

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, June 8, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

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 14 students Grade 7 and 8 standing of the Kane Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kehler. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

We also have 57 students of Grade 11 standing of the Garden Valley High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Schroeder and Miss Barker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

We have 60 students Grade 4 standing of the Happy Thought School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Klym and Miss Leadbeater. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

We have 25 students of Grade 6 standing of the St. Marie School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Aimé and Mrs. Labossiere. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

There are 22 students of Grade 12 standing of the Vita Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. and Mrs. Segal. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

There are 25 students Grade 11 standing of the River East Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Krawchuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the First Minister.

And there are 7 students, Grade 6 standing of the Bloodvein School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Penner and Miss MacDonald. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

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

MATTERS OF URGENCY AND GRIEVANCE

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

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent public importance. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that pursuant to Standing Order No. 26, this House do now adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, that the Premier, by his intimidation of the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro, -- (Interjection) -- is saying that the jobs of all senior Hydro officials depend on their participation in the public insult of a distinguished former Premier of Manitoba and that by this act the Premier has placed in immediate jeopardy the non-political nature of the Manitoba public service.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I wish to thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for giving me notice of this motion to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. After perusing the same I find that the honourable member's motion contains two items for debate, namely one in respect to Manitoba Hydro, and a former Premier of Manitoba; and secondly, a matter in respect to the Manitoba public service. Our Rule 26, subsection (6) (b) states that not more than one matter may be discussed on the same motion. Furthermore, Beauchesne's 4th Edition, Citation 100 subsection (3) states: "Urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself but means urgency of debate." Consequently I must indicate that there's ample opportunity provided within our rules for this matter. The estimates of the Minister responsible for Hydro are to be considered shortly.

I also wish to indicate to members that this matter is now before a Standing Committee which is meeting regularly. For these reasons I must rule the motion of the honourable member out of order.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I, with great regret, Sir, must challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

MR. JORGENSEN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order, please. The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Craik, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, Moug, Sherman, Spivak, Watt and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Ayes 26; Nays 17.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Ayes" have it, I declare the motion carried.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Has the First Minister issued, or does he intend to issue any instructions to the members of the Hydro Board to the effect that they must examine all other senior Hydro officials or any in particular to determine whether they agree with the majority decision of the Board to regulate Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to then ask the First Minister another question. What was the purpose and the intent of the public statements of the Premier in singling out Mr. Kris Kristjanson to have him examined by the Board as to whether he agrees or disagrees with the control of Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet let me reply to the first question by saying that I didn't reply to it earlier because it really is ridiculous. With respect to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Point of order. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, by the fact that he . . . and refused to answer the question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would like to suggest to all honourable members that if they have a point of order, they should state it; not try to debate and then state the point afterwards. Let him have the point of order so I can adjudicate. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your opinion more than you'll ever know, but I'm asking in the interest of fairness . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Order. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the point of order, if there is one before you, Sir, I would point out to you for your recollection that it is commonplace when someone rises to answer a question, to take advantage of that opportunity to answer a previous question that had been put earlier that day or even on previous days. So in order to keep strictly within the rules, then, Sir, I will defer my answer to the first question until I have completed my answering to the most recent one. Fine. The end result is the same, in any case.

Mr. Speaker, in answering the question put by the Leader of the Opposition as to why I singled - I'm trying to use the honourable member's words as close as I can - as to why I singled out Mr. Kristjanson, I must point out that is precisely what I did not do. I did not single out Mr. Kristjanson at all. In reply to a question from someone from the press I said that the same procedure was followed in all circumstances where someone on the board of an organization or on its paid salaried staff could not find himself or herself able to accept a policy decision arrived at by majority decision that such a person or persons are expected to resign. I said this is commonplace; this is standard procedure and I, in fact, replied very deliberately in a way as to give it general application and not to single anyone out.

Now then, Sir, while I'm on my feet, if I may reply to the first question, I will say that

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) I really do find the first question ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister. Could he give the House the occasion on which Mr. Kristjanson declared a policy contrary to Manitoba Hydro Board policy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I am of the opinion that this line of questioning is leading us to the subject matter which is before a committee which has not reported to this House as yet, consequently I cannot see that we should follow this line any longer. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The remarks of the Premier were not made in committee; they were made outside of committee and he's answerable to the House for them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I believe that this is a legitimate question to be asked in the House, and my question again, I'll put: On what occasion did Mr. Kristjanson express a policy contrary to the Manitoba Hydro Board policy.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question with precision nor am I aware that such a contrary statement was ever made, which simply reinforces the answer I have just given which was that the reply I gave yesterday was framed in terms of general application and was not with specific reference or exclusive reference to Mr. Kristjanson, but rather an explanation as to what is the standard procedure in cases where a member of a board or a salaried person does not find himself or herself able to accept the policy-decision arrived at in the normal way that the course is open to them to either find whether or not it's possible to accept such a decision or to resign.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Then I take it that Mr. Kristjanson is under no obligation to resign, according to the newspaper?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there may be the element of hypothetical in this but I will answer in any case. That the same procedure that would apply in circumstances of the kind I've just outlined, applies to everyone, including First Ministers of the province. If in the event a policy-decision were arrived at which by majority will was one that either I or one of my colleagues felt that we could not accept, then we would either have to ponder deeply to see whether or not we could accept it, all things being taken into account, and if not to resign, this is standard and almost - well, it is of universal application.

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

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate whether it's the government's intention to provide for disclosure of the Manitoba Development Corporation loans?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there seems to have been some misunderstanding in connection with that very point in recent days. Let me make it very clear that we did pass legislation in this House during the term of this government last session, providing for the disclosure of the particulars of loans made by the MDC, and to the best of my knowledge of the workings of this legislation, the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- first of all, through an annual report of the MDC, these particulars of loans made are to be made public, and in addition to that with respect to equity positions that may be taken, the Minister of Industry and Commerce is answerable in the Standing Committee on Economic Development. So that I for one, Mr. Speaker, am at a loss to know just what is meant by recent statements that there is need for "disclosure". We have provided for disclosure. The only circumstances under which this disclosure does not apply is with respect to those loans that were made prior to the coming into force of that Act, because commitments for non-disclosure were made to previous borrowers. But I can assure you, Sir, that all loans that have been made since the coming into force of this Act, the successful borrowers have been informed that particulars of their loan will be made public, and accordingly they will be made public.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Our rules very clearly state, Sir, that during Orders of the Day when the question period is in progress, and you have quite rightly enforced that rule on many occasions, that the questions must be succinct and to the point. I draw to your attention, Sir, that the answers must be relevant to the questions as well and not the occasion for the First Minister to make public speeches.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On that alleged point of order, Sir, I merely wish to point out to you that I am in your hands. I take instructions as to points of order from you, Sir, and I certainly wouldn't find it advisable to take any advice from the Member for Morris since I've seen him abuse the rules both here and in other places.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, on Friday the Honourable Member for Emerson asked a question of the First Minister which was taken as notice in respect to whether or not calls, phone calls to Autopac were being taped. The answer is of course, "no", there is no taping of such calls.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the First Minister in connection with a question raised by the Honourable Member for St. George. Does the matter of confidence also apply on loans that were made earlier when they come up for refinancing and when they're refinanced, or do they come into a different category at that time?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate, Sir, that I cannot answer that question in less than perhaps two or three minutes, so I suppose I must now then undertake to answer at the pleasure of the Honourable Member for Morris.

I would answer as follows, in reply to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that the provisions of the Act are very clear, that the disclosure of the particulars of the loan apply to those loans that have been made since the coming into force of the Act. There is a problem, and I freely admit that it is a bit of a conundrum, in that while we would like to have full disclosure even with respect to loans that were made before the coming into force of the Act, nevertheless commitments of non-disclosure, or confidentiality in other words, were given to these previous borrowers and we would then be in a position of breaking a commitment given by previous administrative officers of the Crown. So we are pondering that one, and if someone on the other side is of genius I.Q. perhaps we can find a solution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is the government contemplating putting on tighter controls in connection with education and school financing by way of further legislation or regulation at this session?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, it's a matter for policy.

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 Industry and Commerce and it relates to the present situation with respect to the CAE crisis. Can the Minister advise the House whether the Federal Minister of Transportation is back in the country as would seem to be indicated by radio reports last night; and if so when is the Air Policy Committee going to meet with him?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, we have been advised by wire from the Honourable Minister of Supply and Services, Mr. James Richardson, that he will endeavour to speak to Mr. Jamieson upon his return to Ottawa to establish a meeting for the Air Policy Committee as soon as possible. I'm disappointed that they did not agree to meet with us this week as we urged; in fact we urged, as the honourable member knows, to meet last Friday; this was not possible because of matters in Ottawa and we have no indication of meeting this week as much as we are desirous thereof. So we only have the assurance from Mr. Richardson that he will endeavour to set up a meeting with Mr. Jamieson himself and perhaps other federal officials and the Air Policy Committee as soon as they can possibly set it up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the employees at the CAE base afford to wait till next week for this meeting?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows full well about my concern for the employees and the layoff and I've expressed them many times publicly. We can't afford to wait, of course we can't.

MR. SHERMAN: Does the Minister think that an excursion to Ottawa now, not dependent

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . upon the whim and the pleasure of the Minister of Transport, would be effective in breaking the log jam?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. We can't have a question on a question. I'm sure the honourable member wants some routine in his House. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, if he wishes to answer.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to go to Ottawa on a flight this evening or as soon as we can arrange the whole committee, but just exactly who are we going to speak to?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Does the government endorse by its silence the insult gave to Mr. Campbell by Mr. Cass-Beggs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's a moot point whether or not it is an insult to the individual - the circumstance or case that the honourable member refers to. There was no such adjective used to describe Mr. Campbell, as my honourable friend full well knows; therefore there's something of the mischievous in his question. However, it's true that the calculations were described in a rather unflattering way, for which I do have a sense of regret, but certainly I did not interpret the remark as being in any way descriptive of Mr. Campbell.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure honourable members would not want to refer to a matter that is before the committee. I trust to their judgment since I am not there. The Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It's hardly still before the committee; it's in the public prints now which takes it out of the realm of the committee and puts it in the public arena, Sir.

