one specific request; he did not refer to one specific denial; he would merely like to have it believed because he has said it, and for he himself has said it therefore it must be true. I am therefore - you know, I know that the honourable members don't like to hear that the positions that they have put really have no substance at all, but that is why the Member for Swan River is interrupting because the positions that have been put have been put without substance, have been put without example, have been put without fact and have been put without verification, and I am indicating that when we were on that side of the House we did ask for certain information; sometimes it was refused, sometimes we criticized the fact that it was refused.

I am indicating two cases in my mind: one of them was with respect to South Indian Lake which the Member for St. Boniface has referred to. I've indicated that we were refused the information. We felt we had a right to it for good reason, and I still think we had a right to it, and when this party took power they not only documented and tabled the previous report with respect to the Hydro project but they tabled all of the current reports that were commissioned by this government. Now if that is a comparison as to what is open government and what is more open government or less open government, I put that as an example.

The previous Premier said, and I ask the honourable members to measure my words carefully, he said that the members of the Executive Council had no right to ask the Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund what was happening with money which was advanced by the members of the Executive Council on behalf of the people to that Board of Directors. That was the position of the former Premier. We objected to that position. I think we were right in

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . objecting to that position and when we came into government we substantially changed that practice. As a matter of fact the previous administration, after having taken that position, changed that practice somewhat but we have substantially changed it with the result that -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? -- (Interjection) -- Well, the honourable member while sitting in his chair previously - and apparently he didn't hear or if he heard he didn't understand - I had indicated that in this Order for Return is requested a list of all reports and studies undertaken within the government service since July 15, 1969, and I say to you that such a list is impossible and -- (Interjection) -- Well, I have indicated why it's impossible. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, such a list does not also comply with what I thought were excellent standards of classification that were indicated by the First Minister when he last spoke on this Order for Return.

The purpose of an Order for Return is not a fishing expedition; it's to provide members with needed information with respect to matters which they are considering and we have -- Well, you know, the honourable member always saves himself by saying: "You use this and you use that," and I have said, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if he is referring to me, in three years in Opposition, in three years in Opposition I think I filed one Order for Return, and that was with respect to - the former Honourable Minister of Mines will remember it -- (Interjection) -- I am merely stating a fact. If you think that that fact is a demonstration of my righteousness, that is your position, not mine. I have never pretended to be a righteous person. No. Never. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have often, and more often than the honourable member, admitted to quite the opposite, but the fact is that if you take it as an indication, if you take it as an indication of my righteousness, that's your judgment. I filed one Order for Return. I asked the Minister of Mines for contracts relating to cleaning up the banks of the Red River Floodway and the answer to the Order for Return came back a couple of days later. It said "none." That was the Order for Return. That was my experience with Orders for Return.

I am merely indicating to the honourable member that in the three years that I remember sitting on the Opposition benches and which they have said, without verification, that we complained about a lack of information being distributed to us, there are two notable cases in my mind. One was with respect to the studies relating to the Hydro project on which we were asked to take over the ministerial responsibility of issuing a license - and I don't blame the former Minister for doing this; he was in trouble; he couldn't issue that license by himself; he needed the Legislature to help him; and the fact is that he wouldn't give the Legislature the information that we needed whereby we could help him. That was number one.

The other was with respect to the Manitoba Development Fund. In that case I suggest to you that the position taken by the former administration was untenable. We were perfectly right in asking for the information and events have proved us to be right. So that when we are speaking in terms of what orders we are prepared to answer and what orders we are prepared not to answer, I think that the guidelines set by the First Minister in August of 1969, not something that occurred as an afterthought but that it will always be in the discretion of the government as to whether the release of a document is in the public interest. The same was said by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the same I believe was said by myself - although I can't refer to the page in Hansard when it was asked of me but I believe it was asked of me and I believe I did answer to the same effect - but that merely indicates that the use of discretion was a common factor.

There is only one difference. You used your discretion in a way which we felt we properly criticized. We are using our discretion in a way in which you feel that we should be properly criticized and I suppose that someone else is going to have to judge as to whether we did in fact provide a more open form of government than was provided by the previous administration. I think that if you will look at the number of reports that have been issued - and you know, there is another way of judging there. The Orders for Return and the requests for Orders for Return become, Mr. Speaker, more and more challenging. I think what the Opposition has been surprised about is that when they have asked for an Order for Return which they felt that the government would never release and we have filed a document, they said, well let's file an Order for Return - let us file an Order for Return on something which is even more outrageous until we get them into a position of saying that we can't release, and that's what the Member for River Heights said about this previous Order for Return. He used the entire Order for Return and his time in debate to demonstrate not that they wanted this information but to demonstrate that the government would not respond to this Order for Return and therefore it has proved to be a

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . not open government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that the records are there for everybody to see, that one can look at the record and the response to those records. One can examine whether this government has indeed been more open with respect to the Manitoba Development Fund, with respect to the answering of Orders for Return. One can examine, and the Member for Swan River knows it and the Member for Portage la Prairie, that this government in assembling a Northern Task Force has done something which I don't think happened under any previous administration. We have indicated that those people, that staff which works in the area of Northern Affairs would be made available to the Task Force and that their reports, internal staff documents would go to the Task Force for consideration, members of all political parties being on that Task Force, and have in fact made available -- (Interjection) -- No, you don't want me to bring it up because it defeats -- you don't want me to bring it up because it defeats the assertion that has been made by the Leader of your party that we are not as open as we say we are. I'm suggesting to you that no previous administration has done this, that no previous administration has made available an entire staff and their reports to a legislative committee to be dealt with firsthand by that legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think that -- I repeat -- one need only go through the list of what was requested in the past eighteen months and see the response to those requests and what was demanded in the previous three years and see the response to those requests to see whether in fact this government has been more open than the previous administration. I have no difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in standing here quite confident and knowing what any impartial adjudication of that question would be.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the 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 Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the last time the matter came up I was not in the House. I've since then indicated most of my reasons in my comments directed to the Minister of Labour just yesterday and I suppose I should simply refer members to that Hansard of yesterday and sit down in the interests of expediency, and I think I will essentially do that because this is essentially what I had in mind when I put in this request, not to debate the specific cases involved either at Flin Flon or otherwise but the principle of whether or not striking workmen should be receiving welfare and on what basis do we rationalize this with respect to the free collective bargaining position that we speak to as proposing to foster in our labour management situation.

