

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 9, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 24 students of Grade 6 standing of the Bannatyne School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Goldsborough and Mrs. Martin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

We also have 30 students of Grades 9 and 10 standing of the Ross L. Gray School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Leonard. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

(Recording Failure)

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: . . . praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Westminster United Church Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris) introduced Bill No. 34, an Act to amend The Snowmobile Act.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) introduced Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Sale of Goods Act; and Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson) introduced Bill No. 23, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Real Estate Board".

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the government is in a position to explain why the largest single increase in Winnipeg's cost of living index last month was in the health and personal care category.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, there is no way in which I could respond to that question without notice and offhand. I will take it as notice and attempt to provide some information in a day or two.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, not by way of supplementary but by way of an additional question although it relates to the question of the cost of living. Have any estimates been done of the dollar impact of rising food costs on the average Manitoba family?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we have attempted to do a provincial analysis on a unilateral basis. I would assume that there is some such analysis going on on a national basis. I might add that to the extent the problem exists here it exists elsewhere in Canada and to a greater extent. I do believe that Statistics Canada will show that the cost of living index, the "shopping basket" so-called, increased by approximately one percentage point less last year in Winnipeg than in other Canadian metropolitan centres of equal or larger size.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate what the government believes the effect will be of the Bank of Canada's increase of a half percent in its prime lending rate on the cost of living in Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a phenomena that will be of national application and I don't believe that there is anything that can be done again on a single province basis that will be able to cope with a change that has been brought about by a national agency which is what the Bank of Canada is.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the government can indicate what effect that prime lending rate increase will have on housing costs and retailer-consumer credit in the province?

MR. SCHREYER: It will have an upward effect, Mr. Speaker, contributing towards inflation, in one sense. On the other hand I presume that the action was taken by the Government of Canada and the Bank of Canada for reasons best known to them, presumably because they wish to follow now an anti-inflationary policy, but there is a built in paradox.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes a supplementary. I wonder then if the First Minister can indicate whether the increase will have any direct effect on Provincial Government borrowing and debt financing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh, it will probably have an indirect effect, Mr. Speaker. I would be surprised if it didn't. On the other hand, Manitoba as many other provinces has been resorting to the capital markets of the world in recent years and therefore the effect of the Bank of Canada action will be indirect at most, will not be a direct effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, although if the Attorney-General is back in his seat I think I'll probably direct it to him, it would be probably more appropriate. I wonder if he could indicate whether the government is considering the introduction of legislation providing the guarantees of journalistic protection?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: The question is an interesting one and it's naturally a policy decision on behalf of government, and I'm aware of the fact that other jurisdictions and other parliaments are concerned about the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. I wonder if the Attorney-General can indicate whether there are any proposed amendments to The Manitoba Evidence Act being contemplated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: That's a policy matter and I don't think that I can indicate anything definitive on it at this stage. I understand that there's a bill before Parliament respecting press rights and the rights of journalists.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. I wonder if the Attorney-General can inform the House whether the matter would be studied in co-operation with the representatives of the media or will it be referred to the Law Reform Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Certainly it may be possible that the matter be discussed with representatives of the media, I know that there have been informal discussions about certain matters. For example, prior to the commencement of this House the Committee I think of Rules and Privileges were concerned about certain rights of the media and certainly there was some dialogue on that occasion and I anticipate there will be further dialogue from time to time about the rights of the media.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Does the government have any studies or has it any specific reports on the desirability or feasibility of locating any of the specific proposed oil and gas line routes from the Arctic through Manitoba. Do we have any specific studies on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commiserate with my honourable friend for his affliction. It's not clear to me whether it's a result of something that happened a week ago or just last Saturday night. But in any case addressing myself to the question. There have been discussions with the President of Pan Arctic Oil with respect to possible routing of the Arctic supply oil pipeline and in May, this coming May, there is a probability that there will be some more firm announcement relative to the routing of the pipeline. Up until now we have not put any significant amount of provincial funds at work in terms of studying alternative routes.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. ASPER: Well can the First Minister's answer be taken then as meaning the Provincial Government supports the idea of a pipeline through Manitoba and that the Provincial Government will make representations in that regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, assuming that there is sufficient evidence that there are substantial deposits in commercial amounts of oil and gas in the high Arctic then if that would be so no doubt the Government of Canada will want to take steps with respect to arranging for the pipelining of those supplies to the southern market. And in that context of course the provinces would be advised what the intentions are. So far it has been almost on an academic plane and we have not committed any significant amounts of monies to studies in that respect. I will try to get more specific information for my honourable friend.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. Last week the Member for Portage questioned me on whether or not I had asked my staff to engage in political activity in support of this government and I have since checked into the matter, Mr. Speaker. Of course I want to remind the House that at that point my answer was "no". Subsequent to my answer, however, the Member for Portage went outside of the House and advised the media, or indicated to the media, that the MGEA was indeed very unhappy about the incident having occurred and had passed a resolution, or at least those were the allegations of some people who spoke to the Member for Portage la Prairie.

I want to read into the record, Mr. Speaker, a letter which I have received from the President of the MGEA with respect to this incident, and I quote: "In reply to your inquiry I am pleased to make the following statement which I hope will set the record straight regarding the matter of Mr. Johnston's reputed statement concerning the MGEA and discussions occurring at the recent departmental conference of the Agricultural Department. In my official position as President of the MGEA I must categorically deny that the Association had any discussion official or otherwise dealing with the context of Mr. Uskiw's remarks at the Annual Conference of the Department of Agriculture held on March 20-21 of this year. Mr. Uskiw's statements were an internal concern of the department privy to the employees of department and as such not a matter which could be considered for official discussion or action on the part of our association, and no such discussion or action has taken place or is contemplated. Some confusion may have arisen from the fact that I was asked to and did report to the employees in Mr. Uskiw's absence on the current concerns and business of the Association. In that report amongst many other things I did report on our concern that the government had indicated that it was prepared to grant civil servants the right to participate visibly and actively in provincial and federal election activities. I reported that we were concerned and the executive opposed this increased freedom in the light of what may rationally be expected to occur within the civil service based on historical evidence. In my remarks I at no time made any reference, direct or indirect to any statement of Mr. Uskiw's, nor did I do so by inference."

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take this opportunity -- I want to table this letter -- and take this opportunity to suggest to the Member for Portage that a very simple phone call with respect to the MGEA would have given him the necessary information and that he would not have had to cast aspersions on anyone in this House.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the matter of privilege raised by the Minister of Agriculture. It is true that I did say outside of this House that certain civil servants, and as I take it all civil servants are members of the MGEA, were dissatisfied with government action with respect to expecting them to take politically active parts on behalf of the administration. It is true that I did say that, that I did not attribute this statement to the officials of the MGEA, the President or any of his executive. But I did say that members of the civil service were dissatisfied. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Minister of Public Works says "prove it". I was told by civil servants, and a goodly number of them, and I shall not reveal their names here. If you don't want to take my word for it well then there's nothing I can do about it. So I'm making a statement that I've had

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) representations from numerous civil servants, not from one or two, from many civil servants that they are dissatisfied with the government's action in this regard, and I raised it and I thought I raised it properly.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, this is to the First Minister and it relates to a question that I asked last week and in my absence I think the First Minister answered. The question I had put was: Does the government have in its possession a report which I labelled Manpower Target Groups that indicated that 90.3 percent of the Indian population and 42 percent of the Metis population was unemployed. I understand the answer given was, no the government has no such report. Perhaps I can ask the question giving the full title, date and author. The name of the report which I question is called "Manpower Target Groups and Expenditure Tables"; the author is Paul Nickel and the report is dated the end of 1972. This is a report which I asked the government to ascertain if it has and if so to table.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will check once again. I did check last week and asked for a written indication whether such a report existed. The reply came back in the negative. I will check once again with the sort of expanded title and advise my honourable friend. If he is asking the question in the form which says, do we have such a report which indicates that 90 percent are unemployed, if that is all to be run together as being the question, then I think I could answer right now that the answer is no. I mean the unemployment factor which is troublesome is no worse today or greater today than it was many years ago.

MR. ASPER: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, does the government have any reports at all or any data indicating the level of unemployment amongst the natives and Indian and Metis population?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, asking in that more general frame I can undertake to provide whatever printed report material we have that bears on the general subject of remote native communities and employment opportunities and unemployment problems, I will attempt to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Attorney-General in his capacity as Minister reporting to the House for the Government Liquor Control Commission. I should like to ask him if it is the intention of the Liquor Control Commission to extend the hours of the liquor outlets in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member to indicate what he means by liquor outlets. There are licensed liquor vendors and then there are licensees whose operations are determined by the Act. If he's referring to liquor store hour operations themselves, they are determined administratively. There have been changes over the years; presently there are stores in the City of Winnipeg that operate later than most stores and this is a convenience to the public and also minimizes the illicit sale of liquor from time to time.

MR. JORGENSEN: My question, Sir, dealt with the government control liquor outlets. It is my understanding that the hours are to be extended on each and every one of the stores, not just a selective group of them. I wonder if the Minister would be able to reply to that question?

MR. MACKLING: I'm not aware, Mr. Speaker, of any general extension of hours but that is an administrative matter that is considered from time to time by the board. It hasn't been brought to my attention that there is any general extension of hours but I'll certainly make inquiry about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I'd like to ask him if the school district of Sprague will qualify for special assistance in the same way as did Camperville and Ninette?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, not knowing what the similarity is that the honourable member is referring to therefore the answer must be no.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister then, is it a lack of awareness that leads him to answer that?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'll direct my question to the First Minister, it's really for the Minister of Northern Affairs, has to do with an expediter, Ben Thompson at Thompson who on behalf of a group purchased a cartridge firm. So my question is: Did the MDC give him the \$175,000 that he used to purchase a cartage firm in Thompson?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I would have to ask the honourable member, did he say cartage firm -- cartage -- trucking firm? Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that as notice as to what involvement if any there was on the part of any financing agency of the Crown.

MR. THOMPSON: A question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could report to the House how many inmates were charged -- as a result of that last year's fracas at Headingley Jail, how many individuals were charged?