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

STATEMENT

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the permission of the House to make a brief report on the discussions over the past weekend with the Economic Mission which was sponsored by the Government of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, our prime interest centered around encouraging more Japanese capital participation in Manitoba projects, particularly in the field of secondary manufacturing. The interest of the Japanese in extractive resources is already apparent and the arrangements between Sherritt-Gordon and Mitsubishi, for example, are mutually beneficial. We suggested they examine joint venture approaches to the development of new secondary manufacturing enterprises here. While the main purpose of the visit was to consider long-term prospects we have provided them with a portfolio of investment opportunities and as a result we can expect early discussion on specific projects that can be undertaken.

The Mission did indicate that while its foreign exchange had been growing there were limited areas at present where foreign investment and foreign lending could be applied. After listening to our proposals, Mission spokesmen indicated that they were prepared to suggest that Japan look into changing its investment policy and its lending policy. In any event there are hopeful areas, Mr. Speaker, for further exploration and discussion and it is our intent to pursue these.

In the matter of trade, our interest lay in increasing our sales to Japan, not only of basic goods and materials but finished and semi-finished goods together with processed foods. It is worthy of note that the Mission leader said that while Japanese consumers had good purchasing power and were attracted by the quality, variety and novelty of foreign goods, nevertheless it was a competitive market which was better known to the United States, Australia, Asia, and Europe, rather than to Canada. In other words, we in Canada they claimed were not aggressive salesmen in that rich market of 103 million people which we would do well to follow up. Against this background of new possible approaches in investment and the need for stepped-up sales in Japan, the Honourable the First Minister stated to the Mission that should tangible reasons appear we would be prepared to send a Manitoba Government business mission to Japan possibly late this year or in 1972.

There is no doubt that Japan in the future will become an even more important trading partner with Canada than at present, and when one considers that in this field she now ranks third behind the United States and Great Britain, it indicates how vital it is that Manitoba

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) become firmly involved economically with this progressive country. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All Manitobans will wait with hope and expectancy for tangible results of benefit to Manitoba from the Mission that visited here this past week. We, in this Party, Sir, would like to at this juncture formally place ourselves on the record as being warmly solicitous of the members of that mission and of their interests in economic possibilities with our province and also warmly grateful to the Minister and to the government for inviting the mission to spend as much time as it did here in Winnipeg and Manitoba. The visit here was relatively one of the longest ones, if not the longest one in terms of specific locale of the entire tour, and hopefully that holds promise of good things and good results for Manitoba. We would hope that the government will pursue this initiative very vigorously. Oftentimes in the past initiatives of this type, in this field and others, have been undertaken and then have been allowed to wither to some extent, have not been pursued as vigorously or as forthrightly as they require, and I know the Minister is fully conscious of the fact that particularly in terms of trade with Japan which now is a very attractive economic partner for all nations of the western world, that kind of initiative has to be followed up with more than the usual amount of persistence and vigor lest we be beaten out in the race for opportunities with Japan by other states, provinces and countries.

I was particularly gratified, and my colleagues were to note the First Minister's specific reference to the long mooted uranium enrichment plant in the northern part of our province which is a dream but still a very desirable and hopefully a realistic dream; his raising of this subject with members of the Japanese Mission was timely and like other aspects of the conversations will hopefully produce some results in the future.

The reference of the Minister to processed foods - that field is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, because that is one area of trade, one area in the economic picture where we have perhaps in Manitoba a better opportunity to develop economic ties with Japan and the Japanese than almost any other part of this country.

I noted recently in looking at the opportunities available in Japan for manufacturers, processors and producers in this province, that the field of processed foods and particularly the field of table delicacies like honey, Manitoba honey, for example, seems to be a right one, seems to present opportunities that we could exploit and develop very swiftly; so I would hope that the Minister maintains his emphasis on that aspect of the possible trade relationship.

Finally, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that we would hope in the Conservative Party that emphasis will be placed on marketing possibilities for our manufactured goods because, as the Minister needs no reminding, the emphasis on the relationship is heavily on the side of raw materials where Canada and Manitoba's end of the relationship is concerned, heavily on the side of manufactured goods where the Japanese end of the relationship is concerned, and some evening up, not necessarily a total evening up, but some rationalization of that discrepancy is desirable. A number of commodity import restrictions have been lifted in Japan in recent months; in fact within the next six months, if my information is correct, there will be only something in the neighborhood of 35 or 40 individual commodity items that will be on an import restriction list in Japan which will place Japan in the same kind of category as Germany is at the present time, which makes it a much more attractive trading partner and possibilities for us where manufactured goods are concerned. I would hope the Minister and his colleagues will focus heavy attention on that aspect of the opportunity. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Minister's statement, I have a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: When he stated that the Japanese Mission was interested in secondary industry development here and investment, did I understand him correctly, that they're also interested in investing in the agricultural industry of this province and bringing about secondary industries in the agricultural section?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I indicated, and if I did, I did not mean to indicate that they're interested in investing in agriculture as such. They may be very interested, however, in buying, hopefully, some of our processed farm products.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you're happy as we all are happy that there has been a settlement in CFI in The Pas, no thanks to the Minister of Labour. I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if the Minister would advise the House as to whether or not, as a principle, he has any knowledge of the discharge of 20 more employees in the near future at CFI?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have knowledge of what you suggest is an anticipated layoff of another 20 employees at CFI. No, I don't have that information, I'm not aware of that, but I'll take the matter as notice and look into it for you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture when we might expect a reply to my Order for Return for hail insurance operation in the province in the past year which was submitted some weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): The honourable member may have guessed, it will be soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question to the First Minister. I thank him for his attention. I wonder if the First Minister had prior knowledge of the recent question by the Honourable Member for St. George?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to keep honourable members informed as to the number of times that I'm given prior notice by an honourable member and the number of times that I'm not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for either the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce; it relates to the Air Canada meeting in Ottawa. In view of the inability to be able to meet this week, will the government be prepared now to acknowledge the mistake in not calling the Air Canada Policy Committee earlier as it was requested in this House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the implied suggestion that somehow something was lost by not trying to get a meeting earlier I think is a wrong suggestion demonstrated by the fact that when we have tried to have meetings arranged with all of the appropriate Federal Ministers, it proved to be difficult to the extreme.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would acknowledge or would indicate to the House that if in fact negotiations had commenced with Ottawa . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. It's hypothetical. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could inform the House of the possibility of limited flood protection that has been requested along the Rat River.

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, I thank my honourable friend for having given me notice of this question. I don't think there's anything wrong with that procedure -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government with regard to flood compensation, what I think the honourable member is asking about, is to try to do as we did last year, see to it that the policy offers no more nor any less than what has been given in previous years; and with specific reference to the location that my honourable friend is referring to, the department is now studying it and I'll have an answer for my honourable friend, I hope soon.

MR. GIRARD: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Honourable Minister realize fully that this was not flood compensation but it was in fact flood protection that I had given him prior knowledge of.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had understood it to be flood compensation. If it's flood protection it will be dealt with in the same way. It is being looked at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour. Can we expect to have amendments to the Labour Relations Act brought in this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: That will be revealed in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education. Has the Minister kept his score sheet up-to-date on the number of students that have been placed under the Student Employment Bureau?

MR. MILLER: No.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Another question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Could the Minister inform this House and indeed the people of Manitoba, when the results of the university examinations can be expected by the students?

MR. MILLER: I'll take that one as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct another question to the Honourable House Leader. I wonder if he could advise the House if possible as to when we can expect the Estimates of the Transportation Department?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education will be followed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the sequence after that has not yet been set.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Churchill. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. The question is open. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek 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 Birtle-Russell and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry wishes to speak?

MR. SHERMAN: I would like to ask permission of the House to speak on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems particularly timely and interesting that we should be confronted with this resolution today having to do with human rights, having to do with the protection of the civil rights of individuals when we have a situation in the province arising out of a meeting yesterday of the Public Utilities Committee finding its way in reporting terms into the media, the newspapers and related news media today, where in the opinion of this party, Mr. Speaker, the civil rights of a particular individual are being challenged. The civil rights in fact of many colleagues of the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro may indeed be seriously challenged by the kind of position that the First Minister, and presumably by implication his colleagues have taken with respect to a public position which that individual, the Assistant Manager of Manitoba Hydro took yesterday arising out of a situation that occurred in the meeting at a Public Utilities Committee to which I have referred.

Mr. Speaker, we have had many sermons and much sermonizing from the government side of the House on their belief in and their adherence to the concept of "open" government. Time and time again in the 22 1/2 months in which this government has been in office there have been public differences of opinion expressed in the strongest terms, sometimes in terms ranging on the very borders of verbal violence with respect to positions that the government has taken and with respect to individual beliefs held by individual members of that government

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) conflicting with the positions of their colleagues in that government on such policy matters. Time and again these differences of opinion have flared into public exposure in a most unattractive way. Whether the government itself feels that those differences expressed have done anything to injure the image of the administration of the government, in fact of the New Democratic Party, is really beside the point. The important question is whether those differences have done anything to reflect in a damaging way upon the image, the integrity, the appearance of the Government of Manitoba as such, as an institution. In other words, on the integrity of the Province of Manitoba and of the people of Manitoba. In our opinion many of those differences have been ugly enough to reflect in such a damaging way.

In our opinion, many of the open and only barely controlled confrontations between individual members of the present administration on a wide-ranging number of policy issues and possible questions of public interest have contributed to a general downgrading of the image of the Province of Manitoba through the Government of Manitoba and thereby of the Manitoba society itself, of the people of Manitoba. We have felt that in general the performance of the government in that area has been harmful and hurtful and has been one which should have drawn the stern and conscientious attention and action of the First Minister long long ago. Nevertheless, the Minister has condoned these differences of opinion, these open confrontations, the only barely veiled hostilities that exist

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't follow the point that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is making. The mover of the resolution here is dealing with human rights and he certainly isn't speaking on that subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Logan will bear with me for another moment or two, I'm sure he will see the significance of my introductory remarks. My introductory remarks are related very directly to the question of human rights and civil rights and the protection thereof, and the point I'm trying to make is that we have had here in the past 22 months examples of near violent differences of opinion in the present administration that have been defended and protected by the First Minister of this province on the grounds that this is representative of reflective of "open" government. This government has paid more than lip service I must concede to the concept and the philosophy of open government. It's a reasonable objective, the validity and the merits of which I don't challenge, but Mr. Speaker, it is extremely ironic to say the least that this government which should do so much sermonizing about the concept of open government and the First Minister who should be so ready to defend and rationalize the differences of opinion publicly expressed among his own colleagues, should draw the line when it comes to the question of differences of opinion at the public level, that is at the level of the private citizen, and at the level indeed, as a case in point, of employees of public corporations of the Province of Manitoba.