However, I regret very much that my colleague the Member for Flin Flon chose to use those occasions to inject into the Hansard a rather serious matter and I seek your advice, Sir. I believe that I was maliciously slandered by the honourable member and I seek your advice to see how I can get it corrected because I have no intention of leaving the matter stand on Hansard. He refers to a specific meeting that I held as Minister with representatives of the mining industry at the Westminster Hotel in which, if you can believe it -- I mean even of a Tory Minister -- to say that I am not interested in safety, all I'm interested in is in production. And he says so and I'd like to quote his answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think in fairness to me, unless the honourable member can furnish some information -- and he says "quote" so I would assume it would have to be written information -- where that complete falsehood can be attributed to me speaking as a Minister to a representative of the mining industry, I would hope, sincerely hope without making a great fuss that the honourable member would see fit to correct the Hansard and change this. Quite contrary is the fact that I was more than sympathetic to the establishment of a mine inspector in the North, that we had a very good discussion as I recall about the possibility of moving portions of the mineral or mining staff eventually to the North, and in fact I think my erstwhile colleague the member from -- the Minister of Mines, the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources whose integrity I generally respect would probably have to indicate to you in the House, Sir, that certainly while no specific action was taken that there was certainly a considerable amount

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . of dialogue about this possibility going on within the department at the time that I left the department.

I just want to take this occasion to correct and ask for a correction of what I would consider a most serious charge being made against me, that I as a Minister of the Crown would have ever indicated to a group of mining people, to say when asked a specific question with respect to providing a mines inspector for safety purposes that a Minister of the Crown would answer no, I'm not interested in safety I'm only interested in production. I think that's stretching the credulity of even all my friends opposite that I would make that kind of a statement. However, it has appeared in Hansard and Hansards are used for many different purposes, and it's appeared in Hansard as being attributed as a direct quote to me. So I leave it entirely to you, Sir. I won't raise the matter again unless it's found necessary, and I would appeal to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon to in his own due time and course either find the quotation from which he quoted from or indeed present the person who attributes that kind of a remark to me, because I would have to inform you, Sir, and the member that it is completely without foundation and completely untrue.

Now as to the specific Order, I look forward to hearing the Honourable Member from Inkster, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and others to discuss this Order for Return. Again, I suppose the Minister using his logic of just the argument previous would dismiss it, as has already been indicated by the government that they have every intention of dismissing it. I think the Orders for Return are legitimately to be used to find out what we otherwise don't know in this Chamber. But I think both management and labour and our society as a whole has a right to be informed to what extent are public funds being used in the payment of welfare with respect to striking workers.

Now if this government sees this an embarrassing answer to furnish us the information with, then let them say so. I don't particularly see it as such and it wasn't put in in that particular manner. I think that as we get into the Estimates of the Department of Labour, some of the contributions and suggestions and constructive comments being made from this side of the House will indicate to you that we are prepared and we are hopeful to discuss, you know, the whole piling up kind of situation that's developing with respect to our labour-management laws, regulations, and if and where they are overlapping their various jurisdictions it becomes very difficult to understand where a working man who is covered or can be covered by compensation payments which are coming directly out of the management purse, by welfare payments which are coming out of everybody's purse, by strike union payments which are coming out of labour's purse, and perhaps even unemployment payments, and shouldn't we talk about the whole situation and talk about the possibility of some major reorganization in this area.

In addition to that we talk about a guaranteed income and other matters, and where does this leave all the current matters that we have on statutes that provide for specific situations to fill a particular gap at a time when a gap existed. This is really the underlying reason for this Order for Return. It may be a concern politically to the government. The matter was raised at a previous strike that the public was made aware of where an application for welfare payments was made by those workers, namely the Motor Coach workers, and as far as the general public was given to understand at that time the government refused all requests for welfare in that particular instance. I don't know whether that's correct, and I would have to be led to believe by the posture of the government with respect to this Order that the general implication given to the public was not in fact correct. Therefore, I ask for that information to be supplied.

We are aware that a very limited number of workers are receiving strike pay and receiving welfare at the same time in Flin Flon, and again I ask for the rationale, why Flin Flon and not Motor Coach? How is the government going to rationalize their posture on giving welfare payments to striking workers? It's an area where the government chooses to use its discretion and certainly discretion used in that manner leaves them open to some pretty serious questioning as to how that discretion will be used, presently or in the future, and indeed should it be used.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the government has indicated the intention to refuse the House this information. I was hopeful that we could get into a debate on the matter and see what could be arrived at. Thank you.

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, 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 Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

(1) The number of times the present Attorney-General has personally intervened in a criminal case before the courts of Manitoba.

(2) The circumstances leading to the Attorney-General's intervention in each of these cases.

(3) The charges that were laid originally in each case in which the Attorney-General intervened in each case.

(4) The new charges after the Attorney-General's intervention in each case.

(5) The names and addresses of those charged in cases in which the Attorney-General has intervened in each case.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether -- the Attorney-General has obviously not responded to the member's Order for Return as yet. He is not here today. I can advise the honourable gentleman that my information is that the Attorney-General will be responding in the negative, but he may wish to wait until he's here.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on a point of order or a point of procedure, because the Attorney-General isn't here, I would be satisfied to have this matter stand open, but had I not proceeded with it today it would have dropped off the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Open? Is it agreed this matter stand in its normal rotation? (Agreed)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing, with respect to the Student Placement Office at 1181 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg, Manitoba, the following:

(1) Age, name and address plus salary and expenses of Director.

(2) Age, name and address plus salaries and expenses of other - and if, Mr. Speaker, I could make a correction, or an addition - of other of each of the employees.

(3) Name, address and age of each person placed in a position for the year 1970.

(4) Length of employment of each person placed in a position, department, location and salary received in each case.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can give the honourable member an indication that the government is prepared to accept this order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing, with respect to persons in Manitoba Jails or Detention places by reason of being unable to pay a fine, the following:

How many males were incarcerated for each month of 1969, 1970, and 1971 to March 31st.

How many females were incarcerated for each month of 1969, 1970, and 1971 to March 31st.

In each case give amount of fine or fines levied and the length of sentence.

Where possible, show in each case where the person is of a) treaty native origin; b) non-treaty origin; c) other.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it may not be possible to say whether they are there because of being unable to pay the fine or refusing to pay the fine. Insofar as we are able to determine this information - and I may be wrong; it may be that it is recorded in that way - we will accept the Order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . . The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (Stands) An address for papers.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, an Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd be interested to know from the House Leader, possibly on a point of order, are they going to accept it or not?

MR. GREEN: . . . . . a matter in which proceedings are in progress in various areas, and on the basis of the ongoing nature of the proceedings, the government is not prepared to accept this Order.