MR. MACKLING: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister, it relates to the Pan Arctic Oil development. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has made any studies of what bargaining position the province would take with respect to Pan Arctic if in fact a decision is made for the pipeline to be built on the assumption that it potentially is possible. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I then will phrase it another way. Has the government considered possibilities and have they a policy with respect to the bargaining that must be taken with Pan Arctic Oil with respect to the pipeline so that there will be a benefit for the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is heavily hypothetical. It is, I believe, no secret that there has been a rather concentrated study by Pan Arctic Oil and others of the Government of Canada involved in energy development with respect to two possible routes, at first three possible routes for this pipeline and I now I believe it has come to a choice of two routes. One is directly south as the bird flies literally from Resolute or King Christian Island area south to the southern part of Manitoba, and the other route involves a pretty large water crossing and then down the great northern part of the Province of Quebec, etc. And really, Sir, up until this point in time there has not been occasion or substantial enough reason to involve the Province of Manitoba in bargaining in the sense to which my honourable friend refers.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the government will consider the possibility of a wellhead price for either Northern Manitoba or for all of Manitoba as one of the bargaining factors and criteria with the pipeline company?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is yet another one of the reasons why the Manitoba Energy Council was formed, the matter of the pipeline routing from the high Arctic to the southern part of Canada is something which has been referred to the Minister of the Manitoba Energy Council and the board and it will be discussed and considered there.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. Well I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the government would look favourable to a wellhead price being provided for either Northern Manitoba or for all of Manitoba as a bargaining factor for the pipeline?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, all factors relating to what my honourable friend refers to will be taken into account and into consideration. The matter is still five, six years down the road and we have geared up well in advance I feel to deal with all of these questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister in charge of transportation. In view of the deal announced by the Canadian

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. FROESE cont'd) Government in the sale of wheat and barley to Russia, and also in view that the statement was made that some of the grain would be shipped via Churchill, does this mean that we will have an increased amount of grain going through that port this year. And also in connection with that same question, has the government had any discussion with the Russian government in providing a longer season in regard to insurance?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can take the question as notice on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce who reports for the Transportation Council, but in the interim I can advise my honourable friend as he is well aware, the Port of Churchill seems to have a maximum capacity of grain shipment in the order of 25 to 28 million bushels and on the basis of traditional practice and operations it doesn't seem to be possible to go beyond that without getting involved in extended season shipping. It is with this view in mind that representatives of the Soviet Union Trade Mission were invited to take a look at the Port of Churchill to familiarize themselves with the shipping problems and to indicate whether they would have an interest in extending shipping and we await some indication of intent from them.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and perhaps to the Minister of Public Works. Is the Government of Manitoba negotiating for the purchase of the Community Chev Motors building on Main Street or some similar large facility in north Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works has long-range plans of relocating the Provincial Garage.

MR. ASPER: Is the Government of Manitoba planning to purchase a facility such as Community Chev building and is there a plan to install a community clinic operation in that area?

MR. DOERN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

STATEMENT

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, do I have your permission to issue a short statement?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . leave of the House. Is it agreed? (Agreed)

MR. BARROW: The Flin Flon Midget Bombers are representing Manitoba in the Prince Edward Island Championships. They have won the Midget Championship for Manitoba and are going to the Dominion Finals between April 14th and April 20th. The players, Mr. Speaker, are: Dale Rideout, Howard Bielby, Rick Spiruk, Glen Tindall, Daryl Graff, Don Henry, Brent Kristoff, Kelly Gilmore, Richard Woloshyn, Tom Cullen, Ron Willey, Kim Peteluk, Gerry Nickolson, Kim Davis, Garry Schneider, Keith Rurak, Leslie Bray, Eddie Hagan, Joe Harrower, Kevin Ginnel, Bobby Clark, Ray Jarvis, Coach, and Arnold Kitch, Manager. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and I believe he took the initial question as notice. This has to do with the problems of pre-customs clearance to the United States and the proposed changes that are to be made. I wonder if the government's in a position to indicate whether any representation has been made to Ottawa to prevent the change that has been proposed that pre-customs clearance not take place in Winnipeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that has been referred to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and hopefully he can reply early this week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, my question will be to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and Tourism. I wonder if he can indicate whether there is any possibility that tourism will be affected by the proposed change of pre-customs clearance -- not in Winnipeg but in the United States? Will it mean that there will be an added inconvenience to travellers coming into Manitoba from the United States?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that we were concerned with this change and we expressed our concern to the Minister responsible in Ottawa.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then I take it that there has been representation made to him? -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, I did not really hear the answer, I just would like to paraphrase and then ask another question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, it was informal but we did express our concern to the Minister responsible in Ottawa. I can table the telegram that we sent tomorrow if you wish.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and Tourism. Then in the department's opinion there would be a detriment to tourism as a result of such a change?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the question is . . . and the honourable member is debating the point.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will ask it as a question, again, then, because representation is made doesn't necessarily mean that they consider it to be a detriment. Does the department consider that a change, the change that's being proposed would in fact be a detriment to tourism for Manitoba for those people travelling by air into Manitoba?

MR. DESJARDINS: I did answer the question. I said that the department was concerned and we expressed our concern to the Minister responsible in Ottawa, and we wanted to know more information on it.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Urban Affairs relates to a question asked a few weeks ago which was taken as notice. The question then was, would the government let us know whether it's made a decision on the City of Winnipeg's request for the Province of Manitoba to turn over to the City of Winnipeg the 17 or 18 or 19 government-owned homes surrounding Grace Hospital? The Minister took the question as notice to determine whether such a request had been received.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The request has not been received, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. I wonder if the Minister could indicate if the Manitoba Telephone System has been authorized to charge for station-to-station long distance telephone calls being accepted or received by a mechanical device which simply states by recorded announcement that a message may be recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate whether there's any truth to the rumour that he is going to setup the Minister of Mines and Resources as Deputy Minister resident in Thompson -- Deputy Premier?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear all of the question because the Honourable Member for Arthur was re-asking his question the second time when the Member for Thompson was asking his question and I didn't hear either of them very well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson place his question please.

MR. BOROWSKI: No, it's all right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. Order, please.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, Last Thursday evening the Honourable Member for Assiniboia made a statement in the budget debate at which point I raised a matter of privilege. The member stated, and I quote from Hansard, page 1432: "The Member for St. Matthews, who says that we believe in total expropriation of a state because he doesn't believe in a state any more and . . ." and at that point I raised a question of privilege, saying that he's attributed to me something I had never said. I didn't follow it up because I waited for Hansard in order to get the exact statement of the member and I can now confirm that I was correct that I never did say this. In the speech I made which he quoted from later I spoke for myself, I did not speak for the party and he refers to "we". He uses the term "total expropriation of a state". I don't know what on earth

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) he means, it makes no sense at all; and "because he doesn't believe in a state any more" that doesn't make any sense either.

He then proceeded to quote from a speech I made on June 18, 1971 and he quoted out of context, he quoted the sentence, "I would be in favour of taxing away entire estates." Mr. Speaker, what he did is he omitted a qualifying phrase and I regard this as a very dishonest practice. He quoted directly from a copy of Hansard and he omitted the word "virtually" which qualifies the entire meaning of the sentence, and I regard that as a very dishonest practice and I wish that sort of practice would stop.

My statement is contained on page 1631 of Hansard, June 8, 1971. The honourable member can read, I hope, and he can go back to read it. And I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member took what I said out of context and when what I said is placed in context it's very clear what I meant.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. Inasmuch as the member isn't here and while I don't have the Hansard from Thursday evening, certainly what the Member from Assiniboia said was the general understanding of the community and this House as to what the member said a year ago and that was this: that he believed that on the death of a person the entire estate should be taxed. That was the impression left and that's the impression that my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia tried to convey on Thursday evening. And the word "virtually" simply augments the extent of his view in a total confiscatory estate tax. It's impossible to understand what the point of privilege is. He was correctly quoted last Thursday night.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should involve ourselves in a debate. The only point that could be made, if it was a point of privilege, is that somebody read something from Hansard. If it was properly read the honourable member would have a right to say that he read it properly; if somebody thought it was improperly read, he would have a right to say otherwise. I don't think that the matter should go beyond that.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I now have the gist of the question that was asked by the Member for Thompson. I would like to advise him that the government has proceeded on the basis of a program of action rather than thinking in terms of having a premier's office built in Thompson.

I can advise my honourable friend, for example, that in Newfoundland, a premier's office was constructed at Cornerbrook in addition to the one in the capital of St. John's and I was informed when I was there last year that there have been in all these years, three, a total of three cabinet meetings in this lavish expensive premier's suite in Cornerbrook. I would not like to inflict on the taxpayers of Manitoba the expense of a second premier's office. What is more important is action through the departments of government and that Ministers do get up to the North whenever they have a reason and opportunity. (Applause.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable First Minister, about the progress or steps being taken to send matters of relief to Iceland in the situation which that country now faces and I think with which everybody is quite familiar from having read accounts in the newspapers; whether there is anything that can be reported.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between my office and that of two departments of the Government of Canada. I'm pleased to report there has been excellent co-operation between the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Defense federally, and the Province of Manitoba so that I believe this morning it was announced in Ottawa, and I'm pleased to confirm here, that the Government of Canada, the Province of Manitoba, are joining together in an amount of \$37,500 each and Misawa Homes Limited, which is a partnership of Japanese and Manitoba Investment, also \$37,500; all of which

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) together will provide for the purchase of approximately 8 to 10 homes to be built in Gimli -- Gimli, the New Iceland as it was once known -- and these homes will be airlifted by the Canadian Department of Defence Hercules Aircraft from the airfield at Gimli or New Iceland to Iceland during the course of this spring and early summer. So it's a matter which we can take great, I think, satisfaction that we are helping, joining other parts of the world, Sweden, Norway, British Columbia, other countries of the world, provinces, towards the relief of these 5,000 families that were forced to flee their homes with the most recent volcanic eruption in that country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I directed a question a moment ago to the Minister in charge of the Telephone System, which apparently my question was in some conflict with the question one of the other members on this side of the House, but I think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. WATT: I direct my question then, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways. I ask the Minister of Highways, has the Manitoba Telephone System been authorized to charge for station-to-station long distance calls, the calls being received or accepted by a mechanical device which simply states by recorded announcement that a message may be recorded?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I am not really sure whether that is the case or not, I'll take that as notice.