So when the First Minister talks about open government it becomes something of an illusion and something of a distortion of what is really taking place socially and philosophically under this administration, because over and against the studious attempts to rationalize differences of opinion and criticism on the treasury benches there is no such attempt to defend or protect or safeguard or even endorse the kind of differences of opinion, the kind of constructive criticism, the kind of battling criticism that is from time to time manifesting itself in the area of society at large, manifesting itself in the area of the private citizen. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I would, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Can the Honourable Member for Fort Garry give one or more examples, but even one would do perhaps, to support his argument that there are apparently governments elsewhere in Canada, either Federal or Provincial, that would countenance, that would accept a public servant speaking out publicly against a policy decision arrived at in the normal way? Can you give an example.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I might be able to do that but I think it would be a detraction from the point at issue, because if I may correct the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, he's proceeding from the erroneous impression that the public servant to whom we're referring, in this case, the Assistant Manager of Manitoba Hydro, was speaking out against a policy decision when in fact that individual, and the record will show, was very careful, very explicit,

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . very conscientious about saying that he was dissociating himself from only one thing, he was dissociating himself from what we - and these are my words not his - from what we in this Party consider an odious public insult to a distinguished public servant of the people of Manitoba, namely, the former Premier of this province, Mr. D. L. Campbell. Now what the Assistant Manager of Manitoba Hydro did was dissociate himself from that insult, not from any policy decision that had been made.

Mr. Speaker, this is a case in point of a citizen, someone from the private sector as well as in this case the public sector, speaking out in free - or what he believed to be - free and reasonable articulation of a position which involved dissociation of a position taken by another servant of the Province of Manitoba, and I say to you, that had that happened within the treasury benches, within the caucus of the government itself, there would have been no attempt by the First Minister of this province to outline and anticipate a course of action and a decision for that dissenting individual, whereas in the situation that has arisen with respect to the individual to whom I refer, there has been a course of action and a posture taken by the First Minister which does attempt to anticipate the future position of that individual and does attempt to stake out for him a step and a position which he must take and from which there is no withdrawal. Either he must subscribe to the report as it was delivered in Public Utilities Committee by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, Mr. Cass-Beggs, or the First Minister suggests that his proper course is to resign. Well this is rather like putting somebody in a court room and asking them to answer . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: It seems to me, Sir, that you would be well advised to consider this argument on the point of order. It is my recollection that our rules provide that the substance of a subject matter that is before a Standing Committee of this House cannot be debated in the House, in the Assembly of the House itself. Now this rule, as I understand it, does not apply in instances where specific related subject matters that emanate from the main subject matter before a Standing Committee may be discussed in this Chamber, but the main subject matter itself may not, according to my understanding of the rules, Sir, and I would ask you to consider that.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable First Minister. I was on the verge of asking the honourable member to relate his remarks to human rights and not to the matters before the committee. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I accept your direction, Mr. Speaker, but I must plead with you and with the First Minister that the material to which I refer is extremely relevant in the context of the resolution that we're debating at the present time, and that is a resolution seeking to enshrine civil and human and individual rights in this province, and I'm suggesting by my argument, Mr. Speaker, that the civil and human and individual rights of a particular individual are being challenged if not abrogated by events emanating from circumstances occurring yesterday in that meeting of that Public Utilities Committee in question.

Mr. Speaker, the position that was taken by the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro yesterday is not at issue here and I concede that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think that point of order was raised to debate what is taking place before another committee. I have stated it on numerous occasions. I hope the gentleman will contain himself and conduct himself accordingly. I am not a member of that committee so I have no way of really knowing until he does tell me that this is what transpires in the committee. I would suggest that he not repeat this error. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that particular position is not at issue here and I concede that, but the posture which our party interpreted as an insult to Mr. Douglas Campbell is at issue here because it is out of that that the Premier has taken his position today with respect to the future of the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro, and I say that the rights of the individual concerned, the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro, are threatened and challenged if not abrogated by that position; and if my friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, does not agree with me that that comes under the umbrella of relevance where a debate on civil rights is concerned, then I'm afraid that he and I would never be able to dialogue rationally on anything. Surely as a lawyer he would concede that this is one subject, this is one topic that does logically and conscientiously fit under the umbrella of civil rights. It is my opinion that the civil rights of that particular individual have been challenged, have

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) been threatened and as I suggested, perhaps even abrogated, but I'm not a lawyer and I'm not competent to make a statement as judicially fine as that, but the fact is that this is the issue which emanates from that meeting yesterday on which my position with respect to the resolution on civil rights is based and that's the only reason for my reference to the meeting that took place yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I'll avoid reference to it in the future in keeping with your direction, Sir. -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I ask the honourable member the question because I believe that he was a Member of Parliament at the time when the incident took place. I ask the honourable member if he recalls the occasion, I believe in early 1966, when a person employed in the Federal Department of Health and Social Welfare expressed, publicly, disagreement with the concept policy of the Canada Pension Plan and was asked within a matter of 48 hours or so by the then Federal Minister to submit his resignation. Does the honourable member recall that, and if he does, does he regard that as an infringement on civil rights, as that term "civil rights" is normally understood?

MR. SHERMAN: In answer to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, yes I do recall the incident. I don't regard that as an infringement of civil rights nor would I regard what has happened in the past 36 hours in connection with Manitoba Hydro an infringement of civil rights if the individual to which I've referred had stood up and said that he dissociates himself from the position taken by the Board, but he, I submit to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, has not said so, has not done so, has not even implied so, and I think the First Minister is seriously mistaken if he draws that kind of inference from that individual's remarks. I suggest that in the case to which he's referring, had that particular civil servant made a statement in which he said he wished to dissociate himself from certain remarks that had been made by one of his superiors with respect to a certain individual, which was the case yesterday, then I think the First Minister would agree that that would be a fair and conscionable position for that civil servant to take and that he should not have his civil rights challenged or his future tenure challenged on that basis.

The First Minister says that is not the case but it is my recollection of what happened, that it was specifically pegged to remarks that were made about and reflected upon the sagacity of the former Premier of Manitoba, Mr. D. L. Campbell - and I say this, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I say this, that when the First Minister opposite has contributed - and he's contributed a good deal to the public life of this province, I don't take that away from him - but when he has contributed to the public life of this province to the extent that Mr. Campbell has and when he has been Premier half as long as Mr. Campbell has, I would stand up and defend him in the same capacity. In fact, at the present time, if in a public hearing of that sort the sagacity and the reasoning powers and the thinking processes of the First Minister were attacked unreasonably in the way that Mr. Campbell was attacked yesterday, despite and notwithstanding our partisan political differences, I submit I would stand up and defend the First Minister of this province against that kind of an attack. What he says to me, what he says to me and what I say to him in this Chamber is another ball game, and he'd be the first to concede that. We both assumed the responsibility and ran the risk of that kind of confrontation and that kind of criticism when we stood for election to this Assembly; but a Standing Committee of the Legislature, involving personalities who are not responsible to the electorate, and particularly involving one who has the record that Mr. Campbell has, I submit to you, is quite a different arena. I must say that for all the different confrontations and all the quasi-violent terminology that many of us have used against many others of us in this Chamber, I was shocked, indeed outraged yesterday by the language that was used by Mr. Cass-Beggs in describing the presentation and the submission of Mr. Campbell. I suggest to you that that language, what that language really said was that Mr. Campbell was not making a competent presentation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is debating what is transpiring in the committee. He has so indicated.

MR. SHERMAN: And to me, Sir, that was an odious insult. Now, to take the position that a citizen of Manitoba, and furthermore a public employee of Manitoba, a person who has an executive position with Manitoba Hydro, must subscribe to that position, must adopt the same posture, must endorse that kind of attack or else put his job on the line, I say to you is a challenge to his civil rights and this is what we are talking about in this resolution, civil rights.

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.)

And to get back to the objection which the Honourable Member for Logan raised a few moments ago, I say that it sits not well indeed, Sir, with the kind of defences that the First Minister has rushed to construct for those Ministers of his who in the past 22, 23 months have had violent and public difference of opinion. And if the First Minister is prepared in the interest of his professed faith in open government, to construct those defences and to permit that kind of open confrontation and difference of opinion where his colleagues on the treasury bench are concerned, he should be prepared to do the same thing for private citizens and for public employees, for individual Manitobans who wish to abide by the dictates of their own conscience on questions affecting their conscience - and this was clearly a question affecting the conscience, affecting the individual feelings of that individual. Are we going to have a situation here, an open government that permits guaranteed protection for privileged members of that society or is it going to be not only an open government but an open society that permits free criticism, free opposition for all members and permits it equally to all members. I think the First Minister owes, particularly himself, a serious re-examination of the position that he took with respect to the incident in question, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that he is seriously challenging, and as I've suggested, perhaps even abrogating the civil rights of that individual by suggesting to him that he has to endorse a position taken by somebody else with which he doesn't agree, and it was not a policy paper, it was a personal opinion on the personal capacity of a distinguished Manitoban and public servant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Sir.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like to know - could the honourable member please inform me as to what statement of mine that he is relying on for insisting that I have in turn insisted that a person must agree with a particular statement or turn of phrase. My reference to the press and in the question period today was with respect to a policy position arrived at. Does the honourable member recognize the difference between policy position and a turn of phrase?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I'm at the mercy of press reports in this situation. I only know what the press has reported the First Minister to have said in this connection and those reports indicate that he has said that the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro must consider resigning if he cannot accept the majority decision of the Hydro Board to proceed with regulation of Lake Winnipeg. I believe that that's fairly accurate. But the point that I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the First Minister has constructed a situation here, either wittingly or unwittingly, which does not in fact have any bearing to what occurred yesterday because the Assistant General Manager of Hydro was not challenging policy. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think it creates a rather unfortunate impression, or leaves a rather unfortunate impression . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't want it to be assumed for a split second that I indicated anything other than, with respect to policy, and policy only, that a person who cannot accept a policy position has to either resign or ponder further whether he can accept it. My statement was only in the context of a policy decision and a policy position, and only that.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said I'm at the mercy of what I read in the press. The First Minister nodded a moment or so ago to me which seemed to indicate to me that he agreed with what the press said about his statement and about the incident, that he agreed with the statement to which I referred, and I would ask him whether he is now denying that that is the sense of the statement he gave to the press?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member would apply himself to debating the resolution before us and then we wouldn't be in the quandary we're getting into. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. . . The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . privilege that I rise on again, because after having explained my position, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry then wonders out loud again whether or not I really said this or that. So I will repeat. The honourable member knows that under the rules of the House, if I make a statement that the honourable member takes my word for it unless he has reason or proof to the contrary, and it's very simple, Sir. The statement I made yesterday was in the context, exclusively, in the context of a policy position and the circumstance of one who is in opposition to a policy position; exclusively in the context of a policy position