Mr. Speaker, we are also in the position of waiting for legal advice with respect to this particular request. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should clarify. If the honourable member will let this stand for some time further, it may be that after receipt of considerations of various kinds, we may be in a position to reply in the affirmative.

MR. BARKMAN: This is satisfactory, Mr. Speaker, to leave it open - that's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . . . stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, we have a number of these that are standing. It's marked once; under the rules, is this allowed to have it stand twice? -- (Interjection) -- I think the party loses their right to speak though. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources speaking to the point of order?

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Pembina. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

- continued next page

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, members on this side of the House and the Member for Rhineland have been in favour of the government proceeding with negotiations that would result in the information of the recommendations of the International Joint Commission of Canada and the United States. I know the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources doesn't head this as one of his priority items but I do wish that other members on the other side would hear what I have to say and maybe they could be influential enough, but if they couldn't change his mind they might be able to out-vote him like they did on the Lotteries Bill.

Many of these members on the other side are something like myself and they're probably not too familiar with what I am talking about when I speak about the Pembilier Dam. We have water coming from as far west as Boissevain, Killarney, Pelican Lake, Rock Lake and Swan Lake, coming down the Pembina Valley and different lead-offs into it. This crosses the border south of Darlingford into the United States and from there travels on eastward down towards Wanhalla and then on to Neche and Gretna and eventually to the Red River and then up north to Winnipeg here.

Sixty percent of the water in this area comes from the Canadian side. This is before it reaches Wanhalla. There's 60 percent of the water that's gained on the Canadian side and 40 percent of it comes from the United States. This land in the western portion is at a considerable higher altitude and it travels east. When it comes to Morden, which they call the Pembina Escarpment, there's a drop of 500 feet, and then this area levels off so that when it gets down to Wanhalla the land is practically dropping only a small number of feet to the mile and this is what causes the flooding.

This area takes in - it's at least 130 miles long east and west, and from 28 to 52 miles wide norther and south, and it affects the population of about 38,000 in Manitoba and 25,000 in the United States.

This problem isn't new; it's been going on for years, but in 1948 they set up the International Joint Commission which was to study this whole problem and make recommendations as to what could solve it. This study was very comprehensive and thorough, and was completed in 1967 after having had many hearings on both sides of the border.

Members of the Lower Red River Valley Water Commission, which are on this side, is the Rural Municipalities of Montcalm, Dufferin, Morris, Roland, Rhineland, Grey, Thompson and Stanley, and the towns that are of considerable size that are affected by this is Morden, Winkler, Plum Coulee, Altona, Carmen, Morris and Gretna. Now when these people had the hearings and these different areas turned out, they all agreed on Plan No. 2 which was a dam at Wanhalla and one up on the Canadian side south of Darlingford.

Now if you have the picture that I've tried to bring to your mind, is water coming from the west towards the east, dropping down within the valley until it comes down near Wanhalla, and then it's been spreading out and causing considerable flooding damages, with 60 percent of the water coming from the Canadian side and 40 percent from the American side.

One of the recommendations of the International Joint Commission - this is the recommendation they decided on - was that they go ahead with it jointly and that the expenses be shared, 60 percent by United States and 40 percent by Canada. The main reason for going ahead with these dams was to ease this flooding problem, which was very considerable before 1967 when this was proposed and which has become increasingly worse since. We all know of the floods that have taken place in this area in 1969 and 1970 and now in '71, causing thousands and thousands of dollars worth of damage and even loss of lives.

This flooding of this very fertile land in this area causes soil erosion and the fertile top soil is washed away. It also leads to later seeding of the area, with the result in poorer crops.

This is all high assessed land in this area. Some of the highest assessed land in all Manitoba is in this area, assessed as high as \$10,000 and \$12,000 a quarter and they're having this land flooded.

Another thing that a dam of this nature could do would be to create recreation in this area, and recreation, with the way times are changing and with the shorter work weeks, is becoming a big thing in this province. It is also becoming something that affects tourists and there could be a very fine recreational area on the Canadian side if we were to go ahead with the Plan No. 2, as was suggested, and have the dam south of Darlingford.

Irrigation is also another very large benefit of this dam, and this is if the dam went ahead and was put up at Wanhalla, there could be 12,800 acres of land irrigated on the

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd.) . . . . Canadian side and 8,500 on the United States side. Now the canning industry is becoming a very -- well, it's not really too important yet but we're looking for a big growth in it. We have a cannery at Morden. It's the one that the government took over last spring, known in that area as Eddie's Cannery now, and they have in the neighbourhood of 1,800 acres contracted in this area.

Now these people that have been in the cannery and other people in this, say that irrigation is very necessary to a cannery because even though you may have a flood in the spring and any amount of water, you need a certain amount of water at the right time, and if they had irrigation this could be controlled.

There's a big future for the canning industry in Canada and what the Morden Cannery is under contract now is 1,800 acres, but the amount of land that is suitable to irrigation in Manitoba alone is 12,800 acres. These canneries also need a large amount of water and the Pembina Triangle is one of the most significant areas of all Manitoba in that it is more densely populated and there's more industry in that area. These are all growth centres: Morden, Winkler, Carman and Altona, and they're going to continue to grow, and the success of these industries and these canneries will depend a very large amount as to whether there would be a dam put in which would give irrigation and recreational facilities. With the government owning the cannery now at Morden, I would say that it was a good thing for them to think about and also there will be expansion of the canning industry in Manitoba.

Another thing that's unique in this area is that in this area, what they call the Red River, the Pembina Valley area, there's 124 days that are frost free. This means that there are at least 20 days less of danger of frost in that area, and this is one of the big advantages when you're growing vegetables in row crop.

What I'm really trying to impress the government is that they should get with this and show some leadership. The former Conservative Government were going ahead with this project and on March 16, 1969, they were down to Ottawa and met with the Honourable Mitchell Sharp and Otto Lang about this. They were in the process of working out a satisfactory agreement between Ottawa and Manitoba when the election was called in 1969. Nothing has happened since. Now, as you might understand, this is water coming from both sides of the boundary, and if this is gone ahead with it's got to be a joint venture. So the United States were going to pay 60 percent of it. The cost at that time was \$33 million and if the United States was going to pay 60 percent of it this would leave Canada paying the other part, and then that part would be shared with Manitoba, so it really wouldn't be such a terrible expense for Manitoba although probably prices have gone up since the time this report was made and they may be somewhat higher. However, I do believe that some of the other values have changed too.