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

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to place a question to the First Minister and ask him whether a formula has been devised regarding northern economic development and projects dealing with Hydro development in Northern Manitoba regarding compensation and the like?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been indication in the past to the effect that the Crown must stand ready to meet claims adjudicated for damage and there has been indication of intent with respect to the dedication of certain of the water rentals that the Crown receives from Hydro-electric Development. I believe this was referred to last week. When we are in a position to make a definitive statement in this respect we shall do so and hopefully that could be in short order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Will adjudication of compensation for the residents of Southern Indian Lake be applied on the same basis as expropriation -- the principle of expropriation as applied on the basis of the people who have their land taken away from them?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, insofar as handling the matter in a way analogous to land expropriation, first of all, Sir, it must be pointed out that the amount of land that will be inundated will be relatively small and I don't believe any of it will be near settled or inhabited areas. Inundation of land on the Rat River system is not land that belongs to anyone in particular, it is Crown land I believe. But if there is any damage that is adjudicated to be so, there will be compensation in a way analogous to expropriation procedures in many past years.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate that when an adjudication is to be made what criteria is to be applied?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that, Sir, I suppose is simply a case of anyone who feels that he has evidence of damage caused to property or to livelihood will then submit a claim and have it presented in the same way as in the case of any claim for damage against the Crown in many transactions over many past years; and assistance for making such presentation of claim, legal counsel, etc., the cost of that will be borne by the Crown as well. That too has been indicated in the past.

MR. SPIVAK: I would like to ask the First Minister who will make the adjudication?

MR. SCHREYER: It will be a body, Sir, extra or outside of the executive branch of government -- that is to say it will be a judicial body similar in nature and operation to judicial bodies that have adjudicated compensation claims on expropriation in the past. County Court is perhaps the most probable example.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether there will be a right of appeal from that adjudication?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we have two examples of past precedent, one being resorting to the reference to County Court for this adjudication from which appeals presumably were allowed under certain circumstances in points of law I suppose, I'm not certain. The other example, Sir, is the establishment in years gone by of a quasi-judicial entity, such as was headed, for example, by Mr. Elswood Bole, to deal with claims for damage caused during flood. That would be a second course of action open, but in either case it would be judicial or quasi-judicial in nature with appeal under certain known circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. A supplementary question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. In view of the answer and in view of the example that's been given with respect to Mr. Elswood Bole, I wonder if the First Minister then can indicate that there will in fact be an appeal allowed? In the case of Mr. Bole's situation there was no appeal allowed.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the case of the responsibilities with which Mr. Elswood Bole had been charged, I do not recall, Sir, whether there was appeal allowed under certain circumstances or not. I will have to check that. But clearly the intent would be to proceed on the basis of stare decisis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister on the subject referred to. Will the criteria for establishing compensation be based on the principle of compensation for an asset or compensation for damages; compensation for an asset as in the case of expropriation of land, or compensation for damages as in the case of the flooding of the Red River? And there's a vast difference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, both I should think. If there is damage to assets that will be obviously compensatable; there would be claims submitted and adjudicated. Compensation for damages relative to assets or relative to livelihood would also be submitted by way of claim. The intention is to have moneys available for those contingencies by way of a dedication of the water rental royalties from the diverted water, and that precise formula is something which will be announced in very short course I hope.

MR. ALLARD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are we then to assume that the value of the asset itself would be taken into consideration in establishing compensation in the sense that the people of the north will have not only the ordinary rights of Manitobans, but prior rights as northerners to an asset which is really a northern one?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that principle is in many ways a two-edged sword. Still there is recognition of the need to acknowledge that the resource base of the north insofar as it is related and has related to the residents of the many primary resource base communities of the north ought to be so acknowledged. In other words, Sir, there is the -- I believe this has been made clear -- there will be a dedication of the water royalty -- the water rental royalties received by the Crown would be dedicated to meet the compensation and beyond that, to meet the resource development, economic development needs of the people of those communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland, last supplementary.

MR. ALLARD: Will the level of such royalties be under the control of those who will be using the service specifically -- will the northern people have a serious say in setting the level of such royalties which will be at the service of all Manitobans?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to that. With respect to the level of the water rental royalties, that is not subject to fluctuation. That has existed for many years. There is a very definite formula and the formula would be applied with respect to the volume of diverted water as it generates energy in the Nelson plants, and the amount of that water rental would be calculated out on the basis of the existing formula, long existing formula, and would be then available for the compensation needs and the development needs beyond that of these communities. And it is in this latter respect, Sir, that there would be, ideally

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SCHREYER cont'd) speaking, meaningful involvement and participation by representatives of those areas and those communities.

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

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister, following the same line. In view of the fact that the rights in many, many cases, the majority of cases, the rights that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please?

MR. ASPER: . . . give rise to the compensation that the First Minister has been referring to, don't exist in law, will the First Minister assure this House that during this session he will present legislation establishing those rights to compensation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, rights -- I am one of those, rightly or wrongly, I have never felt convinced that rights can be bestowed by statute law. They either exist as a matter of natural law or they don't. In the case of these people it is acknowledged that there is need for the Crown to recognize that these people living in communities that have been dependent on primary resources in the area. To the extent that there is disturbance there must be steps taken to offset whatever loss there might be in terms of value of primary resources and that is why we have spoken in terms of the dedication of the water rental royalties which would be paid in perpetuity for as long as the turbines spin, I suppose, would be the new idiom, and that amount, Sir, over the years will be more than sufficient to cover compensation real and direct and would be available for general economic development and social uplift.

MR. ASPER: To the First Minister. Is the First Minister suggesting to the House that the rights that give rise to the compensation that he's described, will be discretionary in the hands of government or will be fixed by law?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the indication I have given is one that will be embodied, Sir, and whether it be embodied in statute or whether it be embodied in agreement or in regulations is another matter. I am not aware whether statute law means that it is -- my honourable friend knows it does not mean that it becomes like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, it can never be changed again. So my honourable friend, I do not accept the thesis that it is necessary to proceed in that manner necessarily.

MR. ASPER: The question, and perhaps I'm not being clear, Mr. Speaker, but I'll try it again. The question is, that the right does not exist to compensation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: . . . in view of the fact . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I remind the honourable member that he is to place a question, not to place a debate before the House.

MR. ASPER: In view of the fact that the rights do not exist unless created, does the Minister intend to pass some Act to create the rights which he intends to compensate?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is being proceeded with on the basis of a perceived obligation, statute law is not a necessary feature of it. It would not enhance nor detract from the obligation that is perceived and which will be formalized and proceeded on.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: First Order for Return was the Honourable Member for Morris which is being held in my name. On Thursday, March 29th the Honourable Member for Morris moved for the consideration of the House an Order for Return requesting certain information with respect to Western Flyer Coach Industries. The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management in his capacity of House Leader raised a point of order -- (Order, please) -- regarding the admissibility of the proposed motion and quoted from Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure Fourth Edition, Page 253, which reads in part as follows: "A document of which it is proposed to order a copy must relate to matter within the proper jurisdiction of parliament." The Honourable House Leader has pointed out that while Western Flyer Coach Industries is one in which the Government of Manitoba owns considerable shares the corporation is not a fully owned Crown corporation, therefore the information sought by the Honourable Member for Morris is of a nature which would readily be made available through the process of the Economic Development Committee. The point raised by the Honourable Member for Morris is that the rules of our House provide that a Minister may indicate that the government either accept or rejects an Order for Return. If refused the member has the

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SPEAKER'S RULING

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) alternative of redrafting the Order, accepting the decision of the government or having the matter transferred for debate during private members' hour.

I thank the honourable gentlemen for the positions they advance and find merit in each. In deliberating on this matter I find that in 1963 Madam Speaker Forbes in ruling on a motion by the then Leader of the New Democratic Party for an Order for Return referred to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms and Citations, Citation 171(ff). Since Citation 171 sets out the guidelines for questions, oral or written, the House by upholding the Speaker's ruling at that time appears to regard Orders for Return as a form of written question. Accepting the foregoing one must then determine what is within the proper jurisdiction of parliament. May I then direct the attention of the honourable members to Citation 171, sub-section (dd) of Beauchesne, which reads: "A question oral or written must not, (dd) deal with matters not officially connected with government or parliament or which are of a private nature.

Here the matter is in two parts. In perusing the question of the Honourable Member for Morris one can conclude by the way it is worded that it impinges on private matters of the Western Flyer Coach Industries. At the same time by the Honourable House Leader's admission that the government is a shareholder of Western Flyer Coach Industries would thus to a degree officially connect it and creates an impasse or non-answer. In view of the foregoing the Chair is of the opinion that the Assembly would wish to adjudicate on this matter in conformity with our Rule 49 which allows ample scope for expression of opinions and will of the Assembly and the members. Consequently I am allowing the admissibility of the Order for Return of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Order for Return is accepted. Does the Honourable House Leader wish to indicate his acceptance or does he wish to transfer it for debate?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like this matter transferred on the basis that the government while prepared to give this information, as I indicated to my honourable friend, is not prepared to give it on an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. JORGENSEN: Just on a minor point or order but it may be significant. I'm not sure whether our rules provide that a Minister of the Crown can transfer a -- (Interjection) -- No, that's not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: My point of order is, simply that I don't think that it is up to a Minister to transfer for debate. He either accepts it or rejects it and then the member who is moving the motion can transfer it for debate if he chooses. I'm not going to have to be forced to debate it if I don't choose to. I think that's my prerogative rather than the Minister's.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then the honourable member is quite correct, the honourable member is correct. I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the government is rejecting this Order, not because it does not want to supply the information but it feels that this is not a matter within the legislative competence of the House. I am going to give the honourable member the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Minister to say that he's going to provide the information for me?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker. I indicated that the last day it came up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would take it that the same information would also be available to other members if they so indicate and I so indicate right now that I would appreciate having it too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated that there is no objection to giving the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Point of order, just for further clarification. I then understand that the government is accepting this Order for Return? Don't you think that's the basis that the Honourable Member for Morris . . .

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I have indicated that the government is not accepting this Order for Return. I'm willing to give the information to my

ORDERS OF THE DAY - SPEAKER'S RULING

(MR. GREEN cont'd) honourable friend. With great respect to your ruling, Sir, I am unable to give to the House information on Tantalum Mines although we have some shares in it. I am unable to give information on Chemalloy although we have some shares in it. Since Your Honour has ruled that I have to give information on all these companies which we may have a share in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating the issue now.

MR. GREEN: . . . I am unable to accept that Order for Return. I will give the information but am unable to accept the Order for Return. It's silly, absolutely silly.