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . and it really mystifies me that there could have been any further suggestion whatsoever.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to doubt the First Minister's word and no reason to doubt that this was his intention and this is the implied meaning of what he said, but the impression that was left, whether it's unfortunate, whether it was deliberate or not, the impression that was left is that there has been a challenge here to the future, to the tenure of the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro; and the impression that's clearly left, and the First Minister I think would have to agree, is that it results from the difference of opinion, expressed by the Assistant General Manager of the Manitoba Hydro yesterday, and I say that it's a serious unfortunate situation which threatens and challenges that individual's civil rights; and on that basis the point should either be clarified - the point requires public clarification for the sake of the Assistant Manager of Hydro and his tenure or else we would naturally be constrained to enquire of the First Minister whether he feels he was misquoted or misinterpreted. He says he was not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege again because my statement apparently now leads the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to wonder if I was misquoted, or what was the alternative? - misinterpreted. I don't think that enters into it, Mr. Speaker. I've made it very clear that what I said had to do with policy position and only policy position. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier today, and I repeat it again as a matter of privilege, that the reply I gave was framed in the universal - and in fact I wasn't particularly interested in answering a question with respect to a particular individual - I framed the answer, and I recall it well, I framed the answer in the universal, giving it universal application to circumstances of that kind.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I've requested a number of times that he debate the resolution before us. He's getting to the stage where he's debating with the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable First Minister really did not have a matter of privilege at this moment, and if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would refrain from conducting his debate in this manner, we would not have this problem. Now the Honourable Member for Fort Garry may proceed.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the definitions of the First Minister's position by the First Minister in recent moments satisfy me, and I'm sure satisfy my Party with respect to his meaning, and my objective in speaking on this particular resolution at this time was to obtain from the First Minister either a statement that would correct and in fact reverse the impression left by today's newspaper stories, or that would clarify his point further.

My purpose in speaking to this resolution was because I suggest to you, Sir, that as a consequence of what has happened in the past 36 hours, the civil rights of an individual, the individual to whom I referred have been seriously challenged. Now the First Minister says to me that is not the case; notwithstanding what has been written, notwithstanding what impressions have been left, this is not the case, that the Assistant General Manager of Manitoba Hydro is not under any threat in terms of his conscience or in terms of his tenure and that is a satisfactory position as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. We attempted to initiate an emergency debate as you will recall on this question because we felt it was crucial and an emergency. We were unsuccessful in doing that, but the resolution in front of us, with which I agree, the concept contained therein is one with which I agree, provided an opportunity to raise the question and debate it with the First Minister as to whether or not this government endorsed the kind of insult that was levelled at Premier Campbell; whether or not any position taken by this government challenged the civil rights of the Assistant General Manager of Hydro. Now the First Minister has said to me, the answer to both those questions is "no"; the government, expressed in his words through his language, was distressed itself at the language that was used with respect to Mr. Campbell and that Mr. Kristjanson's position is not under threat or under challenge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if this is a point of order - perhaps you may indicate if it is or not. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has just misquoted what I've said. At no time did I admit that any insulting language was used with respect to Mr. Campbell; in fact during the question period I indicated that with respect to Mr. Campbell's person, there was no such insult. There was language used with respect to Mr. Campbell's

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) calculations, which was I thought unfortunately abrasive, but in no way would I agree that this could be interpreted as an insult to Mr. Campbell. I leave it there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I had the distinct impression, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister did express himself somewhat unhappy about the choice of language. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? About the adjective.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry realizes that impressions and things of this kind are not related to the subject that's before us. I'm asking him again to come to the question of the resolution before us.

MR. SHERMAN: I have said to you, Mr. Speaker, that the concepts implicit in this resolution are concepts with which I agree, but I was particularly concerned today with the civil rights of one individual and that was my reason for rising and speaking on this resolution at this time. We were not able to exchange this kind of a dialogue with the First Minister during question period for obvious House rules' reasons. This debate on this resolution has presented us with that opportunity. Since the civil rights of the Assistant General Manager of Hydro are safeguarded, are not under challenge and not under threat as was implied in the impression left in the reports having to do with the statements made by the First Minister, I'm satisfied and I'm sure that members on this side are satisfied; but this was a crucial, burning question of conscience for us today on the basis of today's reports and I would think the First Minister would be able to understand that, and having not been able to satisfy ourselves earlier, I wish to satisfy ourselves now.

I am satisfied now that the First Minister does not consider that the position that the Assistant Manager of Hydro took yesterday is one which is compromised in any way by anything he has said, and on that basis I accept that his civil rights are safe, at least for one more day. I'm satisfied on that. But this was the purpose in speaking on this resolution at this time, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that it points up a serious pitfall into which the government may in its zeal to complete the public business fall again. I think that the government has come close in this situation to threatening the civil rights of that individual.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I think this is a legitimate point of privilege, Sir. The very suggestion that the government has been using intimidation, implied or otherwise, with which to coerce a policy position, that is a matter of privilege that I wish to raise now. I make it clear, as I have already, that we are proceeding by well thought out and long standing precedent and standard of operation here, which is that ultimately a policy decision is taken and when it is then it is incumbent on those that have to carry out policy to either carry it out; if they find that they can't, then to resign. And if that is to be construed by the honourable member opposite as an intimidation with respect to one's civil rights then I would say that governments under the British Parliamentary System and democracies everywhere have been intimidating persons' civil rights for ages.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, even the Minister of Mines and Resources I'm sure would see that that's rather a thin kind of rationalization. The First Minister says . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member is attributing things to me, I tell him that they are not so.

MR. SHERMAN: The First Minister says . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder - order, please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would address himself to the Chair and not to the members across and then we wouldn't have this problem. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has six minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the last remarks of the First Minister are a rather thin attempt at rationalizing the situation, because surely the Assistant General Manager of Hydro needs no reminding - surely a person in that position needs no reminding that if he can't agree with the report of his board that he's putting his job on the line. It's interesting that the First Minister should find it necessary to remind him of that stricture today. This is the question that logically arises from what the First Minister has said. The First Minister in saying what he said wittingly or unwittingly has upgraded the Assistant General Manager of Hydro. And that is the way it would be interpreted.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member would address himself to the Human Rights! resolution before us and not to the Assistant Manager of Hydro. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, it's the civil rights of that individual with which I was concerned, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I'm sure the honourable member could find the right words to debate the resolution.

MR. SHERMAN: It's the civil rights of that individual with which I am concerned, and as I say, I'm satisfied that the First Minister now will jealously protect those civil rights; but it's interesting that he should have to remind an official of that stature that disagreement with a report of his board, or with the majority, with the consensus, the majority position of his colleagues calls for resignation. Why should the First Minister feel that that kind of a reminder is necessary if he were not somewhat upset, unhappy and exorcised by events leading up to today's interview with the press?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I distinctly heard him asking a question, so I take the liberty of answering. When the honourable member asked me why I found it necessary to remind someone of a well understood principle about policy decisions and how they're arrived at, etc., my answer is that I didn't find it necessary at all to remind anyone. I was asked the question and I answered it; if I had not been asked the question, I wouldn't have made the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has two minutes. Order! Two minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: The Honourable Member for Radisson will have ample opportunity to plunge into this debate in his usual elephantine manner if he wishes to, in a moment or two, Mr. Speaker.

As I suggested, the resolution presented us with an opportunity to defend the civil rights of an individual which we felt needed protection at this point. I'm satisfied that the First Minister will with zeal and conscience guard them and protect them through the remainder of this dispute.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the debate on the resolution and not to participate in what seems to be a very extended and difficult speech made by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry in an endeavour somehow to make his remarks appropriate to the resolution.

The question that we have before us is one of the degree of entrenchment of fundamental rights and freedoms and I question whether the speech of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry really had any relevance to the resolution at all, Mr. Speaker, and I will endeavour to focus the attention of the members of the Legislature on the real import and intent of the resolution, which is a good one.

Mr. Speaker, history has taught us that constitutional guarantees are not of themselves sufficient to ensure the basic liberties of the individual. Far too often the only result flooring from a Bill of Rights is the porvision of show-piece legislation to a government fundamentally opposed to the very principles enshrined. In such cases the rights of the individual are not in fact protected; indeed despite constitutional guarantees to the contrary the individual is without rights. The basic problem is that no governmental act can guarantee rights into the future. What it can and must do, however, is provide the means with which the people themselves and their successors become imbued with the knowledge of these rights and a desire to protect them and preserve them. In the final analysis democracy depends on an enlightened citizenry rather than the enshrined principles in the statute books. Examples of countries having exhaustive constitutional guarantees and yet lacking real freedoms or legion. Two come to our attention immediately, however; Spain and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. In Spain, in a modern history, Salvadore de Madriago comments on General Franco's much vaunted Charter of Rights, the Fuero de los Espanola, and I quote: "The Charter of Rights is the most mendacious document ever penned. It guarantees every right which the government tramples upon daily. Freedom, when any man is at the mercy of any official. Property, when any man's property may be confiscated and sold over his head. Opinions, when none are allowed but those that please the dictator. There is not a single article of this Charter that is not in itself an insult to the nation whose daily experience give it the lie." This seems to be a far cry from the Spain of 1931, the

(MR. MACKLING, cont'd.) Spain that had a constitution declaring it to be: "A democratic Republic of workers of every class organized in a regime of liberty and justice."