The government has done some things since it's been in power which are of a short term nature. We can't discredit them for this. Things like giving \$1.00 an acre up to a maximum of \$100.00 an acre has been of help to farmers and it's acceptable, but at the same time we do know that it's a vote-getter and it was done right before the by-elections. What we really need is long-term planning that will last so that our country will grow. United States have been wanting to go ahead with this project and have become impatient about it. At present they are talking about going it alone, and if they do go it alone it won't be just on the plan that was drawn up, Plan No. 2. They are talking about lowering the height of the dam at Walhalla by 12 feet. Now if this was lowered at Walhalla, it would mean that the water wouldn't flow from there by gravity north so that irrigation could be accomplished on this large acreage that I spoke about.

We have the cannery at Morden now and with United States wanting to go it, because they are also putting up two missile sites down there where they are going to be having about 1,000 people on each site. It's very necessary that they have water, and I feel that we would really be missing an opportunity if we didn't go ahead with it now or at least start with it now. It doesn't really mean that you're going to have to put up the money now but negotiations should be started now and probably by the time three years is up we'll have got far enough.

I also have to criticize the government for not having the foresight to help an area with the potential that there is in this area. With this very fertile soil that we have down there and with the dense population we have and the type of people we have, I think the government should take some action. These towns of Morden and Winkler and Altona, they are going ahead and they are going to continue to grow. There's no recreation facilities between the Red River and up around Killarney. Rock Lake has some but they aren't very good. If this dam was on the

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd.) . . . . Canadian side it would be providing recreation for these people.

As the years have gone by, the NDP Party have been criticizing the United States for investing money in our country and exploiting our resources. I have here an article that appeared in the paper yesterday, and it's in relation, it's got the heading here: "Gonick blast U.S. exploitation." He is a spokesman for the NDP Party and these relations, and here's what he has to say: "Canada may benefit temporarily from American exploitation of her natural resources, but in 50 years our resources will be depleted and Canada will become one great ghost town." And, by the way, he said this when he was speaking at a meeting held to organize a committee to raise funds to defend political prisoners in Quebec. That's another subject; I won't deal on that.

So now, I'm glad that I've had a chance to talk to you other members on it. You'll know what I'm talking about when I'm talking about the Pembina Dam. I hope that you bring this up in your caucus and your Cabinet and discuss it with your Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. We know he's a very stubborn man and maybe you can't change him, but if you get enough out and you can out-vote him, why you might be able to accomplish the same thing that you did in the Lotteries Bill. Thank you.

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

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I just want to indicate to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, knowing his interest in this, that we are prepared to accept his Address for Papers and supply the information for him in order that he may continue his endeavours.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion for Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there has been an agreement - I seek your advice by the way, Mr. Speaker - there has been an agreement between myself and the House Leader, I believe, that this Order would be held in abeyance to see if they could comply with it - it would take them some time, I understand. If I don't speak on it today it'll go off the Order Paper - if I don't proceed with it, Would the government indicate what their position is?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate to my honourable friend that we are prepared to accept the major portions of the Order. There's reservations in one or two respects that I would reveal to my honourable friend, but if he would care to introduce it, he can. It can be withdrawn by unanimous consent from the Order Paper, if I understand the rules correctly, and be re-introduced. If my honourable friend would prefer that course of action, with consent, then that may be advisable but I do want to indicate that there are certain reservations. I leave it to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, to use his judgment as to whether he should attempt to have agreement for withdrawal at that time so that he can re-introduce it, or take his chance on the reservations that we're going to put on the Order for Return.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if someone on the government side in debate would spell out what the reservations were, perhaps I could agree with it, but the vague suggestion that . . . -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll move the motion, and then in the debate perhaps the government can spell out the reservations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage - proceed.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence, reports and agreements between:

- the Government of Manitoba and the Jordan Wine Company;
- the Manitoba Development Corporation and the Jordan Wine Company;
- the Government of Manitoba and Valley Rouge Wines of Morris;
- the Manitoba Development Corporation and the Valley Rouge Wines of Morris;
- the Manitoba Government and Tartan Breweries;
- the Manitoba Development Corporation and Tartan Breweries;

Since June 25, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief, but there's two reasons for moving the Order; the first one was, during the question period about a week ago on questions pertaining to the Order, the Minister of Industry and Commerce suggested that I make that the subject of an Order for Return, which I did. Then there was a news report, or a television interview I believe it was, where the Minister stated that it had become a policy of his department, and I suppose of the government, to make an agreement with the firm to induce the firm to come in, and in that agreement spell out a prohibition prohibiting similar companies from establishing in this province, which may be desirable on a short term in order to get a plant in, in a particular field, but on the long term I wonder how far this government or any government should go in making an agreement of this nature. This means now that we have a freeze for some time on the establishing of wineries in the province no matter what. It could lead to, and I believe it has already led to a case where the Manitoba Liquor Commission is giving a favoured status to these companies. I'm not saying this is wrong but they have something like 26 or 32 listings, and other firms in Canada have a lesser number of listings in the catalogue and its place on the shelves of the Liquor Commission.

This is the type of restraint of trade that this government is raising quite an uproar about - I'm referring now to the chicken and egg war - so we may have a problem come home to roost much the same as other provinces who have limited our goods or our produce from going into their provinces, so I say to the government that this is a policy that requires very careful examination. If we are now going to, in another field entirely than agricultural products, that we are going to restrain the construction, or restrain trade, then I say restrain trade if it is a fact that the Liquor Commission has given more prominence in its shelf space and its listings to the two companies located in Manitoba than to other companies in Canada. This is a policy that has to be very carefully examined and this is the reason for my moving my Order for Return, Mr. Speaker.

The suggestion made by the acting House Leader that they're willing to go along with the major portion of my request is interesting, and I believe it's made in good faith and I'm willing to accept it, but I would like to know exactly what is being excluded. If an agreement has been negotiated and completed and enforced, and the Minister has stated publicly that this is an integral part of the agreement, that there will be a prohibition on other firms of that nature coming into the province for a given period of time, then I can see no reason for holding any information back, because this is really the information that we are seeking about that particular agreement. We also would like to know if in the negotiations with Tartan, if there's a similar clause in the agreements - this is the crux of the matter. It isn't every bit of correspondence that has gone on between the agency, the government and the parties concerned. It's whether or not the government's policy of restriction is the right and proper policy and we in this Legislature would make that decision when we've seen the correspondence and seen the agreements.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, 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 Member for Fort Rouge, The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to see that the Premier is not here since he turned down this request the other day. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development is absent; I believe the acting Premier's gone. Perhaps I could count on the acting House Leader to see that my arguments are brought to the appropriate people.