MR. SPEAKER: In other words the Order for Return has not been accepted? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I just want to make it clear. The Minister has said that he, although the Order for Return is not accepted, he is going to provide me with the information?

MR. GREEN: And any other honourable member, yes. But that we cannot accept the fact that government is responsible for providing this information on an Order for Return.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion for an Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On the matter, I think it's worthy to have this absolutely clear. What will take place now is that this kind of information will be privately made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. The answer was given; the House I believe understands. If the honourable member has a particular difficulty he'll have to confer privately. We are not debating Orders for Return at the present moment. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I certainly don't wish this to be misunderstood as the Honourable Member for Lakeside apparently wishes it to be. The information will be provided publicly because I told my honourable friend that it will be provided publicly. But, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to you, we cannot accept it as a governmental responsibility to provide information for a private corporation in which we happen to have a shareholding, and rather than appeal your ruling I am refusing the Order. If it's debated we will debate it on that basis. On the other hand, we are perfectly happy to give the honourable friend the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West for an Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin,

THAT an Order of the House do Issue for a Return Showing the following information:

The latest audited annual reports for the following Corporations in which Manitoba Development Corporation holds an equity position: Flyer Industries Limited; Saunders Aircraft Corporation Limited; Macey Foods Limited; Morden Fine Foods Limited; Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd.; Leaf Rapids Corporation; Phoenix Data Systems Ltd.; Misawa Homes of Canada Ltd.; Alphametrics Ltd.; Tantalum Mining Corporation of Canada Limited.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, provided the information contained in the honourable member's statement is correct, that we hold an equity in each company, which I assume is correct, that we will provide a Return to this Order.

MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson, Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rhineland, THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information with respect to The University of Manitoba and The University of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the concurrence of the House to add on Brandon University which was not put on there?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member have the concurrence of the House to add on Brandon University? (Agreed)

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you.

1. The number of Manitoba born professors employed at each University.
2. The number of Canadian born professors employed at each University.
3. The number of non-Canadian professors employed at each University.
4. The number of professors employed at each University who are U. S. citizens.
5. The number of the above mentioned U. S. professors who are draft-dodgers.
6. The number of the above mentioned U. S. professors who are deserters from

military service.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell pork chop to stop beating his gums while I'm trying to read my Order for Return. No. 7 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BOROWSKI:

7. The number of U. S. citizens who are employed by those Universities in non-academic positions -- i. e.; administrative, etc.

8. The number of U. S. citizens employed at these Universities who do not pay any Canadian Income Tax.

9. The number of U. S. citizens who are registered as students at each of the Universities.

10. The number of students mentioned in 9 above who are draft-dogers.

11. The number of those students who are deserters from military service.

12. The number of those students who are receiving student aid, welfare, unemployment insurance provided by the federal or provincial governments or employed on projects financed by public funds.

13. The number of professors employed at those Universities who are not Canadian citizens and who have applied for Canadian citizenship.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I raise a question of order on this Order for Return. The University like a private corporation is not required to give this information to the Honourable Minister. It is not within the legislative competence of the government to demand that of the university, therefore I would ask you to rule this motion out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I have considered the matter and I had in mind to question whether this was admissible but I wanted to see what the mood of the House was. Since the Honourable House Leader has raised the objection it buttresses my own opinion, therefore I do rule the question out of order. The Honourable . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the matter is not debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: That's right.

MR. BOROWSKI: That means that the only re . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that if it is ruled out of order it is not debatable. It is only debatable if it is put and it is refused on the basis that government doesn't wish to provide the information. If the motion is out of order it is not debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think if the motion was not acceptable then the Minister shouldn't have replied in the first place. By having the Minister speak on it I think it's already accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Official Opposition I would have to concur with the statement just made by the House Leader. The question of whether or not a matter such as this is debatable is only if the government decides that they refuse to give that information but presumes that it is within the competence and within the jurisdiction of this Chamber to ask that question in the first instance. I would have to concur with the House Leader in this instance.

MR. SPEAKER: Well if honourable members had been listening I said that I had trepidations in regard to this Order and I wanted to see what the mood of the House was. Since there was objection raised I concurred with my own particular first opinion that the question

ORDERS FOR RETURN

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) was not admissible. Therefore I'm not accepting it as an Order for Return and consequently it's not debatable. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have no alternative but to challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Does the honourable member have support? Will the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. BOROWSKI: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Does the honourable member have support?

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. The question before the House, shall the Chair be sustained in its ruling.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Adam	Messrs. Hanuschak	Messrs. Paulley
Barrow	Henderson	Pawley
Boyce	Jenkins	Petursson
Burtniak	Johannson	Schreyer
Desjardins	Jorgenson	Shafransky
Doern	McGill	Spivak
Einaron	McGregor	Toupin
Enns	McKenzie	Turnbull
Ferguson	Mackling	Mrs. Trueman
Gonick	Malinowski	Messrs. Uruski
Gottfried	Miller	Uskiw
Green	Moug	Walding
		Watt

NAYS

Messrs. Allard	Messrs. Froese
Asper	G. Johnston
Barkman	Patrick
Borowski	

MR. CLERK: Yeas 37; Nays 7.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Yeas have it, I declare the motion carried.
The Honourable House Leader.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd call in order the second reading of government bills. There are two bills, 25 and 24.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 18. The Honourable Minister for Emerson.

MR. PAULLEY: No, that stands, Mr. Speaker. 18 stands.

BILL 25

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 25, an Act to amend the Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney -General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, honourable members will recall that in 1971 we enacted a new Mortgage Brokers and Mortgage Dealers Act which was proclaimed last year after the necessary regulations were prepared and passed. Some of the sections of this amending bill

BILL 25

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) correct a minor oversight in the original legislation and the last part of the bill permits mortgage dealers to keep their trust accounts with credit unions. At present they are limited to chartered banks and trust companies.

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

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and passed.

BILL 24

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 24, an Act to amend the Crop Insurance Act for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that actually is an attempt to tidy up the legislation to provide a degree of flexibility on the part of the insurer which he did not have to this point in time. Under the present Act one has to have insurance or the complete crop insurance program on every field on which he applies for hail insurance coverage. This particular amendment will allow any farmer to insure any part of his holdings for hail insurance or for protection against hail notwithstanding the fact that he may only have one or two fields insured under the all-risk program. So it's really extending the program and giving the farmer greater flexibility.

The other amendment is really correcting an inadvertence, it's a technical amendment in the area of definitions and I don't think that it's worthy of spending our time debating it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 10(b)(1) -- The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, when we were last on this particular item I was speaking on it and at that time the Minister took exception to the fact that I did not have a copy of the Press release from which I was quoting. I now have a copy of the Press release and find it even more interesting than what I had first supposed. I made one mistake for which I apologize. I said that the statement was made in Brandon; it was not, it was made in Winnipeg at a meeting of the Farm Bureau, and I will quote some of the sections of the Press release which comes from the Winnipeg Free Press. I might also add that there was an account in the Winnipeg Tribune of the same date, November 28, 1972. The statement goes on to say, "Low Cost Help Out - Uskiw. Farmers can no longer depend on tactical enslavement for low-cost farm labour and are going to have to pay a premium for farm workers, -- Manitoba Agricultural Minister Sam Uskiw said here Monday. 'I suggest you put out of your head the idea that you can get labour at a lower cost than other industries,' Mr. Uskiw said. He was speaking to delegates at a quarterly meeting of the Manitoba Farm Bureau. Mr. Uskiw said that paying a farm worker \$400 a month plus room and board may sound like a good deal but it really isn't so good when the employee is expected to work 16 hours a day. 'This is really tactical enslavement,' he said. The Minister said the problem of farm labour

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) is compounded because many people don't especially want to work on the farms. He said that while the farmer himself may be willing to work 16 hours a day on his own farm, another person will not unless he's very interested in agriculture. Present provincial labour laws exclude farm work from the provisions of the minimum wage." Then he goes on to say: "Mr. Uskiw said he doubted if farmers would want to employ many of the people on welfare because they would not likely be good farm workers; many are alcoholics or have drug problems, and I don't think you'd want them on your farms. 'However', he said 'one possible solution is now being considered by the provincial government' " -- and then he goes on to explain what he has in mind. That's how the Minister in chastising the Member for Portage la Prairie a while ago, he said, that if he'd made one telephone call to the Manitoba Government Employees Association he could have found out for himself just exactly what was said. The Minister obviously has taken great exception to this reported account of his in the newspapers.

I took the trouble to make a few telephone calls to various people who were at that meeting and to a large extent they confirmed what the Press report has stated. The Minister has a habit and he'd done this -- and it's characteristic not only of the Minister of Agriculture who is a master at it, but it seems to be characteristic of most of my honourable friends opposite. They make speeches, and as reported in the Country Guide just recently the Minister made the statement there and I must concur with him. He said when he was a young boy he often argued politics and he said I admit now that I often didn't know what I was talking about. That particular characteristic has not forsaken him. He very frequently doesn't know what he's talking about now.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister very frequently makes statements off the cuff such as these and then has a very convenient habit of blaming the press. I have never know a government that have complained so much about being misquoted as honourable gentlemen opposite. -- (Interjection)-- Well my honourable friend Minister says for good reason. If my honourable friend is afraid of being misquoted then perhaps he might take a suggestion that is often followed by Federal Cabinet Ministers, and that is that they have texts of their remarks which they pass out to the press where there is no opportunity of misquoting. But this is a very convenient device and I've often seen him use it. --(Interjection)-- I wonder if my honourable friend will wait until I'm through. If he wants to speak he's going to have plenty of opportunity because this debate as he knows is a debate in which we can participate back and forth and for just once I would like to be able to complete my remarks without some of the interjections that almost invariably come from the other side. My honourable friend could issue texts of his remarks to make sure that he wasn't being misquoted; there are many ways that he can make sure that the remarks that he makes don't sound so foolish when they come into the press. And one way is not to make so many foolish remarks. Sometimes the Minister, and I've often heard him myself at various meetings, making statements of that nature, and often wondered why the press don't report him a little more frequently because of some of the somewhat asinine that he is capable of making from time to time.