There is no incongruity, however, because the Spanish Civil War was shortly to rage in that country, whose constitutional principles sprang from the people, all of whom were equal before the law. Did these people in 1936 really believe that their constitution guaranteed them political and individual rights, equality and freedom? Did they perceive that neither birth, social class, wealth, political ideas nor religious beliefs provided a basis for privilege in Spain? Did they enjoy freedom of thought and right of petition, freedom of assembly and a free press? Were they protected against arbitrary arrests and imprisonment? Had these platitudes been realities, the future of Spain might well have been different, but they were not. Despite these entrenched rights, however, the government of the day still felt it should have emergency powers, and so they enacted a clause permitting suspension of any part of the constitution when the security of the state so required - oh, subject of course to the subsequent approval of the Cortes or the Congress of Deputies. Needless to say, such suspension would only be valid for 30 days. From the constitution of 1931 to Franco's version of such only required 15 years, 15 years in which neglect and inaction, rebellion, insurrection and civil war succeeded in showing the worthlessness of guaranteeing anything not imbued with reality.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has also had a long history of entrenching the human rights it feels its citizens should possess. In 1905, Czar Nicholas the Second made the gesture of enshrining some rights for the populace in the constitution of the Russian Empire. The success of this document was evidenced by the Russian Revolution of 1917. The Bolsheviks for their part, however, felt that they too should enshrine the rights and guarantees that the people enjoyed, and consequently, in 1918, the fifth all-Russian Congress of Soviets enacted, or purported to enact, laws guaranteeing freedom of the press, freedom of association; and surprisingly, the right of national minorities to determine their own future even if this involved succession from the new Russia.

In 1924, these and other principles were enacted in yet another constitution, and finally, incorporated in 1936 into what has been called the Stalin Constitution. The Stalin Constitution with amendments continues on in Russia today. It too gives a right of succession, but the problem is in the discernment of what is succession and what is counter-revolution. Counter-revolution is illegal. Chapter 10 of the Constitution is headed, quote: "The basic rights and duties of citizens" and contains 16 articles. Articles 118 to 122 establish the economic rights of the citizen. The right to employment, the right to leisure, the right to support in old age and in sickness, the right to education and equality of rights for women. These by themselves are laudatory. However, they necessarily suffer from the blankness of the Constitution in providing means of enforcement. Civil rights and freedoms are in articles 124 to 128. These include freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of association and of meetings, freedom to street processions and demonstrations. Are they believable? Are they real? Would Pasternak, the Ukrainian Nationalists, the Russian Jews or the thousands in prison camps from 1937 onwards find these unseated freedoms credible? The paper rights exist to be sure but do they have meaning. In the United States they've had a Constitution since their inception as a nation. This country's constitutional history points to a substantial area for worry with regard to the entrenchment of basic rights. Once these rights are documented, they are necessarily subject to judicial interpretation. It is to be hoped that judicial interpretation will keep pace with the needs and aspirations of society. But what happens if this is not the case? What if the rights we entrench as our protection become instead millstones around the collective neck of the majority of society. This may be too pessimistic a forecast and it is hoped that it is, but the constitutional history of the United States prior to World War II gives ample grounds for such pessimism. Within the American Constitution, guarantees were given with regard to property rights. By property rights we mean the rights of the individual to own, use, rent, invest or contract for property. Property has no rights. It is only the individual's right in property to which we refer. In the United States there has been emphasis on the close connection between liberty and the private ownership of property, between property and power. Some emphasis has been reflected in both American political thinking and institutions. Thus, in the American Constitution, the states were forbidden to pass any laws impairing the obligation of the law of contract. The Obligation of Contracts clause of article 1, Section 10 has been widely interpreted, and in 1819 the United States Supreme Court in *Dartmouth College vs. Woodworth* ruled that charters creating corporations

(MR. MACKLING, cont'd.) were contracts; therefore whatever privileges a charter conferred on a corporation appeared to be irrevocable by any subsequent law. The real effect of this contract clause was to protect vested property at the expense of the power of the states to guard the public welfare.

While this stance underwent modification, its place was gradually taken by the due process clauses, the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution, that forbade the national and state governments respectively from denying any person his life, liberty or property without due process of law. Because the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court were of a Conservative frame of mind from the 1880's to 1937, they struck out social welfare legislation as unreasonable, contrary to substantive due process.

Similarly, minimum wage laws, hours of work laws, price legislation and prohibitory laws against discharge solely for union membership were invalidated. By the use of this doctrine, laws adversely affecting property rights were struck out unless the judges could be persuaded that such laws were absolutely necessary to protect public health or safety. Naturally enough, in this context the judges were interpreting laws from their own subjective points of view and thus substituting their economic, social and political views for those of the elected representatives of the people. The court had become in effect a super Legislature, and so it was to remain until Franklin Delano Roosevelt succeeded in gaining the appointment of judges more willing to allow the legislators to be the best judges of the people's interest in these spheres.

Chief Justice Hughes saw the danger judges face in the interpretation of the United States Constitution when he wrote: "We should be faithless to our supreme obligation if we interpreted the great generalities of the Constitution as to forbid flexibility in making adaptations to meet new conditions and to prevent the correction of new abuses incident to the complexity of our life, or as crystalizing our own notions of policy, our personal views of economics, and our own theories of moral and social improvement."

The entrenchment, Mr. Speaker, of a right, any right must have its limitations. In the words of the late William Lyon MacKenzie King: "Private rights cease to exist when they become public wrongs." The United States Constitution in French, for example, the right of habeas corpus. However, the wording is: "The writ of habeas corpus will be available unless suspended in time of rebellion or invasion." This seems to require decision of the U.S. Congress as to whether or not such a state of affairs exists. During the American Civil War, President Lincoln did suspend habeas corpus and this was only retroactively assented to by Congress. The right exists but it must be tempered so as not to cut against the general good of the society.

Situations may and do arise, where society as a whole is threatened under such conditions, the rights of the individual will necessarily be of secondary consideration. The basic rights which we enjoy as citizens of Manitoba are found in Section 92 of The British North America Act. This section gives the provinces control of property and civil rights, and within this sphere they are supreme. Such matters such as free speech, freedom of worship, etc. are protected by the province. All residuary powers - that is, anything not specifically given to the provinces - is a preserve of the Federal Government. Therefore, any provincial entrenchment of rights could only deal with areas of provincial responsibility and these would be far from exclusive as regard to rights of a Manitoban as a citizen of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we do have a Canadian Bill of Rights which one might suppose would be sufficient to protect our rights as citizens of Canada, and thus, with a provincial Bill of Rights as well, we would be adequately safeguarded. The problem is that no one really knows as yet the effect of the Canadian Bill of Rights. From 1961 to the present, it has had scant attention, let alone effect on the judiciary of Canada. And this remains so in spite of the Supreme Court's decision in the Drybones case. One of the great judges of Canada, the late Ivan C. Rand, has said of the Bill of Rights: "It is basically defective in its character as a statute. As an act to govern the interpretation of other acts, if it is lacking in specific direction for dealing with language which clearly violates the freedoms declared but for which no alternative interpretation is possible. The Bill's provision for due process of law, a phrase which could establish an overriding necessity for rational legislation, is without a definition, which no court could disregard."

The Bill of Rights only applies to federal legislation and is not really entrenched because it was only passed as an ordinary Act of Parliament. The Bill has few guarantees not already

(MR. MACKLING, cont'd.) embodied in the British North America Act, which has a proviso for a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom. These rights are set forth in those great English constitutional documents: Magna Carta, the Habeas Corpus Act, and the Bill of Rights of 1689.

The Canadian Bill of Rights also recognizes the necessity for suspending the basic rights of the individual under certain circumstances. Thus we have the provision that: "Any act or thing done under the authority of the War Measures Act shall be deemed not to be an abrogation, abridgement or infringement of any right or freedom recognized by the Canadian Bill of Rights." It would appear, then, that the Executive of the Canadian government can abrogate rights any time they wish to exercise the provisions of the War Measures Act. As an example of this power in use, and the loss of rights as a consequence thereof, was a suspension of habeas corpus for those interned by security and police forces during the Quebec fiasco of 1970. Also, just after World War II, habeas corpus was suspended for individuals arrested as a result of information supplied by Igor Guzenko about a communist spy operation in Canada.

The Canadian Bill of Rights also suffers from the fact that it carries no sanctions. If it is void of these, how do you enforce your rights? Perhaps the best thing one can say of the Bill of Rights, that it is well-intentioned but really not effective. Also it would be an error to assume that our Supreme Court has the powers found in it like the body in the United States. It does not, and so it is not really capable of the same type of jurisdiction. The Supreme Court of Canada is a creature of the Canadian Government. The Supreme Court of the United States is a child of the Constitution. It is not by way of the entrenchment of human rights that this Legislature will control, let alone conquer the inequities, injustices and prejudices that beset our society. A document of this nature will not quiet the harsh voices in our midst including those that emanate from the Opposition. -- (Interjection) -- Nor give the meek their rightful place. The problems are too deep, too diverse to be settled by any one Act. This is not to say, however, that there is nothing we can do. We can do something. We can encourage and actively assist in educational programs outlining and explaining to people the rights they possess and enjoy in Manitoba. This, Mr. Speaker, would not necessarily involve any great expenditure but could be accomplished within the present structure of our educational system by the introduction of comprehensive rights of Manitobans in the courts of this country and the workings and structures of federal, provincial and municipal governments and their administrative organs. -- (Interjection) -- question, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Would the Attorney-General submit to a question?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. PATRICK: Are you against a Bill of Rights?

MR. MACKLING: I'm sure, if the honourable member had have been listening instead of reading as intently as he was, he would have appreciated the tenor of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the process of educating persons as to their rights is fundamental to an appreciation for the quality of life that can be fabricated and maintained in a society. The obligation, Mr. Speaker, exists for newspapers and the media to encourage the participation of citizens in the exercise and awareness of the rights that they possess. It is only by giving information to the public and by allowing them the opportunity to learn that they can become aware and conscious of the rights that they enjoy and are entitled to as citizens of Manitoba. Putting yet another Act on the statute books of Manitoba will never accomplish our purpose without more in the line of education and facilities to carry out or implement in a meaningful way such legislation. With regard to these matters, we in Manitoba have made a good start in the area of human rights by the establishment of a Human Rights Commission, to which members of the public can go with grievances concerning their civil rights.