-- (Interjections) --

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking for a look at this report which has been prepared for the Minister was simply to try to clear up the tremendous confusion that exists in the community at the present time as to what the proposed community clinics will actually be. We've been subjected to conflicting and contradictory statements and a barrage that has been comparable to that which we were exposed to all winter long concerning the policies in the social assistance area and the conflicting reports that were sent out by the Welfare Advisory Committee, the Minister, and anybody who felt like stating some matter of policy.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)

Now, we're told that in the community clinics there hopefully will be a cost sharing by the Federal Government. I think we all realize that this has not been undertaken before and that this should be a major concern whether there would be a cost sharing such as there is in hospitals and out-patients' departments at the present time. It's suggested that the cost sharing be 40 percent federal, 40 percent provincial and 20 percent by a Community Clinic Board, and if then on another occasion maybe if Ottawa says "no" to this cost sharing, that then the province will cover two-thirds of the cost with the rest being taken over by the proposed clinic. I think the financing of these clinics is an extremely important item about which we would like to have more information.

We've been told at one time that originally there would be five such clinics: a downtown clinic, which sounds like an excellent idea; that Mount Carmel Clinic would be taken over, although we're told by representatives of that organization that they prefer to remain independent. There's to be a community clinic in Ste. Anne's; another in Churchill; and one in Seven Oaks. This is the statement the Provincial Government made, then the next thing we read in the newspaper is that the board of the proposed Seven Oaks Hospital is considering resigning because they had made all their plans, made their requests for a hospital, and now they are told that they are to have a community clinic instead. The Provincial Government appears to be over-riding the so-called grass-roots involvement; in other words, to say that there's grass-roots demand there would be pretty phoney.

Now, at other times there have been statements made that there will be as many - this is by the Minister of Health and Social Development - that they will start as many clinics as they can, presumably as many as ten within the Greater Winnipeg area. Now I think we all realize that in some areas such clinics might serve a need which is not being met at the present time. However, I suspect that in other areas there will be a definite duplication of existing clinic services and this is going to raise serious problems of manning such clinics. We hear variously that they would have seven doctors, 14 doctors or 20 doctors even, and it's just a little difficult to understand where the manpower is to come from.

We're interested in the status of Dr. Tulchinsky who apparently is here to advise concerning the community clinics. To a question asked of the Minister of Health and Social Development the other day, he replied: "Mr. Speaker, the role of Mr. Ted Tulchinsky is a part-time special consultant to the Minister of Health and Social Development." This is on Page 193 of Hansard, Monday, April 19, 1971. Later on we read in the newspaper that the same gentleman is to be an Associate Deputy Minister of Health. Then this report is denied.

We seem to hear or read various statements contradictory about the financing. We are told that the doctors may be paid on a per capita basis or that there may be medical staff paid under a written agreement. On April 27th we read that the government is ready to finance these clinics and on another time we read that the doctors will be on salary.

Now concerning the capitation possibility, or capitation fee, I think that we all would want to look very seriously at the experience in Great Britain where they have done their financing on this per capita basis, and in order to make a decent living the doctors have had to see so many patients that they could perhaps give them two or three minutes and that's all - just time enough to say, "Well are you feeling any better today?" and give them some more pills; they go home and they're told to come back in a couple of weeks if they don't feel any better. Now Manitobans are used to much better health care than that. They are accustomed to being able to go to their doctors and having a doctor give them enough time to determine what their health needs are.

We're told, too, that compulsion is out and that there's to be consumer participation; that there are to be membership fees - on that we get a yes and then a no. And then the Premier holds out a promise of considerable savings without saying how this is going to be managed, but we do read in the newspaper that - now let me see, where is it? - I think there was - Oh yes, an incentive allowance for establishment of clinics, as they have been shown to cut hospital utilization between 25 and 40 percent resulting in lower hospital cost. I hope that's true but I hope it doesn't mean that the quality of anyone's care is going to be sacrificed for the sake of this.

We know that there has been little, if any, consultation with the medical profession. I believe there was one meeting at which the conversation never got around to community clinics. The Manitoba Medical Association has stated in the newspapers that they at the present time

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) . . . . . have under preparation something like 15 position papers on the delivery of health care, so conceivably they might have some rather good ideas to share with the government if the government was willing to consult with them.

We are told that these clinics are to remain open 24 hours a day. I seriously question the need for this. I think that our out-patient departments in the principal hospitals seem to be able to handle all the emergency work and I can't conceive of being able to staff ten community clinics, in addition to all these other facilities, on a 24-hour basis. It doesn't seem necessary and it doesn't make sense. I think we have to ask, too, if doctors are going to be working in these clinics on a salaried basis, whether they are going to be willing to work the 60 to 80 hour week that they are now putting in. For just a while in the late 1950's and 1960's, the supply of doctors sort of caught up with the need and doctors actually got their working hours down to a moderate 60-hour week. They were seeing a little more of their families and perhaps they were closing a little bit that gap of -- I don't know whether the members of the Legislature are aware of, for instance, that the life expectancy of a doctor is six years less than that of anyone else in the community.

I think we have to keep in mind, too, that the principal reason that Manitoba has the numbers of doctors that it needs at the present time is due to the fact that the climate in Great Britain was so unattractive to them that they escaped to Canada and to the States, to other countries, where they found the environment a little more favourable, where they were not subjected to the capitation fee and being limited to perhaps two to three minutes per patient. They were able to practice good medicine in this country.

There is no explanation of where the medical manpower is supposed to come from. We know that many medical students, in fact very nearly all of them, go away to get their post-graduate work. Now many of them leave the country, they go to the United States principally, and I think that if, as they're suspected in some areas, the government is developing the community clinics with the idea of being able to bring the profession and the cost of medical care under government control, then I say that this spectre of government control may be enough to keep many of these graduates from coming back here to practice.

When the Premier speaks of important savings being made, I wonder whether he is taking into consideration the capital cost of providing the facilities and the additional administrative costs of running ten more centres. Also, I think we need some explanation as to whether existing clinics, which may be now medical clinics, can, by adding social services, then qualify to serve as these community health and social service clinics.

We're interested in the idea that Dr. Tulchinsky has come here as a special consultant. We are told that he is part-time. We are told various things. The Free Press in an editorial on April 20th may have come rather close to the best description when they refer to Dr. Ted Tulchinsky as "one of the numerous socialists who have been flocking to this new North American mecca to experiment on the Manitoba body politics." The same editorial raises a question about capitation fee and also wonders whether people are very anxious to parade their problems within their own community.