But I rise only, Sir, because the Minister of Labour who exorcised himself so unduly the other day because I didn't have a copy of the particular news release, I have it now and I've placed it on the record so my honourable friend will know that I was quoting from an article that I had seen and I won't go to the trouble of putting the similar news report from the Tribune on the record because they're pretty much the same. I do say, Sir, that the Minister has made statements with regard to what the government plans to do insofar as farm labour is concerned. We all know that it's a serious problem in this province and he's not making it easier with the kind of policies that the government are following. There are ways that farm labour can be obtained and there are people that are willing to work on the farms.

One of the great drawbacks that we have at the present to obtaining farm labour is the kind of interference that the government insists on bringing about between those who wish to work on farms and those who wish to employ them. I suggest to the Minister that if he is to bring about any degree of assistance to the farm economy, why the greatest effort that the government can put forth is to stop creating policies that have the effect of increasing costs to the farmer. That is going to be the real problem that farmers are going to be faced with in

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) the next year or so. I submit, Sir, notwithstanding the new levels at which prices of farm products have risen, that it will be a matter of very short time that farm costs are going to reach a new plateau as well, and the difficulty is that those farm costs will remain at that plateau whereas farm prices will drop because world markets will fluctuate from time to time and there is no way that a farmer, once he has established a level of production can conveniently cut back and expect to stay in business. The Minister has misread, completely misread the mood of the farmers of this province, the problems of the farmers in this province, and he has completely misjudged the action that is required to solve those problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris is as phoney as the newspaperman who gave that account.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. JORGENSON: I was very careful to refrain from using any remarks that would warrant that kind of remark from the Minister. Now if he has got any objections that he wants to have to the remarks I make, that's fine, I have no quarrel with that, but I leave it to you, Sir, that that kind of a personal remark is not permitted in this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. The Honourable Minister please withdraw his remark.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out how ridiculous my honourable friend is

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I think the remark is one that the Honourable Minister should reconsider and withdraw.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps for the record I will withdraw the remark, but by tabling documents which I have here, that those statements perhaps might be justified in due course.

The Member for Morris takes a great deal of satisfaction out of a newspaper account having to do with a -- not a speech of mine, Mr. Chairman, but a sort of informal question and answer type of meeting that was held between myself and the Farm Bureau some time ago, I have the copy of the press statement here and I also have one, a copy of the Tribune accounting, and one will notice, Mr. Speaker, that in the accounting given to that particular discussion by the Tribune there is no such allegation as one would find on the front page of the Winnipeg Free Press of the same date.

Now I believe -- I don't have the specific date, Mr. Chairman, no. I can find out for my honourable friend and advise him later. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is true that we had a very frank discussion on the question of farm labour, but I want to read into the record, Mr. Chairman, a letter which I received from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities as a result of this newspaper account. It's from J. C. Scott, Secretary Manager, dated December 4th. It says "Dear Mr. Uskiw: I have been approached by a considerable number of people who upon reading the press report were disturbed by your remarks when speaking to the delegates of the Manitoba Farm Bureau on Monday, November 27, 1972. 'Tactical enslavement.' Do you as Minister of Agriculture and a man of agricultural background really believe that farmers employ skilfully planned methods for gain when acquiring their necessary farm labour? Your proposal for a manpower pool for agriculture whereby labourers would be on the provincial payroll and available to farmers we believe is a sign of mistrust to the farmer and the agricultural industry on the whole, and the fact that it implied the farmer cannot be trusted to negotiate for their own farm needs. People who are engaged in the agricultural industry know that elements of weather govern in great part the business of farming and sixteen hours a day may be necessary at intervals during the seeding and harvesting operations but I am not sure it is by no means standard practice. I shall be pleased to receive your comments. Yours truly, J. C. Scott".

Mr. Speaker on December 12th I replied to that letter, and I think this reply will serve to indicate to my honourable friend the kind of message that is long overdue to him. This is a letter from my office to Mr. J. C. Scott, dated December 12th. "Dear Mr. Scott: I would like to acknowledge your letter of December 4, 1972 regarding farm labour pools. I understand that my Executive Assistant, Gordon Peitsch, already called you to clarify the

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) misunderstanding. Firstly, the term 'tactical enslavement' was a distortion which only the Free Press can answer for. I spoke to the press reporter who wrote the subject article and who agreed to issue a retraction, but to my knowledge has not yet done so. I did make comments recognizing the fact that competent farm labour is almost impossible to obtain, especially in peak seasons such as seeding and harvest. To meet this need I suggested the establishment of a farm labour pool composed of experienced men who are available for hire by individual farmers. To reduce complications for medical, unemployment insurance and pension benefits I suggested that members of the labour pool be paid by the government who would in turn bill the farmers. In this manner, several different farmers could hire help for short periods with a minimum of complications, regarding records experienced by farmer and worker. There is by no means any intention to interfere with individual farmers hiring their own labour. The plan would simply be intended to help farmers in their desperate requirement for competent hired help. Hopefully some training could be included in this total concept to assure competent help. May I also take this opportunity to suggest that you should not question my intent or integrity, but rather the intent and credibility of the Winnipeg Free Press. I am sure you would appreciate news media which reflects true happenings in its reporting as opposed to allowing yourself to sink to new lows as evidenced by the article referred to in your letter. Only corrupt and dirty minds whose motives are questionable could put out such disgusting stories in the name of news reporting. Yours truly." And I signed that letter, Mr. Chairman.

Now, it is true that a number of statements were made, questions were put and answers were given; and it is true that some of those words reported were used, but it's the context in which they were used that is important, Mr. Chairman. My whole point in dealing with the question of hours of work, the question of whether one is enslaved or not, had to do with comments made to me by farm workers which I was relating to that meeting. It was not a statement of mine; and obviously any newspaper man that wanted to have some fun could have taken those comments out of context, Mr. Chairman, and could have brought about this kind of ridiculous story.

The Member for Morris knows that. I'm not sure if he was, but I know his colleagues were at a number of similar meetings wherein this question was discussed and they fully appreciate the context in which this point was discussed. I would think that it would be a credit to the Member for Morris if he would desist from engaging on the marginal side of the facts, Mr. Chairman, and dealt more fully with the truth of the matter. I think his constituents, Mr. Chairman, would appreciate a little bit more credibility than has been forthcoming from their representation in this house.

Now I did take the trouble to phone this reporter and he did say that he was going to put in a correction. After a few days when it didn't appear I phoned him again and he indicated to me that since I had no text I really couldn't prove what I said or didn't say and therefore it was my word against his and that he would leave his story stand. And my honourable friend here picks that point up and suggests that I should have had a text in a question and answer situation, a bearpit session. That's absolutely ridiculous and nonsensical. The honourable member knows better than that. He knows that you're not in a position to presume the kind of questions that will be answered and thereby cannot have a text prepared accordingly. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Morris do a little more of his homework, a little more research, and having done that, pursue his objectives with a greater degree of integrity than he has over the years, and in particular in this instance, because it would do him a lot of good as well.

MR. JORGENSEN: I have now received a lecture from the Minister of Agriculture on integrity and I don't intend to lecture the Minister but I will say this to him. That when he makes statements such as he was reported as making in this meeting -- and I took the trouble to phone people who were at that meeting, they verified it, they verified it Sir, and said that those statements were actually made. And that's what he was cautioning the Member for Portage to do. He said if he'd taken the trouble to make a telephone call, which I did. He complains that I didn't do any research. I did a lot of research. That's what's bothering my honourable friend is the fact that I've done too much research on this and it begins to hurt him. My honourable friend, if he'd stop making foolish statements he would stop getting foolish

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) press and he would have nothing to complain about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few comments in support of what the Member for Morris has just said. I have also read the reports from both the Winnipeg Free Press and the Tribune and from other sources, and I have also talked with some of the members of the Farm Bureau that were at that meeting. But what I would like to say at this moment, Mr. Chairman, is that I'm at a loss to equate what the Minister has just said about the press, in reporting the press statement as being phoney.

The other day, Mr. Chairman, we listened to the Member for East Brandon, the Honourable Member of Industry and Commerce for 40 minutes, read from the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune statements that fitted into the thinking apparently of the government on that side of the House, and the government constantly lauded the Member for East Brandon time after time as he read excerpts from both the Winnipeg and Free Press, -- which apparently were factual at that time and were not phoney, in support of the government. But on the other hand today we find now that reports from the press are irresponsible and phoney, and I'm just wondering and I would like to ask the Minister if today the press, speaking in support or writing in support, or quoting in support all members of the government, are completely with integrity, and if tomorrow or the day after they are not, because they report adversely what the Minister or a Minister has said?

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the reports from the press as I understand it in the Farm Bureau are very close, if not exactly what was said at the meeting that day, and that a great deal of harm has been done throughout the Province of Manitoba so far as agriculture labour is concerned and there is not a farmer in the province that is not aware of it. (Hear, hear)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a very few comments on this particular subject. I didn't, from memory I wasn't absolutely certain as to when this statement was made by the Minister but I do recall it coming over the farm broadcast last fall, and I have asked a number of farmers as to whether they recalled this statement being made, and I'm not here, to stand up here to criticise the Minister in such a way that I want to destroy him but I want to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, the comments that he's made and I know many people said it came over the farm broadcast. I would suggest that the Minister himself should have got on it, you know, through the farm broadcast because very many farmers hear this throughout the rural parts of Manitoba -- would come out and stated his exact position, probably given a written statement as to exactly what he said and what he meant. And I want to reiterate too, Mr. Chairman, from what my colleague from Arthur said, that we have a very critical situation insofar as labour is concerned in Manitoba, and in fact it has a psychological effect to people who are interested in going out and working in the country are given the impression that my God farmers are slave drivers and that they've got to work 16 hours a day, and this has given the impression that this goes on all through the year, which is just not a fact Mr. Chairman. In the springtime when we are putting our crops in, which is a couple of weeks, in harvest time when we are spending two weeks to three weeks taking it off, is the only time of the year that you might put in some extended hours, and in most cases, farmers are prepared to remunerate those hours for help. I think Mr. Chairman that we have a situation here where something should be said to clarify this matter, because it is a serious matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- or Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the debate that went on about whether or not the Minister made certain statements at a meeting but I would like to refer to the matter that the Minister brought up as a matter of privilege earlier in the afternoon and that is the premise that I think he is operating on, and I guess it will be government policy in that Cabinet Ministers are actively encouraging civil servants to work or to act sympathetically . . .

POINT OF ORDER

MR. USKIW: On a point of order, my honourable friend is debating that question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What would you like?