Again, a more comprehensive legal aid system is needed to ensure that a fair hearing is given to all citizens regardless of their race, religion, creed, economic or social standing. Without guarantees such as these, Mr. Speaker, and without a better opportunity for those presently less financially and educationally advantaged, a Bill of Rights would not accomplish its true purpose which is to guarantee the basic rights and freedoms of our society to all. Much has been accomplished but it is not yet enough, and if we are to have true equality and freedom in this province, it will be necessary to ensure that our populace are in a position to take full advantage of these programs. In this way we will accomplish something beyond the enshrinement of principles in statute books by placing such rights and their protection in the

(MR. MACKLING, cont'd.) minds of men.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that has moved refers to the continuing dialogue at present in process in respect to a new constitution for Canada, and in that process discussions are proceeding in respect to the entrenchment of certain fundamental rights; freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly and association, democratic elections, and the right to vote. And we are hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a degree of entrenchment within a new constitution of Canada which will provide that no Parliament or no Legislature can abrogate or abridge those fundamental rights. The Honourable Member for Morris, who hasn't been listening during the course of my speech, says we have them now. They have them now; they had them in Quebec in 1970, and they were taken away by an Act of Parliament. And the fact of the matter is, that they had them -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: The interjections of the Honourable Member for Morris indicate the depth of his profound ignorance, Mr. Speaker, and they trouble me not. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is strong argument to be made for the entrenchment of certain fundamental rights, and we are hopeful that those rights, as determined by a Canadian consensus established hopefully in the dialogue participating in the discussions hopefully to lead to a new Canadian Constitution, will agree, will arrive at a formula for the entrenchment of certain fundamental rights within the Canadian Constitution, rights then which cannot be varied or abrogated by any Act either of Parliament or Legislature. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we have argued that not only must there be a right to free democratic elections and there must be an accountability to the people within a minimum period or a maximum period, let us say, of five years, but we have argued also that there ought to be reasonable representation in Parliament and in the Legislature, and some of the position papers, some of the documents that have been submitted to the Constitutional Conference sessions have indicated a concern to reflect within the constitutional documents an infringement of reasonable representation in Parliament and in legislatures, and we argue that that is important, particularly not only for Parliament, by the legislatures itself.

In saying this we recognize the value of the work which was established by a previous Legislature in this province, in the establishment of an independent review commission, the result of which is that this province has an independent body to review and authorize boundary changes, and it is a far cry, a tremendous improvement over what we see in a sister province where gerrymandering makes representation by population a farce.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we articulate, formulate and enshrine principles of freedom, principles of equity, freedoms that are fundamental to the welfare of a free and a fair society, but these freedoms, as the Honourable Member from Point Douglas pointed out, can be hollow shams unless we are prepared as a people to produce a society where there is a greater measure of equality, a greater measure of fundamental freedom, a greater fairness in the approach that is made by government to people in respect to the administration of services. It is not a fair society when - and the Honourable Member from Morris smiles when he reflects on this - it is not a fair society for an administration to have a system and to say that this will be a compulsory system and then treat all people alike regardless of their ability to pay.

That was the fair system, Mr. Speaker, that they imposed on old age pensioners, people on very frugal incomes, a fair and equitable system in their eyes, of taxation, a system which makes a millionaire and the pauper equal. That's the kind of equality and freedom that they believe in. Pass a Bill of Rights, have some window dressing, but in the basic economic functions of government they created a sham. And so it is, Mr. Speaker, that while we argue for the embellishment on our statute books of words of real meaning and value from the point of view of a fair and just society, we don't mouth expressions and leave it go at that. We have seen from one part of Canada to another, successive old-line parties that have talked about, talked about glorious programs for the better good of the people of Canada, and then allowed those programs to lie on the shelves until another election campaign rolled along.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that true justice, fair play in society demands an involvement of government, of positive participation of government in planning to meet the needs of its people, and the farce that is generally introduced as window-dressing by old-line parties by way of a colourful display as to their concern for the rights of individuals, mocks the intelligence and integrity of the people of Canada.

(MR. MACKLING, cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, we will have no part of that. While we are concerned about the development and the entrenchment and the nourishing of fundamental rights of people in this province, we are concerned with basic economic reforms to provide, so far as it is possible to do, a greater measure of equality to people of Manitoba and an enrichment of the quality of life of the people of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Will the Minister accept a question? The Minister mentioned that governments could not guarantee freedom in the future. Could this not be done by way of referendum and have these freedoms sanctioned by the people in the country?

MR. MACKLING: I didn't understand the speaker's question because he seemed to imply that I said something that I don't believe I said, so would you repeat the question?

MR. FROESE: Well, the way I understood the Minister to say was that governments could not guarantee freedom for the future of the people, and could this not be done by way of a referendum and have these freedoms sanctioned?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there have been many many hundreds of lines written about the whole question of freedom in society, and those constitutionalists in the Soviet Union would say that "we have a free society"; and those people, I'm sure, that would write under the authority and the blessing of the Government of Spain would say "we have fundamental freedoms in our society." And the Honourable Member for Morris, and others, has said that they had great freedom and nourishment in our society when they enacted the same amount of taxation against people on no income as compared to millionaires.

So it's a relative thing, Mr. Speaker, to evaluate when you have true freedom. In a society, in a society of men there is an acceptance of certain restrictions on individual freedom for the benefit of all and that is why we have a Legislature, to determine what laws we, as representing a majority of the people of Manitoba, will deem appropriate - restricting maybe corporate freedom, maybe individual freedom for the common good, and we don't deal by referendum. We, as part of the responsible government tradition that the parliamentary system represents, is based upon an acceptance of a responsibility and one that is not controlled by a referendum, and if you want to debate the whole question of whether or not we ought to return to the - recall in referendum suggested many many years ago and go back to those grey ages, I would be prepared to do so, but obviously that isn't what we are articulating.

MR. SPEAKER: The question will remain in the Honourable Member for Logan as adjourned.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this one stand.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence to let this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, this Resolution No. 9, proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, proves far more than anything I could ever say, the total hypocrisy and ineptitude of the Liberal Party.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye repeatedly claimed in his speech supporting this resolution that the resolution would benefit the little man in our society. He was very very concerned with the little man, the poor farmer, the ordinary citizen. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, it's a very legitimate concern. If he were really concerned, however, with the benefits of this little man, he would have brought in a resolution advocating raising the level of exemptions on estate taxes such as the Government of Ontario has just done. Instead, what does the Liberal Party bring in? They bring in a resolution advocating the rebating of the provincial share of 75 percent of estate tax. And what's the effect of this? I'd like to quote the latest figures available. These are the figures as of March 31, 1971.

In the fiscal year '70 - 71, there were 192 taxable estates - 192; non-taxable, 4, 179 estates. In other words, 96 percent of the estates in that year were non-taxable; four percent, four percent were taxable. Now who is it the Liberals are really concerned about? Is it the old age pensioner, the low income person who holds a low-paying job, the marginal farmer?

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. JOHANNSON: Certainly. For you, any day.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member has included in his statistics the number of people who pass away and no estate is taken out because there is no property at all. Now you have used 96 percent as between taxable estates and non-taxable estates. Have you included in your statistics the whole series of people who pass away and leave no estate at all, in which case it's also non-taxable.

MR. JOHANNSON: These people are not included.

MR. GREEN: Not included, so it would even be worse.

MR. JOHANNSON: This includes only the people who leave estates of some size when they pass on. So who is it the Liberals are really concerned about? The low income people? I would suggest they are more concerned about the Richardsons, the Heffelfingers, the McIsaacs. These are the people in the top four percent whom the Liberal Party is concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to simply contrast this with what our government has done in the field of taxation. The Liberals bring in a resolution which has no benefit at all for the bottom 96 percent, the vast majority of our society, with no benefit at all for these people. They bring in a resolution which will have progressively increasing benefits for the top four percent - the top four percent. Our government, the first session we were in office, brought in a measure to reduce Medicare premiums and to increase income taxes. Now the effect of this was to progressively reduce taxes for the bottom 96 percent and increase them progressively for the top four percent. The same resolution now, the resolution we are debating, has been introduced in three successive sessions by the Opposition. I'm inclined to believe that this is the proof of the bankruptcy in their ideas and also a measure of their steadfast allegiance to the elite of this province.

I'd like to state very briefly and simply the position of the Government of Manitoba. The Government of Manitoba has consistently stated that there should be one equitable estate tax in Canada administered by the Government of Canada with equalized compensation for the provinces. This would ensure that all Canadians would be treated with equity. The Manitoba Government's main positions are as follows: (a) that Ottawa, not the provinces, should handle estate taxes; (b) the provinces should not compete by manipulating the tax rebates; and (c) there should be uniformity across the country.

I was very interested in examining the philosophy of the new Liberal Party as exhibited in the speech of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. There has been a remarkable transition in the Liberal Party which was called "new" during the past by-election. I'm not sure whether the Honourable Member for La Verendrye qualifies as a new Liberal because according to the election literature which I saw in St. Vital, the Liberal candidate there was supposed to be the first of the new Liberals so perhaps the honourable member doesn't qualify.

However, let me quote the member. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm talking about your speech. I'd like to quote the member. He said: "I would like to call it a Liberal Party resolution" - and I'll call it that too - "it's also a plea on behalf of our farmers, on behalf of our small business men and on behalf of their survivors." And I quote again: "Secondly, in many

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) cases the tax amounts to confiscation. This tax discriminates against the thrifty and discriminates against the industrious, because he who works hard throughout his life is hardest hit at death." I don't quite get the logic there. I can't conceive how anybody dead is going to feel in any way the impact of taxes, but I continue, "discriminating against the thrifty, those that really tried hard and those that have made the best of it, it seems that they're not getting anything out of having done what they did in life." Very interesting philosophical statement from the new Liberal Party.

I should now like to quote another interesting philosophical statement made also by a Liberal. This was made by the Right Honourable David Lloyd George, M. P., Chancellor of the Exchequer in the British Liberal Government in his Budget of 1909. He called this the "People's Budget." And this Budget I would like to commend to the reading of the Honourable Member for Charleswood. This Budget contained a beautiful explanation of what I regard as the proper position on estate taxation and I quote: "I still say it is a fair tax" - he's talking about the estate tax - "it is a just tax and an effective tax. No unjust tax can be effective in the long run. I do not want to take extreme cases, but take the case of 25,000 pounds, 50,000 pounds or 100,000 pounds." - Multiply by five roughly I guess to get a dollar equivalent - "We will assume that a man leaves that amount net after payment of all liabilities and debts, because a net amount is what he pays upon, upon a fairly liberal valuation. How has he been able to accumulate that? From the security which is given by the State. The protection of his property, the protection of this country even against invasion has enabled this country to accumulate greater wealth than any other country. But all that costs money.