Now, to our astonishment the other day, we find articles in both newspapers which seem to indicate that this part-time specialist consultant has called a press conference and has made policy statements. Apparently they had not even been submitted to the Cabinet Ministers -- at least this is what is indicated by the Minister of Health and Social Development, that there still has not been a decision made, and we really question the propriety of such a person making such statements.

Now the Premier has turned down this request for the report by Dr. Tulchinsky on community clinics, on the basis that this is material that is privy to the government, and I take exception to that, Mr. Speaker. It is not an inter-departmental memo; it is a report by a special consultant, and in our understanding on this side, reports by special consultants are papers that should be available to the entire Legislature; that they are, after all, paid for by the people and I think that we deserve clarification and some facts. I think that we must know soon what is really meant by the proposed new health services delivery plan which the government speaks of.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it was interesting listening to the arguments put forward by the Honourable the Member for Fort Rouge. I think that there was some misunderstanding on her part as to the role that is being filled by the doctor mentioned in this particular



(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . . Address for Papers. It is true that the doctor in question was in the relationship of special consultant to the Minister of Health at one point in time, for a period I believe of just a few weeks, but that soon thereafter he was taken on as Associate Deputy Minister of the department.

Now, the rules governing the question as to what kinds of documents it is proper to table are very clear, and any reference, cursory reference to Beauchesne or Bourinot will make it clear in just a matter of a few minutes that any communications between an officer of a department and the Minister, or between officers of the department, are privy and as such there is no obligation; in fact, the rules and usages of parliament over the years counsel against tabling of such documents.

In the circumstance where a Minister of the Crown makes reference to such an internal document and quotes from it, makes specific reference to it, then of course it is open to honourable members opposite to ask that the document be tabled, but inasmuch as there has been no quotation or specific reference to any specific passages from the report or the document in question, there is no obligation to table it. In fact, as I say, usages counsel against making it public.

Now that doesn't mean that at some point in time it may not be in the public interest to make this report public, at which time the Minister will do so along with the statement as is made by a Minister when tabling a document - a statement before motions, or a statement on motions, rather - and I am suggesting that it is a real possibility that this may very well be done, but at this point in time there is no particular reason for tabling this document inasmuch as there is no policy formulated as yet.

Now the honourable lady suggested that there was something very much unusual, something very much wrong, in that policy statements were being made by persons other than elected members in government, and I suggest to her that, you know, that is virtually an impossibility because, unless a statement is made by a Minister of the Crown, it is not policy, by definition. Therefore, whatever statement was made by a public servant would be an expression of opinion, it would be an expression of a professional opinion, but it is not an expression of policy, automatically and by definition. Therefore I would suggest to my honourable friend that what she refers to as a policy statement by a consultant or a staff adviser is in fact not a policy statement.

Now, should this government feel it necessary to apologize or feel embarrassed by what appear to be contradictory statements with respect to the issue of community health centres? I suggest to the honourable member that there is no feeling of embarrassment or need for apology at all, for the simple reason that we are admittedly probing into an area of health care policy which has not yet been formally decided upon in terms of policy. It, after all, took a quarter of a century for the necessary consensus to build up for the implementation of public medical care insurance, and whereas it was -- the Honourable Member for Radisson is right, more than a quarter of a century, it could be argued with validity that it really was an issue in the public domain for half a century and in some countries of the western world even longer than a half a century. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that whereas public medical care insurance was introduced formally in this country on a pilot project in the late 1940's in one province, in one area of that province, and subsequently introduced province-wide in 1962, it took six years, perhaps seven years, between the implementation of a policy and program in one province before it was implemented here in Manitoba.

I believe that it will take, it will certainly take quite a number of months before there is any formal policy decision with respect to the concept of community health centres or clinics. Now, does that mean that we should therefore feel embarrassed because there are some diverging views expressed by different persons involved in the public service, in the government? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is an inherent part of policy formation in an open society; that a concept, once it is introduced by someone or another or a group and then there is an expression of counter opinion by some other individual or group and the issue is joined, it goes into the realm of public debate and discussion, and after a passage of time a policy is determined, and as I just tried to point out with respect to medical care, this process took years, in fact decades. And I rather suspect that this issue of community health centres, since it is rather novel in this province, even to this country in many ways, many parts of it, and to many people it is novel, that there is no likelihood nor is there any desirability in trying to come to a firm policy decision without conflicting views, dissenting views

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . and so on, in a matter of just a few weeks or even a few months.

So I'm afraid that honourable friends opposite will have to be about half, perhaps a quarter or a tenth as patient as we on this side had to be patient in the 1960's and 50's when we were talking about things like medical care and hospital insurance. They will have to be at least one-tenth as patient before there is actual implementation of concepts such as community health centres, such as the computer data banking of diagnoses of patients by doctors and so on. And that, by the way, is another very important concept in health care that is in many ways novel and which is now being put into the apparatus and to the procedure of policy determination - policy analysis and determination. Certainly there will be a good deal of dialogue and consultation between a government and the profession with respect to such things as the community health centre concept and the computer medical data banking of diagnoses and so on. There will be consultation and an interplay of views on this, and I don't think that my honourable friend was seriously suggesting otherwise. We make the distinction, however, between the process of consultation and some other process whereby a professional group impose their views without giving to government an opportunity to proceed with policies that are really believed to be in the public interest. We look forward to genuine dialogue and consultation, and I'm sure that it will take place.

So then, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would simply reiterate that certainly by all the usages of parliament, if this is what honourable members want to argue on, there is no question that the kind of information requested here has often, often been in the past deemed to be confidential and not in the public interest to table or reveal prematurely. At the appropriate time, however, I am sure that there will be the tabling of a report on this very subject matter along with an accompanying statement by the Minister indicating what the policy determination is.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Would the First Minister submit to a question? At what date was Dr. Tulchinsky appointed as Associate Deputy Minister?

MR. SCHREYER: The Minister of Health, I am sure, is in a position to answer; I'm not. All I can indicate to my honourable friend is that for a period of time Dr. Tulchinsky was a consultant it is true, but after the passage of a few weeks he was appointed as Associate Deputy Minister.