MR. USKIW: My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that we are now on a specific resolution and the Member of Portage la Prairie is introducing a totally different matter entirely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. I think Rule 64 of our House Rules 64(2) Speeches in the Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to your suggestion we're talking about people who worked indirectly, or who are going to work for farmers but are steered there by government activity, and I want to talk about the attitude of civil servants and people like this who are beholden to the government for their jobs, and what the government policy is with regard, --(Interjection)-- beholden exactly what I say. I'm talking about if a civil servant refuses or declines to act politically for the administration what is his status in the Civil Service in the future? That's what I want to discuss at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: On a matter of the privileges of the civil service of Manitoba I must rise on a point of privilege, and I believe it is a point of privilege, to object to the inference that the civil servants in Manitoba are beholden to any political faith. At the present time in legislation they can't express themselves during the term of an election it is true, but I would ask my honourable friend from Portage la Prairie in fairness to the civil service to take a look and to re-read what he said. I don't think my honourable friend meant it really the way he uttered this statement. I hope he didn't mean it, because I, as the Minister responsible for the civil service have every faith in the civil servants of the Province of Manitoba to use their own judgment as to how they conduct themselves as employees of the Province of Manitoba, and I feel obligated as that Minister, Mr. Chairman, to ask my honourable friend to reconsider the remark that he made which is derogatory, I suggest, of the civil service of Manitoba.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on a matter of privilege and I hope I'm allowed the same latitude that the Minister was allowed when he spoke on privilege. I have in my hand a document that was read on to the record by the Minister of Agriculture earlier in the afternoon and I would like to quote out of this document to substantiate what I'm talking about. And this is in the final paragraph and this is from Mr. Howden the President of the MGEA, and I quote. He said "I did report on our concern that the government has indicated that it was prepared to grant civil servants the right to participate visibly and actively in provincial and federal election activity. I reported that we were concerned and that the executive opposed this increased freedom in the light of what might rationally be expected to occur within the civil service based on historical evidence." Now, Mr. Chairman, if this isn't showing concern by civil servants that they're being urged or asked to take a part with respect to helping government instead of doing their job as professional people . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I think what the Honourable Member for Portage has referred to in the letter by Mr. John Howden, the President of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, he's expressing a concern which in the opinion of the executive may happen in the future. The references that were made by the Member for Portage la Prairie indicated that such was a privilege today. Mr. Howden is taking a different approach entirely. He's prejudging possible legislation. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Chairman, he is making reference to something that may happen or may not happen. My honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie in his remarks indicated that it was happening as of this moment. And there, Mr. Chairman, is why I appeal to my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie to not mix apples with oranges.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I must say that the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture are two of my favourite ministers, but this doesn't preclude the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has made remarks publicly that would lead any reasonable person to conclude that they were being asked to work politically.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I ask the honourable member to withdraw that. That is not correct.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: The Minister in this House a few days ago said that he spoke at a meeting and gave - I don't know if the term was a "lecture" but he gave a talk, instructions on democratic proceedings, to members of his Department. Well this is something unusual for a Minister to lecture members of his Department on . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of privilege.

MR. USKIW: The honourable member knows full well that that is not what I said in the House the other day and he's completely distorting the facts.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's the meaning I took from his remarks. If he wants to clarify what he did say at that meeting, well let him go ahead. But he used the word "democracy", he said he spoke at length to members of his Department on democracy, and what does he mean? That's what many of the civil servants have taken out of the meaning of it, that they are asked to actively support the government and abandon their traditional role as being professional civil servants working under whatever administration they may be under at the time. So I ask the Minister to tell us what he did tell them in his little lecture on democracy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage is again indulging on the very thin and narrow line. In fact he's straying beyond the margin of truth in his allegations. I want to say for the record here that the Department of Agriculture holds a number of staff meetings, as should be the case, during the course of each year, some with small groups, some with practically the whole department present, and it is the job of the ministry to try and indicate policy to the staff membership. And in indicating new policy it's obvious that it's expected that the staff is going to carry out that policy in that they are working for the administration, the employer, and that is the Government of the day, and my comments were simply comments related to the fact that we have had for many years in this province changes of government over which there was not a great deal of desire nor need to review policy, but that in 1969 when, for the first time in the history of this province, this particular government came into

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) office, that policies were being reviewed and new direction was being given and that perhaps where staff did not have clear direction before, that they are in a position now of getting that kind of direction for which they are appreciative, I might say, so that they know the position that they must take. And they have to deliver the policies of government throughout the whole system of the department, throughout the whole system of government, not only at the center but regionally all the way through.

The whole thrust has to be behind the new policies whatever they are, and my instructions to them were that these policies that have been recently introduced should be supported wholeheartedly by staff who should be developing the necessary program work to implement these policies, and that if an opposing administration was to take office this year or five years from now or twenty years from now, that they may very well receive direction that might be quite different from the direction they now have and that I would expect that they would even reverse their position in carrying out those instructions in line with the thinking of the government of that day. That is what the democratic process is all about. And that is not asking civil servants to support any political party. It's only asking for the full support of the staff in the delivery of policies that are already announced in part of the program of this government.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister spoke at length but I don't think he said a great deal. Could he tell us what radical policies he's persuading his staff to implement that are so different philosophically from agriculture over the past hundred years. I'm at loss to know what policies would be so radical in agriculture that would require this kind of a lecture to staff that they must wholeheartedly support his policies. He almost says that they weren't supporting his policies. We're talking about agriculture, we're not talking about philosophies or new ideas and changes in democracy. We're talking about the Department of Agriculture, and if he's got some radical policies that he thinks he has to hard-sell into his own department, for goodness' sakes tell us about them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone has to spend too much time responding to that kind of debate because the Member for Portage full well knows, or should know, that there are things changing within the system of government on an almost daily basis, and there is always a degree, a fairly substantial degree of philosophical input into programs and I would want to -- I could list a number of examples, Mr. Chairman. I could list a number of examples in any department where there is philosophical input, and probably the most glaring example is the change in taxation measures if you want to take the Department of Finance as the key department that is leading the way in bringing about measures that reflect ability-to-pay principles in taxation. There are policies involving agriculture at the present time, with respect to land tenure, that very much deviate from the old policies of the past wherein more emphasis is given to the needs of people that don't have the capability of borrowing money but where we would want to provide opportunities for those people to enter the industry or to sustain themselves within the industry. Land lease policies, the new policies with respect to the administration of Crown lands, a major departure from the past procedures, again in keeping with the philosophy of the government. So that let not the Member for Portage la Prairie suggest for one moment, Mr. Chairman, that there has not been a major change in policy and philosophy since 1969.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I find this debate on this item 10 (b) a most intriguing and interesting one. I think I was the one that raised the question the other night in the estimates of the Minister to find out if he would clarify what he was talking about regarding farm labour and the shortage of farm labour, and my gosh, Mr. Chairman, we have enough problems in rural Manitoba today with the dry spring, the meat boycott, shortage of farm labour, high unemployment, and what's so bad about farm life that the Minister of Agriculture has to go out and make such ridiculous statements as was quoted in -- I'll quote from the Tribune on it if the Minister will permit me. --(Interjection)-- Well, he said, Mr. Uskiw said farmers should put out of their heads the idea that farm labour will ever again be available for lower wages than are paid elsewhere. And I just wonder now, is that the government policy and we must get it read into the record.

Now, is the Minister talking about a new labour code, or where are we going on this

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) specific item? Or is the Minister withdrawing that statement and spelling out the policy again much clearer than it is at the present time, because this is a real gut issue of rural Manitoba today. The Cabinet Minister . . . stand up and made a statement and -- I'm assuming that's government policy, and at the same time I'm assuming that the Minister must assume some of the responsibilities for some of the farm problems that we have today, or try and helpfully come up with a policy that will help us to try and solve some of those problems. And I'm wondering the cost of \$873,000 under the item, is that the cost of the labour pool that you're talking about for this program? Can the Minister explain in more detail what kind of farm labour we're going to have? Is he indicating that there'll be a new code for farm labour, or just what is it all about? It's a matter of serious concern to a lot of people in rural Manitoba today, and if the Minister is saying that he was misquoted and that's not government policy, I wish he'd stand up and spell it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the other night when we discussed this item I put some questions to the Minister. We haven't yet had answers coming forward. I certainly would like to see a division or the figures given for the various items in that particular vote because we've been talking, or been told, that the STEP Program comes into this. We have an increase of around half a million dollars under this item, and surely enough we as members should know just how is this pool of labour going to function and are we going to subsidize them? Is that the intention, to subsidize the farm labour that will be working under this pool? Will this farm labour that we are speaking of come under the civil service? Will it have any ties? --(Interjection)-- Well, let us hear from the government just how is this pool going to be set up? Is it going to be set up completely aside from the civil service? Will you be paying for the unemployment insurance and so on? Certainly we should know when we set up a program and certainly the Minister must have told his representatives at that meeting what kind of a program they were going to initiate. This must have been discussed. I think this is probably where some of the misunderstanding came from. So let's have a clear understanding, let's have a full discussion of this very matter, because we now have the Guidelines of the Seventies which has a whole chapter on agriculture and on Page 83 we find the statement under -- it says here, "The four principles of Guidelines are perhaps more important to farmers than to any other large group of people in Manitoba."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. I would refer the honourable member to our Rule 64 (2). We are on a specific item, not on the Guidelines. The item we're discussing here is Community and Family Programs, Other Expenditures. 10 (b) (2) . . .

MR. FROESE: Well this is just the very thing. It says Community and Family Programs and we're setting aside a half a million dollars or more for specific items that we do not know of at this time what it's all about, and when I mentioned the Guidelines for the Seventies, certainly here they have an outline as to what some of their intentions are. I just quoted a statement here and I don't see any reason why we cannot discuss the Guidelines for the Seventies when we're in the Seventies and when this is a report tabled by the government and which has a section which deals with agriculture, with the very subject that is under discussion. So certainly, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's out of order at all to refer to the Guidelines of the Seventies when we discuss a certain matter in the estimates which is dealing with things that are reported on.

It says here; "The continued decline of employment opportunities in agriculture must be ended and the growing gap between income and agriculture and other industries must be reversed." When we say that the employment opportunities in agriculture must be ended I would like to hear from the Minister further to this whole program.