"Not only that, but money which is spent upon education, upon improving the condition of the people and making them more efficient even as wealth-creating machinery, is part of the 25,000 pounds to 50,000 pounds. With an inferior population in intelligence, in physical condition, in general contentment, with a state of greater insecurity against dangers of invasion he would not have accumulated his 25 or 50 thousand pounds. All that costs money to the State. Is it therefore unfair to say that when you were passing that 25,000 pounds, 50,000 pounds or 100,000 pounds to someone else, that the State ought to take a toll upon it, not merely in recognition of its services but to enable it to continue those services in future for all, even for the person who has inherited the money and who may convert the 25,000 pounds into 250,000 pounds under similar conditions. What is unfair in that?" That's the statement of David Lloyd George in 1909.

Today, we have a Liberal Party in reverse which now disowns - disowns this philosophy. I'd like to read one more paragraph out of this document. It deals with Mr. Gladstone and the Succession Duty. It's very interesting to know that exactly the same arguments were used against Mr. Gladstone when he first proposed the succession duty as were used against Mr. Lloyd George. In a debate in the House of Commons in 1853 when Mr. Gladstone proposed the succession duty, an honourable member said "The whole object of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was war against property. It might be popular in some quarters but he was sure it would be productive of hardship to industry. He warned the right honourable gentleman how he struck a blow upon public confidence, the effect of which might be felt to an extent of which he had no present conception." Doesn't that sound just like the Honourable Member for River Heights? This could be a direct quote except that the grammar of Mr. Lloyd George is a bit better. The arguments are the same as those proposed by the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party today.

So far, no member of the Conservative Party has spoken on this resolution but they did propose a resolution which is virtually the same in intent so I assume that they share the same position. I would like to quote a couple of statements from last year's Hansard which reflect the position of the Official Opposition, that very progressive crew who hope that the people of the Province of Manitoba are some day going to place their confidence in them. Now let's hear what they have to say on this. Here's the philosophy of estate taxation of the Honourable Member for River Heights. "There has to be an incentive for those to save and to build and to be able to pass it on to their children. But my philosophy would be that the small person in this province and in this country have the right to protect whatever savings he can accumulate and should not be put into a position where upon the death of one spouse or the other he's not in ability to pass it on, because one of the incentives in our system is the incentive to be able to develop and build for the future for yourself and for your children, and if you dull that incentive you're going to dull part of the quality that built this country." He is, of course, in effect speaking for the top four percent of the people in this country.

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd)

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell made an even more interesting statement. He's a fighting man and he made a fighting statement. "I believe in fighting for our rights and being aggressive, and also in establishing a climate which is conducive to initiative on the part of the individual. I believe that the attitude of the Minister of Finance would push Manitoba further down the economic scale and there would be a certain alienation of small business capital, small investment capital from small estates, that the spirit of enterprise would be injured and the climate would be one of a regressive rather than an aggressive manner." If the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell were such a rugged individualist he would be in favour of a confiscatory estate tax. Why should he want to pass on an estate to children who would then have an unfair advantage over others in their start in life? Why shouldn't they, if they're rugged individualists, earn their own way in this world? If he were consistent in his philosophy I would think he should take this position.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland is opposed to estate taxation.

Our philosophy as a party, of course, is a philosophy in favour of estate taxation, progressive estate taxation and I quote a statement by the Smith Royal Commission on taxation in Ontario, 1867 which states as well as anything our position. "Death taxes are admirably suited to control the growth in this country of an economically powerful minority whose influence is based upon inherited wealth. By this device the amount of capital that passes from one generation to another can be controlled, an essential safeguard for the basic fabric of a democratic society. Moreover, because the tax is not payable until death, this end is achieved with a minimum deterrent to working and saving during a man's earning and creative life." This is the position of our party. As far as I'm concerned personally, I would be in favour of a far more progressive income tax than exists today. I would be in favour of virtually taxing away entirely estates. Perhaps I'm a partial believer in the philosophy of the Honourable member -- (Interjection) -- So my position personally is that I would be in favour of a confiscatory estate tax, but the party is in favour of -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews address his remarks to the Chair, please.

MR. JOHANNSON: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to abide by your ruling.

The estate tax is a source of revenue for the province today of approximately 5.8 million according to the last Estimates -- according to the last revenue statement. It's significant that when the members opposite want to give relief to somebody through cutting taxes they don't choose to relieve the lower income groups in our society, they choose to relieve the upper income groups, the children of people who belong in that top four percent, and yet at the same time they say they're concerned about the small man. If they really were they would have brought in a resolution advocating a raising of the level of exemptions.

How would we raise that 5.8 million which we're going to lose - or roughly that amount. Well, the former government would have done it by a premium tax. The present opposition would have us cut expenditures, and yet when we're going through the Estimates they continually protest about lack of expenditures in certain areas. The problem is that the rebate is a futile solution. Rebate of estate tax is self-defeating. There's no advantage in the long run to anyone because once the rebate becomes universal, all advantage disappears. And the futility would be that - and I am simply repeating some arguments used by the Finance Minister in the last session - if we rebate 75 percent, Saskatchewan and Alberta can up the ante; they can rebate more. Ontario can enter the game and Ontario has more wealth to give away than we can possibly give away. So it's a futile exercise.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye stated in his preamble three "whereases," each of which are false to some extent. But the second - pardon me. The third "whereas" states that "it has been established that the absence of an estate tax in a province acts as an incentive for industrial development and the importing of badly needed development capital into a province." I don't know where the honourable member gets that statement, but there is absolutely no evidence of proof of the success of Alberta and Saskatchewan directly attributable to their decision to rebate estate taxes. There is no way in which it is been proved that Saskatchewan and Alberta have benefitted from this, and we as a government certainly do not intend to evade our responsibility by giving away estate tax revenue without real and substantive benefit to the community.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye expressed repeatedly his concern for the family farm, the family farmer, repeatedly throughout his address, and he expressed the concern that

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd the children of the family farmer were going to have to sell all or part of the farm in order to pay the estate taxes. In fact he says - he's talking about an estate of 175 to 200 thousand. He says that "the tax on such a property would be so high that the survivors would have to sell, perhaps have to sell a portion or part of the farm just to pay the taxes, and in a day when the agricultural sector is already facing a real economic slump."

Well, the problem is that there is -- well, there are a number of problems with his statement. First of all he says that this is a common type of estate, 175 to 200 thousand. According to the figures which I have, this estate of 175 to 200 thousand falls within the top one percent of estates in the province. So this is his common man, his common man who's really going to suffer when he dies, or whose children are going to suffer when he dies, a man who belongs in the top one percent. -- (Interjection) -- 1970-71. The honourable member used some earlier figures as I recall in his speech. But he's talking about protecting the poor fellow who belongs in the top one percent among estates in this province.

The interesting thing is that a number of people have examined this kind of contention and they find that there is no proof that it happens. The Estate Tax Office locally for example is aware of no such cases on record. The Smith report made in Ontario in 1967 investigated claims made about this and found that they were non-existent, cases such as this were non-existent. The Carter Commission, the Royal Commission on Taxation, Volume 3, 1966, examined this sort of statement and found there was no basis in fact for it. There was no proof that it was happening. So the member makes the claim but there appears to be no evidence from what I have read that these cases occur.

At present the federal legislation permits payments - and the member pointed this out - of estate taxes over a five year period, and if a man inherits a farm worth 175 to 200 thousand he certainly should be able to get financing to repay the tax on this, which would be roughly 20 to 30 thousand dollars, over a five year period. -- (Interjection) -- Why should he pay the tax? Because it's an equitable tax. In fact, I think it's too low, much too low.

I think the Province of Manitoba has a positive policy. Our government is not trying to attract people to Manitoba to die. In fact, it's a rather macabre sort of policy, formulating a policy to attract people so they come to the province to die. I would rather that our government form policies which would attract people to come to Manitoba to live. In fact, I was walking across the Legislative grounds yesterday and I noticed that the little beer store across the street has a very nice little sign. It says: "Live it up in Friendly Manitoba." Well, I'm not sure whether we could share the objective of that little slogan. Labatt's would have a slightly different intent in their slogan, but I would certainly favour our government adopting a policy which would ask people to come to live in friendly Manitoba rather than to die.

The member stated that we have to attract vigorous, imaginative, innovative people into the province in order to create investment - and he's assuming of course that the people in the province are incapable of developing it. I would far prefer a policy -- (Interjection) -- Need some more what? Mr. Ault. Well, we've been bringing in some very talented people like Mr. Cass-Beggs and Mr. Ouelette, Dr. Tulchinsky, very very able, talented people. Dr. Weldon from McGill. We have attracted some of the best brains in the country to Manitoba. The Liberal Party continually attacks us for the brain drain that's occurring, and yet yesterday the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge stands up and makes a speech attacking us because we're creating a brain drain into this province, and this is the kind of policy that our government intends to follow, to attract brains into this province to live here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the honourable member permit a question? Does the honourable member support the philosophy, the family farm, that has been advocated by the Minister of Agriculture?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. JOHANNSON: Well, as an urban member, I'm not overly knowledgeable about rural policy, although after hearing the members opposite speak, I wonder whether they are too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) The Honourable Member for Radisson. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Dropped off the Order Paper.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Charleswood, WHEREAS there are many women entering or re-entering the labour market who need counselling on training programs and job opportunities, and

WHEREAS there is new legislation at both federal and provincial levels which needs interpretation and enforcement, and

WHEREAS equal opportunity, improved access to advancement, and equal pay for equal or similar value in work will become a reality only through the efforts of an agency concentrating on women's interests, and

WHEREAS the withdrawal from the labour force of a large proportion of the female population represents a major cost to the Canadian economy,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a Women's Bureau within the Department of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's not necessary for me to spend much time explaining to members of this House that women have been liberated from much of the drudgery of housework by the development of modern equipment. Technological advancements make it possible for the housewife to shop once a week, do her baking in large amounts and store them in the freezer. Automatic washers, dryers and permanent press fabrics make washing a simple procedure - and this leaves extra hours for learning, for recreation or creative activities.