MRS. TRUEMAN: A supplementary question. Has the First Minister seen the report in the Tribune on April 28th . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder of what interest to the process of the House is it whether the Minister saw a report in the paper.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to ask if he knows that on that occasion a 12-page position paper . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member is debating the question. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: With your permission, Sir, I should reply because the honourable lady is correct. What I indicated was that Dr. Tulchinsky was a special consultant and that after passage of some weeks has been appointed Associate Deputy Minister. I understand that this is something that is about to be done, and in fact at this very point in time he is still a special consultant. Therefore, really in practical terms there's no great difference; what I indicated was already done is about to be done.

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

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, 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 Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of any correspondence, reports and agreements between the Government of Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg Navigation Ltd.

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.)

the Manitoba Development Corporation and Lake Winnipeg Navigation; the Manitoba Government and the Manitoba Development Corporation; regarding Lake Winnipeg Navigation.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Order was prompted by a remark of the Minister again where he was reported to have stated that one of the reasons the company had done as badly as it had was that there had been incredibly bad management, so I thought it would be in the interests of the members to see what the judgment of the government is, based on the correspondence whereby they advanced money in this particular case. That's really all I have to say.

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

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

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this resolution before us, namely the checking off of red meats as it pertains to the production of all red meats in the Province of Manitoba, I just want to speak briefly on this matter. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this is a subject that has some concern and interest to farmers generally throughout the Province of Manitoba over several years. It's not something that's come up just in the past year or two. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the matter was, to my knowledge, was first discussed about seven years ago, there wasn't too much interest in it at that time, and as the years went by the interest in the matter of checking-off of red meats seemed to grow.

I know when I was a member on the government side in the Legislature we had farmers approaching and asking us for legislation in order that this may be done, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, with farmers scattered all over the Province of Manitoba it's not easy to get the ideas and recommendations to the point where they may be all pretty well unanimous on a subject such as this, but I must say that because of varied conditions that the interest has grown. I can think of mainly the economic situation as we find ourselves in today and the way things have developed in the agricultural industry in the last couple of years particularly.

I think of the hog industry when in 1969 - and I'd like to quote a few figures here - we had a production in the Province of Manitoba of some just over 700,000; in 1970 we had an increase from that figure to just about a million. Now one million hogs to be produced in Manitoba where we have only a population of one million is a lot of pork and no one has to tell you, Sir, what the situation is with the pork producers today. They find themselves with prices depressed to the point where there is hardly a dollar to be made in the industry, and I think this is one valid reason why very serious consideration, I think, should be given to this matter because I am given to understand that many farmers through various organizations have come together, they have met with the Manitoba Marketing Board; they are very concerned and interested in establishing a red meat council whereby this would be the tool which could be allowed to operate and collect the check-off fees from all red meats.

Now there are those who might say that this is not a practical thing to do. There are those who might say that there's certain interests, such as maybe the packing industries, who might benefit more from a type of legislation of this kind than the actual producer themselves. I wonder about that, Mr. Speaker. In a time when farmers are having a difficult situation, and we've had the experience where governments have been involved and it hasn't worked out all that well, I think we have arrived at the point where farmers generally, through farm organizations, are coming to an impasse where they are pretty well agreed that they have to do

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) . . . . something to help themselves. I know I can think of the producers of cattle in the Province of Manitoba who have always been pretty much an independent group of fellows who have done reasonably well and I think we can take a lesson from that group of people. There are many cattlemen, too, who are fearing of the fact that they could get into the same dilemma that the hog producers are in.

So I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I say to the Minister of Agriculture that I think we have reached the point where we have to do something about this matter. In the economic situation that we find ourselves, now we have farmers who generally are willing to do something to help themselves, to establish a body, and this body in turn asking the Minister of Agriculture to set up legislation whereby the collection of say, 10 cents for a cattle beast - I only use this figure as an example; I don't know for sure what the ideas are in mind so far as the producers of red meats are concerned - but I think this could all be agreed upon by the various organizations. Fees could be established whereby they could collect on all the various red meats.

Now then, this sounds like a compulsory atmosphere in which this legislation is going to be drawn up, but the reason I say that I think it has to be collected from every producer is the fact that I'm given to understand that the meat-packing plants say that this is the only way that it could be operated. However, if there are producers who don't agree with this, they can ask to have this money refunded. There are some who will say that this is just not a practical way of doing things but I think that, in essence, it's a method by which - it is a voluntary system - and I think that we will find that most producers will be agreeable on this particular thing, particularly at a time when we have a surplus.

And we must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we produce agricultural products in the Province of Manitoba that we can't begin to consume, so I think it is all-important that we do dwell on such things as trying to find ways of developing a research system whereby we could find many ways of processing our raw products. We have interests in the province who are prepared to do that and I think we also have some means of finding markets for our products. I don't see anything wrong with farmers doing a little bit along those lines to help themselves providing they all agree on it, and the one important thing I want to emphasize to the Minister is the type of legislation that is going to be drawn up. I think, Mr. Speaker - I emphasize this very carefully that it's very important - it's the kind of legislation that is going to be established whereby it will assist the producers and not other areas. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is very important.

There's another area that comes into this subject, Mr. Speaker, and that is there are other interests that are not producing agricultural products but that are now developing and growing more every year as competitors of the raw products that we produce, such as synthetics in a number of areas, and these people and these interests, Mr. Speaker, are doing a lot of advertising to advertise that particular product.

At this time I want to say, Mr. Speaker, when the group of farmers gathered out in front of the Legislature the other day, one of the things that I said to them, and I commended them for it, that I hoped from this gathering that they would be able to impart some information, some knowledge of their experiences to the people who live in the cities. I think, Mr. Speaker, there are too many occasions whereby people in the cities read the papers, they read figures pertaining to the amount of money the farmers are getting for certain products and too often they are misleading, merely because they just don't understand the situation. I think this is very important, that we have a better understanding between the city folks and the rural people and vice versa. I think it works both ways; it's a two-way street.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I think this is very important, because if we don't do something to promote our products - because I know, to give you one example, we have many stories, many editorials on how butter affects the health of a human being - and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this has concerned me many times and I can't say that I agree at all times with this, but nevertheless -- (Interjection) -- Yes, you're a good genuine farmer. Nevertheless, this is something that can be damaging to our industry. It can be damaging to our industry and this is some of the things that we have to combat as agriculturalists. Now if we don't counteract these things and get information out to the people who are our customers, namely the consumer, then we are in serious trouble, for the simple fact that we have to depend on markets outside of our province as well as within our province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in making these few comments on this particular subject, I

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) . . . . . want to say in conclusion that there are other provinces who have already brought about legislation for the purpose of making check-offs on red meat, in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Now I think that we could do well, Mr. Speaker - and I advise the Minister of Agriculture I haven't looked at the legislation that has been carried out in those various provinces - but I do want to say to him that I would hope that if there are areas of that legislation that could be improved upon, well let's do so. In that way we could assist in making even better legislation that will suit the objectives insofar as the farmers of this province are concerned.