We questioned him the other night what was going to be the cost to the farmer for employing people from this pool. I think these are questions that we should have answered too because the farmers back home will be questioning us on this and if we just sit here and do not have these programs explained to us I think we are nuts, and the people will feel the same way. We should have the answers right here now when we allocate and when we pass large amounts of money, and the total amount under the item is over a million dollars. So let's hear from the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would want to draw attention to the fact that the accounting of the comments given to the Farm Bureau as shown in the Tribune is fairly accurate, in fact

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) is accurate, and the Member for Roblin should not get overly excited and should not read too much into the statement wherein I have suggested that farmers should not expect to get farm labour at lower costs than what labour is paid in any other sector. I think that is a true statement of fact. That has nothing to do with government policy. Whether there is government policy or there isn't government policy, that happens to be the situation of the times, and the members opposite full well know that it is increasingly more difficult to get farm labour and that it is obvious, it is obvious that we are going to face a situation, if we're not already there, of having to pay premium wages to get farm labour. This is where we are and the reason for it is very obvious, Mr. Chairman, the reason for it is very obvious.

There are no, virtually no students in any school of learning at any level that I'm aware of that have a desire to be an employee of a farmer in this province or in this country. That is not their career; that is not their goal. It so happens by and large that the farm labour force is made up of people that for some reason have not been able to fit in to other sectors in society, to other employment opportunities, and it is almost the residual farm labour or the residual labour force that farmers have to depend on. This is really the situation and members opposite know that full well, so that if one is really looking at expertise, if one really wants to get qualified people to work in agriculture, to work on farms, one is faced with a situation today of having to up the ante, of having to raise the benefits, of having to build into the farm program some security for the farm labourer whether it's unemployment insurance or whether it's compensation programs or whether it's some other form of guarantees, whether it's housing, adequate housing for the farm family that is going to work on that farm.

There are many things that enter into it. And quite unfortunately, the history of our farm labour problem in this province has been one surrounding the minimum wage, surrounding the casual labour force that is available from time to time, is not one of consistency where you have a block of people available to work in the industry at the farm level. So we have serious problems here and I think the farm community itself, and only the farmers themselves, will have to rise to the challenge and to meet the needs of the people that will have to work on the farms in the future. And they will have to be competitive with industry, with wage offers in all sectors of the Manitoba economy, or in Canada as a whole I think it applies equally so. Every province has the same problem. So that it's a matter of fact, not a matter of desire; it's a matter of fact and I'm sure the Member for Virden will confirm what I am trying to say here. He has often the same problem as we all do in trying to find farm labour.

Quite often we expect too much, Mr. Chairman. A lot of farm people expect that all of a sudden when they are busy that somehow out of the corners are going to be oodles of farm labourers flowing towards them just because they have a peak period in the springtime when they're putting their crops in, or because they have a peak labour demand in the fall when they are harvesting. What do you do with these people in between those seasons, Mr. Chairman. No one wants to come to grips with that question. So the attempt here is very obvious, Mr. Chairman, the attempt here is to have a more systematic approach in trying to deal with this problem, in trying to bridge these gaps. The objective is to initiate, organize and conduct educational programs to further develop agricultural manpower resources. This is something that has to be an ongoing process. The placement part of it is sort of after the fact, after you've brought about a degree of educational services to the potential clients, are you then in a position to place these people who graduate from these programs on farms.

We have in this particular budget a very sizeable increase, as the Member for Rhineland quite rightly points out, and the bulk of the increase, Mr. Chairman, is in the area of agricultural manpower services somewhere in the order of \$514,000 more in this particular aspect of this program, which is almost entirely if not entirely recoverable. I don't know whether I can pick out the revenue side here. Total recoverable, Mr. Chairman, is \$615,900 - no, I'm sorry, \$555,000 out of a \$615,000 item, so that the intent here is to recover a portion from the Canada Manpower people wherein they are involved in the training programs, Manpower Development Programs, and the balance is going to be recovered from the farmers who participate in the program. We will be receiving full payment for wages and benefits of the Centre - the Manpower Centre - through a charge on the farmer that uses those services. So it's not a subsidy program other than in the manpower training area; that is the only area of subsidization.

Now there are many components to this program, but I want to say that where we had one staff person up till this point in time, and I believe members opposite when they were in

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) government involved themselves in manpower programming for agriculture, but you know I want to say that they didn't involve themselves enough, Mr. Chairman, because they provided for one staff person to look after the manpower needs of our farming community - one staff person for the whole province. It's quite an interesting thrust, Mr. Speaker, of their time. We have added to that one, ten additional people, five of which will be placement officers, one located in each region, and five clerks to assist the five regional placement officers. So we're beefing the staff up by ten for a total of eleven.

Now my honourable friends want to be critical. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that the reason that they are raising so much hell here today is because they're embarrassed by the inadequate program that we've had in this province for all those years during which time they were the governing party in this province. They're embarrassed by the fact that we have substantially moved in this direction to try and come to grips with a manpower problem that is province-wide. So the Member for Morris should take note, Mr. Chairman, that I do recognize why he is uncomfortable, because at some point in time he will have to explain to people in rural Manitoba why it is that in their wisdom it was only necessary to have one person look after the manpower program. A complete farce, Mr. Chairman.

We have had a significant amount of involvement in the educational section of manpower programming in co-operation with the Government of Canada - I want to point out between 10 to 15 farm management courses, of 12 to 15 weeks in length, and 25 to 35 courses of 4 weeks duration in the specific areas of agricultural production in the year 1972-73, fairly active in that particular area of manpower and management development. Now the objective of the Manpower Resource Development Program is very obvious. It's to assist in the development, co-ordination, execution and evaluation of agricultural education for farmers and farm labourers, and there it's based on a need having been established. This program is a joint program, Mr. Chairman. It's related to Canada Manpower, Agricultural Manpower Training in Manitoba, a service co-operates with regional division personnel, Canada Manpower Centre in Winnipeg, Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Dauphin, Steinbach, Selkirk and Morden, and the Department of Colleges and University personnel in Winnipeg and Brandon in the Canada Manpower Training Program - agricultural training. Farm labour placements sometimes necessitate co-ordination between Canada Manpower, the Department of Indian Affairs, the Northern Development and Agricultural Manpower Services. This is sort of the overall scope of the training program.

The Manitoba Agricultural Manpower Committee is composed of representatives from the federal Department of Manpower and Immigration, and Indian Affairs and Northern Development; provincial Departments of Agriculture, Colleges and Universities; five major farm organizations; and the committee sets guidelines and recommends programs for the Agricultural Manpower Service. So that gives you a pretty clear picture, Mr. Chairman, of that part of the program.

We have what is known as the 15-week extensive course in farm management where teaching emphasis is in farm business planning, land management, livestock management, agricultural engineering and academic upgrading in mathematics, English and communications. Course participants, twenty in number, are recommended by a local advisory committee on the basis of having the potential of becoming commercial farmers. Instructors are practicing farmers who have a degree or a diploma in agriculture. There were 13 such courses held in the winter of '72-73 at Swan River, Gilbert Plains, Roblin, Strathclair, Napinka, Plumas, Treherne, Somerset, Miami, Starbuck, Anola, Selkirk, Ste. Rose du Lac.

The four-week intensive course is involved in a number of areas. We have the Beef Production Management Program and those programs, or those courses, were held at Oak Lake, Miniota, Amaranth, Ethelbert, Fisher Branch, Teulon, Beausejour, and Vita. Farm Business and Business Planning Course was held in Boissevain, Portage la Prairie, St. Pierre, Stonewall and Selkirk. Hog Production Management at MacGregor, Manitou, Minnedosa, Arnot, Rosenfeld and Killarney. Dairy production - Arborg, Grunthal, St. Lazare, Eriksdale, Birnie, Winkler and so on. This gives us a good indication of the intensity of our farm management training programs, which is part of this particular budget, Mr. Chairman.

We've also had crop production management courses at Lorette, St. Jean, Carberry. It's expected that some 940 farmers will be available, or able to avail themselves of these training programs during the winter of 1973-74, 220 in extensive training in farm management

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. USKIW cont'd) and 720 in four-week intensive training and specific enterprises. That's somewhere in the area of, well, as I said 940 - it's almost a thousand farm units in this province. --(Interjection)-- That's an ongoing program; it's been with us for some time in co-operation with Canada Manpower.

Now the program dealing with the Manpower Pool in this province of course is a major new thrust, and there it does involve, as I said earlier, 11 staff man-years, an addition of ten in other words, and a significant amount of money. Now the intent is that we would use these people to assist farmers in obtaining qualified labour and in providing for opportunities for people that are under-employed, unemployed, on welfare, whatever it is, and to give them some opportunity to training as well. It's hoped that this all round global approach to the problems of under-employed manpower resources on the one side of the ledger, Mr. Chairman, and the needs of our farm community on the other side, can somehow be met. This is the desire of this particular thrust.

Now I have to say to my honourable friends that it is indeed a pilot project. We're going to give it a whirl this year; on the basis of this year's experience we'll determine where we go with this program next year, and surely one would appreciate the importance of learning by participating and hopefully the pilot will prove to be something very much worthwhile in the long run

Now it's obvious that there are many farm people, many people that are still farming but are somewhat under-employed because of the nature of their enterprise, the size of their farm, who could be enrolled in this program if they were given the information, if they knew what the wage scale was, if they knew where the demands were, and vice versa, if the farmers requiring this kind of assistance would know where to get in contact with these people. And we would be using our offices to facilitate this information flowing both ways and perhaps in arranging for either transportation or whatever from one point in the province to another, so that we can maximize the benefits to both the one seeking employment and to the farmer that requires those services. There are many people that are semi-retired who have had a lifetime of farm experience, and they too would be people that would be put on the list and would be available to the farmers of Manitoba and hopefully to this program where we introduce people to the farm community, that there will be somewhat of a graduated approach wherein, after a period of time, after an experience has been had as between the employee and the employer and found satisfactory, that that person no longer has to remain as part of the operations of this Manpower pool but could very well fall into a permanent employment category. That is really a transitional, the Pool is a transitional approach to the problem, and as soon as it seems advisable to move someone out of the Pool and into a permanent position, wherever it may be found, that would be the case.