But more and more women are returning to employment as their family responsibilities decrease. They do so for the satisfaction derived from personal achievement, for social benefits and for a desire for an outside interest, as well as a chance to be useful. Financial reasons rank low in a labour force survey by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, which show that there are 540,000 working mothers in Canada in 1970. They had over a million children under 14 years of age; one-half had children under 6 years; a sizeable majority of these women were working just part time. Their median earnings were \$50.00 a week, and combined with their husbands' incomes the median then became \$7,032, and I must say that is hardly lavish. One-third of these children were being cared for at home by their father while the mother worked, and the part time employment was in the retail trade, food stores, nursing, cleaning offices at night, and this work could be seasonal or casual. A factor affecting the decision to go to work might have been debts and the need to supplement the husband's income. Children under six years of age were found to be a strong deterrent unless there were extra adults in the home.

In 1931 married women made up 3.5 percent of the labour force; in 1961 that number had grown to 22 percent. In 1966, Alberta set up a Women's Bureau to act as a liaison between women and the Provincial Government. They saw this as necessary because of a growing participation of women in community and business affairs, and of course these women wanted accurate information on a wide range of topics. The Alberta Women's Bureau collected and compiled information, opinions and other material on such matters as social, cultural, legal, public and other rights, responsibilities, interests and privileges of the women in Alberta. They published pamphlets, fact sheets, the most popular of which I think it's interesting to note are concerning the laws of interest to women in Alberta. The second most popular concerned wills and estates. These fact sheets dealt with such matters as training, education and upgrading for mature women. A booklet on laws deals with elections, citizenship, property and civil rights, marriage, social development, child welfare, courts, legal assistance, consumer affairs, labour, criminal offences, the Ombudsman's work and so on.

The Alberta studies indicated that women, the average woman working in that province was 37 years of age, but nearly a third of them were actually over 45. Sixty percent of them were married, that is in 1967, and one in four married women was working. Their figures show that a girl in high school today may work as long as 25 to 35 years of her life. If she has more than an average education, she is apt to work still longer.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd)

The Alberta publications stressed opportunity for employment in data processing, interior design, banking, dental hygiene, social work, engineering technology, economics and natural science and nursery teaching. You will note that in these jobs it's unlikely that they would be displacing male workers. These women are not asking preferential treatment; they know that acceptance will only come when women become fully competent as a result of being educationally equipped. They have to dispel and disarm the prejudices of previous ages.

As an example of some of these old-fashioned attitudes, I would like to quote briefly from a booklet called "The Saga of the Working Woman." It's a reprint from a topical quarterly in November of 1970.

In 1881, apparently the lady managers of the YWCA were called well-meaning but misguided ladies who made an obvious error in judgment when they announced their course in type-writing would be open to women. The female mind and constitution, they said could not possibly withstand the strain of a six-months' course in typing.

In 1890, the true traditionally female occupations of teacher and nurse were solidly entrenched. Women were virtually taking over the classrooms, the main reason being their availability at a much lower salary than men.

In 1892, for example, 460 of Toronto's 500 teachers were women. The female monopoly in nursing has gone unchallenged from the beginning.

In 1929, attitudes have changed slightly but women still were in a rather disadvantaged position.

In 1921, the women of the west tried to persuade Canada's Prime Minister to appoint a woman to the Senate. The Crown's legal advisors told the Prime Minister they had no power to do so, since in their opinion a woman was not a person within the meaning of the BNA Act, and they referred to a previous decision by an Alberta female magistrate which had been ruled invalid for the same reason.

In 1928, the Supreme Court ruled likewise, and not until an appeal was made to the Privy Council were women recognized as persons under the BNA Act - and that was just 42 years ago.

In 1940 to '45, I think that many of us can remember that as a million men went to war, a million women replaced them in industry. Rosie the Rivetter rose tall in Canada's war production. Unglamorous in her turbaned head and coveralls, she also welded, soldered, painted, assembled planes, tanks, guns and radios and wrestled with 3 1/2-ton trucks. She was indispensable to victory.

I think this, Mr. Speaker, gives you a little idea of attitudes towards women over the years.

In the Province of Ontario a Women's Bureau has been set up which has responsibility for the enforcement of the Women's Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1970. It also enforces the Human Rights legislation. They have in five different cities offices where there is counseling available for those who want to return to work. They have prepared publications on the new maternity leave policies and the protection that they provide for seniority and fringe benefits and there are also guidelines for companies implementing these new policies.

There's a very interesting glossy magazine called "The Career Selector." They suggest such ideas as becoming a comparison shopper, computer programmer, data processor, dental technicians, gift wrappers, economists, dressmakers, house mothers in correctional institutions, medical records, librarians and occupational therapy assistance. I think just these few suggestions will convince you, Mr. Speaker, that if women want to go to work they are not necessarily going to displace men. There are some, particularly some employment which attracts women and do not attract men.

They've also in Ontario put out some pamphlets called "You're a What?" - and there are some really wonderful ideas in here. For instance, there's an article about a woman who became a hyperbaric nurse; another who is a physicist, a whole body counter; inhalation therapy technicians; marine mammalogists; audio vestibular technicians; medical photographers; psychometricians. I think, Mr. Speaker, there's ample evidence, if we look for it, that there are many positions which are vacant because there are no people qualified to take them, and I think we have to dispel some of our rather old-fashioned ideas that there are just so many jobs and if women take some of them there are less for the man who is supposed to be the breadwinner. There are actually many highly skilled fields where there are real shortages of workers, even in periods of high unemployment such as we have now.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd)

In Ontario, women are advised on a choice of career as well as on how to improve their qualifications and job opportunities. They feel that their measures could take some families off welfare, although they recognize that they must find women jobs then which would provide a better living than welfare does.

Women are no longer considered to be poor risks since the myth of absenteeism was discredited. Surveys have shown that women take just 1.24 more days off a year than men. Only two percent of women take maternity leave per year, and 30.45 percent of women who are employed quit work, eventually return.

Now, occupational segregation of the sort that we've witnessed in the past generally means a waste of education, training and talent among certain women. In 1969, 54 percent of the working women were in clerical positions, service jobs or in recreation. The women's average earnings in 1967 were only 43 percent as high as those of men, and this of course was not necessarily because they were being paid less for doing the same work, it was simply that due to occupational segregation they were being kept in lower paying jobs. Twelve percent of all managerial positions were held by women although they represent a third of the labour force. They hold less than one percent of top corporate positions in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that women are entering and re-entering the labour force in phenomenal numbers. In most cases their skills are rusty from disuse. They are looking for satisfaction and personal achievement, but with cost of living rising and high levels of taxation, it more often becomes desirable to have a second income in the family. I think a government with as voracious an appetite for tax money as this one should quickly realize that it will stand to receive its proportional share of the increased earnings.

There is an important role for government in helping to direct these women into those areas where their work is most needed. It's old-fashioned and ill-informed, as I have pointed out, simply to think that women should not be seeking jobs in days of high unemployment. It's entirely possible that if the man of the family has lost his job, that the women can find a job which will tide them over. And Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at the numbers of women who are employed in order to keep their husbands at university or getting some further training.

I believe that a Women's Bureau could be developed within our Department of Labour by a simple redistribution of the duties within that department, although, Mr. Speaker, I have grave doubts that there are any women occupying managerial positions within that department. I'm sorry that the Minister of Labour is not here because I would like to know just exactly what the situation is in regard to occupational segregation within that department. I suspect that the women are not being given a chance to advance to more challenging positions. Undoubtedly it would be necessary to find a woman who could qualify suitably as head of such a bureau. I think that it should be entirely possible to find one from the community, from Manitoba, who is however able to head up such an agency.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely recommend to the government that they endorse this resolution.

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

MR. GREEN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please.

MR. GREEN: I'm willing to waive the division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Sergeant-at-Arms, cut off the buzzer.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

WHEREAS the creation of new jobs for Manitobans and the economic development of this Province must proceed at an accelerated rate if the best interests of this Province are to be served, and economic opportunities are to be made available to the people of this Province;

AND WHEREAS there is an international shortage of capital, for development, and that shortage is more acutely felt in areas of Canada, such as Manitoba, which have historically suffered from underdevelopment and lack of financial resources for our development potential;

AND WHEREAS it is in the best interests of Manitoba that all reasonable steps be taken to attract development capital to this Province, regardless of the national source of such capital;

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)

AND WHEREAS it is important that the public and the general financial communities be made aware that foreign capital and investment is welcome in the Province, subject only to the restrictions referred to hereinafter, and that, despite statements of certain Government members to the contrary, this House unequivocally will take the steps necessary to encourage such investment in Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS it is important that this House should proclaim a clear code of good corporate citizenship for all non-resident investors in Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House record and publish the fact that whenever possible Manitoban and Canadian capital will be encouraged to develop business and industry in Manitoba, and that whenever such Manitoba and Canadian capital is not forthcoming this House approves and welcomes foreign investment in Manitoba and intends to aggressively seek means of attracting and stimulating such investment in all segments of the Manitoba economy, except in certain sensitive areas of the economy, such as broadcasting, publishing, and certain areas which may from time to time be designated by this House, and subject to such foreign investors following and subscribing to the Manitoba Code of Good Corporate Citizenship described hereinafter;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House proclaim a Manitoba Code of Good Corporate Citizenship for all non-resident investors, which said Code, as amended from time to time by this House, shall in the first instance be declared to contain the following principles:

- (a) that if such non-resident investor is a public company or the subsidiary of a public company, its shares, or, where it is a subsidiary, its parent company's shares, shall be listed for sale on the Winnipeg Stock Exchange, and the non-resident investor shall take reasonable steps to encourage investment by Manitobans in its shares;
- (b) that where such non-resident investor is a public company, or the subsidiary of a public company, at least one of the members of its Board of Directors shall be a person who is ordinarily resident in the Province of Manitoba;
- (c) that where such non-resident investor is not a public company, but subsequent to its establishing its operation in Manitoba, if it shall ever offer its shares to the public, a reasonable attempt shall be made to offer such shares to Manitobans for investment;
- (d) that except in extraordinary circumstances, the employment practice followed by non-resident investment companies shall be to hire Manitoba residents in respect of all jobs which are to be performed in the Province of Manitoba;
- (e) that where such non-resident enterprise utilizes techniques of production or technology which are not then currently practised in Manitoba, such non-resident enterprise shall, wherever practical, train Manitobans in the use of such techniques and technology.

And that this House further acknowledges that the foregoing principles are merely representative of the guidelines which should be established for non-resident investment in Manitoba, and to the end that a full Code of Good Corporate Citizenship is established, the Government shall propose to this House, from time to time, additions thereto in order to complete the said Code.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I wonder if we would call it 5:30 and have the honourable member proceed next time?

The hour being 5:30, I'm now leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.