I want to say that I'm one who is very concerned in that kind of legislation that is going to be brought forward, if it is, that it will be in the interests of the producer, because I've had some comments, and they are not too many but they are concerned that this will be legislation of a kind that will benefit other than the farmers of this province, and I would hope that in this consideration that this will be looked at very carefully. I think that the time has now come, and I say when we were government the interest wasn't nearly that great as it is today, and I hope that the Minister will give very serious and earnest consideration on this matter that I think is of real interest to the great majority of producers of red meats of the Province of Manitoba. Thank you.

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

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Point Douglas, that the 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 Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the proposed resolution by the Member from Birtle-Russell because I believe that this resolution has a great deal of merit. Since this resolution was proposed, I have had the occasion of making some statistics as far as incidence of rustling in this Province of Manitoba, and particularly in the constituency of Ste. Rose which I have the honour to represent, and I find, Mr. Speaker, that in one detachment alone I was shocked at the amount of rustling taking place in our province.

We have a considerable amount of cattle in the Ste. Rose constituency and I've got some statistics on rustling in the Ste. Rose area in 1969, and I think that for the record and for the members in this House I should perhaps elaborate on the amounts of livestock that have been rustled and the value. I will say that in October there was seven head reported as stolen, value of \$1,200; in September, nine head, value of \$1,450; two head in September value \$350.00; four head in September, \$850.00 value; four head again in September, \$825.00 value; two head again in September, \$400.00 value; 12 head between July and October, value \$3,000; four head in October and November, \$600.00; six head reported stolen, \$1,150; three head, \$600.00; two head, \$325.00 - these all in the months of October and September - one head, \$250.00; two head, \$400.00; 14 head, \$2,950; two head, \$450.00; one head, \$240.00; two head, \$200.00; three head, \$561.00; one head, \$130.00. These are the cattle that have been reported as stolen or rustled in the constituency of Ste. Rose.

I might point out that there are 20 reports of cattle being rustled in our constituency and 17 of these reported rustlings are still unsolved. There has been three charges laid in respect to these cattle rustlings. I would say that the total amount that were reported was 82 head and the value was \$16,386, so it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that cattle rustling is a very lucrative business. The amount is probably much larger than what I have been able to ascertain, because many times in the fall when round-up is done there are cattle missing which people don't even bother to report as missing, they just presume perhaps they are strayed away or perhaps have died, but I think that we should look into this resolution and I would think that we should come up with some comprehensive inspection of brands. I have received this afternoon two acts from the Province of Alberta and one from the Province of Saskatchewan regarding the legislation there regarding brands. However, I think that they are perhaps outdated and I think there has been some amendments to these acts that I have here.

I don't want to elaborate too much on this, what I have said now, but I think we should do something as far as cattle is concerned in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose for I believe having made one of his first speeches in this House if

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . I'm correct, and let me say to him through you, Sir, that I envisage a distinguished future for him for he has seen the light in his very first utterance in this House to follow the example and the lead of a good party resolution put forward by the Member for Graham, and I want to tell him that, Sir, as long as he follows the example that's been given and supports our amendments and our resolutions he won't go too far wrong, although I must say that just like the advice sometimes given to us by the Honourable the House Leader, he too no doubt will have the tendency from time to time to depart from that well chosen course that he took this afternoon and find himself with that brand of renegade . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the member would be kind enough to debate the resolution.

MR. ENNS: Oh yes, I'm coming to the rustlers, Sir, and I would like to say a bit more emphatically that speaking to some of the cattlemen, of course they view this kind of a resolution and suggest "bring back the hanging judge" as the answer to the rustling of cattle in the Province of Manitoba. However, we're not at that particular stage with respect to our law enforcements and I don't advocate it either, although I must admit the chagrin that a cattleman feels when some of his prize livestock are gone. This usually happens, and the most favorite way this happens is when a livestock producer pens off a few head of cattle or his head of cattle in readiness for a sale the next morning - and this is done usually in the vicinity of a road or of a highway - and rustlers have found that this is a very convenient way of getting hold of these cattle. They've already been penned up for him and all they have to do is back up the truck and off they go. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, yes I am experienced. I, along with my lovely wife and five year old, six year old son, we moved 200 head of cattle off the pasture this morning before coming to this House. I assure you they were mine, and they were branded.

Brand inspection and the use of brands of course plays a pretty important role in this whole business. We were fortunate in having educated I think increasing numbers of cattlemen in the province to use brands, and we have their brands registered. This is a prerequisite to being able to do anything with respect to this resolution. I think also the resolution has to be expanded somewhat, that it is not simply the lack of comprehensive inspection at our stockyards, but of course the event of many local feeder sales such as they have in the constituency of Ste. Rose, in the constituency of St. George, in the constituency of Lakeside and others, in fact spread throughout the Province of Manitoba we have a number of localized feeder auction sales or sales houses. These are becoming increasingly popular with cattle producers and cattle buyers, and of course any inspection that would be carried out in the province would have to be carried out in these places of sale and business as well.

I think this resolution bears the serious consideration by the Department of Agriculture. I think it's the kind of resolution that could only be introduced at about this time and in view of the fact that branding was not carried out that extensively and still is not carried out as extensively as perhaps it should be in the province. I think the Minister of Agriculture, though not in his seat, would recognize that prior to making this resolution meaningful we would have to see to it that cattle are branded and branded properly throughout this province, and then in fact we can act upon this resolution. I think the Minister could give us considerable information when he rises to speak on this resolution if he can give us some indication as to the percentage of number of cattle that are in fact being branded, how the branding program is running in Manitoba, and then also of course, particularly in view of the kind of statistics that the Member for Ste. Rose gave us, we would have to consider the cost involved of carrying out a brand inspection program.

I might suggest to him that he may well consider this as being the kind of a program that the producers organizations may choose to participate in - and I use the word "may" - if for instance the Minister were agreeable to accepting the resolution put forward by my honourable friend and colleague the Member for Rock Lake with respect to the check-off which is required for that specific industry. I believe in allowing people to do things for themselves, whether it is with this resolution or with other resolutions, and I think that we have a situation where this resolution is finding a considerable amount of popularity among the cattle producers in the Province of Manitoba and it should be given every serious consideration by the Department of Agriculture and I look forward to the Minister's participation in this debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

May 4, 1971

599

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00.