Now the Member for Rhineland raised a number of questions or one in particular, Mr. Chairman, having to do with the rates of pay, and this is something that has yet to be worked out and will be announced fairly soon. Obviously we will not be suggesting that anyone at whatever level is going to be working for less than Manitoba's minimum wage. That is definite as far as the Pool program is concerned. But there will be a range of increments beyond the minimum wage depending on experience, and that particular proposal we have not yet finalized, but hopefully within a matter of weeks we will have that information available and the offices will be able to get into motion and to offer the services.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that covers all of the questions that have been put. I suggest to members opposite that rather than criticize the entry of government in this area, that they should bend over backwards, Mr. Chairman, in support of this thrust so that we can deal with the social problems that beset us both in agriculture and in the areas of unemployment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a few comments on the remarks the Minister has just made. At the outset I would like to say that I appreciate the position that he is in right now insofar as farm labour is concerned. I appreciate it very much more than he did four years ago when he was sitting on this side of the House and we were sitting over there, when the same debates took place and particularly in the area of farm labour, when the Minister was most critical of the government at that time as he still is today referring back to 1969. And what do we find, Mr. Chairman, today after four years? That we are in a worse position now as far as farm labour is concerned than we were in 1969. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I say that we

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. WATT cont'd) are in a damned sight worse position than we were in 1969. It has got to the point now, through the actions and through the vocal statements that the Minister has made, that it is almost impossible to entice anybody to go out to work on a farm, and the Minister stands up and talks around the situation and talks about the embarrassment on this side of the House. The embarrassment is on that side of the House, Mr. Chairman. The embarrassment is on that side of the House because all the answers that he had when he was on this side of the House which he didn't voice, didn't come into fact when he moved over to that side of the House after four years. He says the picture now is clear. The picture to us on this side now and to the province of Manitoba is clear, that we are in a worse position now than we were as a result of the lack of policies on the part of the government and particularly the Minister of Agriculture and on the part of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that it's up to the farmers, and he's reiterating what he exactly said to the Farm Bureau, that the farmers are going to have to pay more money if they want labour; and he referred to the minimum wage as a basis to start off from but the wage will be increased according to the ability of that particular worker to work on a farm. I would like to know if the minimum wage is going to include board and room, or if it is not going to; and I'd like to know what the graduating scale is going to be, if a farmer hires a man who has no experience on the farm, if he's going to start off at, is it \$1.75 an hour, is it going to be an eight hour day? Is it going to be a five day week? We're talking about the minimum wage, we were talking about the labour code, labour relations, labour management relations. Is this going to be a fact insofar as farm labour is concerned?

The Minister has just pointed out that the picture is clear; that we should understand on this side of the House what has been happening, what is the fact now. What is the fact now? The fact now is that the Minister has increased the farm program insofar as labour is concerned from one salary, shall we say, one person in charge of the management of farm labour, to eleven. Very commendable. Got eleven employees now, very commendable; he's got eleven employees now. What have they done? We still have no more farm labour. I said a moment ago, we have less labour available to us on the farm now than we had four years ago, and if the Minister thinks that he can get up and take ten minutes to talk around in circles and try to make this side of the House and the farmers in the province of Manitoba believe that he has done something in respect of farm labour, I say to him now that it's clear and evident -- he has said the picture is clear. The picture is clear. But it's worse now than it was in 1969 or probably ever was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I do not intend to be critical of the Minister's intention of attempting to bring those who may be desirous of working on the farms in contact with those who wish to employ farm labour. I think that is a commendable effort and, as a matter of fact, I suggested something of that nature a number of years ago during a harvesting crisis that we had in the Red River Valley when I was a federal Member of the House of Commons, and indeed, in contacting the Minister of Agriculture at that time and the ag reps, they acted as a sort of catalyst between those who had machinery and who had labour and had completed their harvesting, who were looking for jobs in helping farmers whose harvest hadn't been completed. There is nothing wrong with that and I commend him for that if that's what he's doing. But for him to suggest that because he has added ten more people to the staff here, that that has somehow magically solved the farm problem, is sheer nonsense and the Minister knows that.

As my honourable friend the Member for Arthur said, it has not added one single worker to the farm labour force. Simply putting more civil servants on the payroll is not solving the farm problem, but that seems to be the magic formula for the Socialists - the magic formula for the Socialists. The way they answer all of the problems and the way they solve the problems of the farmer is to hire more civil servants, put more people on the payroll here in the City of Winnipeg, and that magically, somehow, solves the farm labour problem.

The Minister knows that's nonsense and the farmer knows that's nonsense. He challenged me to get out to my constituents and explain why I am opposed to his program. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't have to wait till I get out there; I'll say it right here. If he thinks that he's solving the farm problem by hiring more civil servants here in Winnipeg he's crazy because that's not doing it. What is required is farm labour.

Another thing that he doesn't realize, as was pointed out by my friend from Arthur, four

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) years ago we didn't have near the problem in farm labour that we have today, because in those days farmers were allowed to arrange for their own farm labour, they were able to get farm labour because the policies of a government weren't such that they prevented people from getting on the farms and working, because in those days there were people that wanted to work on farms. But you're not going to find farmers under the conditions that are being imposed by a government, that they're going to hire labourers. In the first place they can't afford to. Labour happens to be a very high cost commodity today on farms, and farmers, rather than using in many cases what is a very marginal profit or a very marginal operating margin, are not going to spend it on labour. They'll find other ways of getting work done if it means that they have to work 16, 17 hours themselves. When you start imposing conditions under which farm labour is going to work, under which a farmer must hire a farm labourer, then you're preventing, in my view you're preventing the farmer from acquiring the kind of labour that is necessary to operate on the farms.

The Minister should recognize that. I give him full support if his intention is simply to use his offices, the ag reps' offices or whatever offices he wants to use in the country, of bringing those people who want to work on farms together with those who want to hire them. That, in my view, is a commendable effort and that's as far as it should go. When he starts interfering in the conditions under which a man must work, the hours that he must work, the wages that he must work for, then of course he is defeating the purpose of his whole program because working on the farm is so different than working in any other occupation. Every farmer knows that. There are days when you work 16 hours because if you don't work 16 hours on a day and it's fit to work you may not get your crop in at all; the next day it may rain and then you can sleep all day. That's the very nature of the business, and to attempt to impose conditions such as the Minister is attempting to impose, defeats the very purpose of his whole program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I mentioned in another connection that I had learned a lot from the Member for Morris, because in most instances he's a very reasonable man unless he's got a burr under his saddle, but he said something in his speech that I agree wholeheartedly with him. You know, the farmers can't afford it, and someone else made reference to it about the meat boycott and things like this, but really of all the things that are in the Minister's estimates, this is one of the things that I am most enthusiastic about. While I don't agree with everything the Member for Morris says, I can understand some of his apprehensions; but really, when people like the Member for Portage la Prairie, who is a businessman, and the Member for Roblin, who is a businessman, stand up and talk about, you know, the type of labour, how much we should pay labour, I don't think either one of them would hire somebody who didn't produce an honest day's work for an honest day's dollar.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On a point of privilege, I never at any time said anything that I can recall about the price of labour or words to that effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, if it was a matter of privilege that the gentleman rose on, a few moments ago he was -- oh, perhaps I did err; it was something about political philosophy of people employed by the civil service - that was correct. So I will make the point relative to that, and I'm sure that he would agree that if he was selling turnips and he had somebody who was working for him who insisted on selling prunes, he wouldn't keep him around for very long.

But relative to the Member for Roblin, who usually makes sense in this House, but if you haven't -- you want people who can produce who will do the work. Now, it seems strange to me that on the one hand we pay industry, I think it's up around \$5,000 in tax incentives and the rest of it to create a job in industry, and yet we don't seem to be doing anything to help people who could, would, and would like to become involved in working on farms. That's what I meant, yes - Federal Government - thank you very much. The Attorney-General said I meant help. . . the Federal Government - and here provincially, too, up to this present point in time.

A case comes to mind of a chap that my wife and I had living with us, a friend of mine who owns a dairy farm outside of Winnipeg. This chap went to work for him and he - names are unimportant - but he didn't have the quickness of mind that perhaps most of us are blessed with but if you took your time and you explained very, very slowly to this fellow he would do an excellent job, but . . .

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

MR. BOYCE: The fellow phoned me up and he said, "You know, Bud, I'd like to keep this fellow because if I had the time to train him," he said, "he'd be excellent, but, you know, if I don't tell him every day what to do and really go through the work with him, he just can't do it. So," he said, "I'm going to have to let him go." And this particular farmer, he's a friend of mine and he's you know, a very nice person and he didn't like to do it, but nevertheless he's forced in the economics of the situation, as was pointed out by the Member for Morris, that the farmer can't afford to pay these kind of wages. So people come along and they say, you know, the meat boycott type of thing. Who takes it in the neck? It's the farmer once again. You know, when people say well, why didn't I support the meat boycott, and I said, "Well, if it solved the problem or even forced people to adjust themselves to the problem, I'd support it, but it does not." Who takes it in the neck? It's the farmer and the meat packer. You know, the big companies can weather that kind of a storm.

But really, why I chose to enter agricultural debate as a Member for a City --(Interjection)-- Well, that's the Member for Thompson's concern. Why I chose to enter it, it's going to take the co-operation and the understanding of all people within the province. It isn't just, you know, why did you -- I remember one time during the debate, somebody said how much wheat do I grow in Winnipeg Centre? Really, I eat more wheat in Winnipeg Centre perhaps than some of the other constituents, so really it's the co-operation of all Manitobans, and in this particular area, having taught school in a high school, all of the propaganda that is given to our younger people, how wonderful it is to pack into the city. You know, they don't tell them all the mental illness and the drunkenness and the marriage split-ups and everything else. There is no propaganda, if you will quote propaganda, presented to younger people how perhaps life in a rural community is more attractive against many criteria. That's one thing I'd like to see. And the ten people, eleven people that the Minister has put on staff, doubtless will be articulating some of these things, these alternatives that are available to the younger people in the province. At St. Johns, for example, we had an enrollment of 2, 200 younger people. I never had one kid come and tell me he wanted to be a farmer, he wanted to work on a farm. I never had one kid, by the way, tell me he wanted to be a plumber either, but all of the information that's provided to younger people is you've gotta go to school, you've gotta do this, you know, you gotta develop an accountant or a lawyer or some professional thing, there is no . . .

MR. GIRARD: . . . a politician.

MR. BOYCE: So really I am, as I mentioned, very enthusiastic about this program because if younger people are presented with a challenge -- I don't know how many of you recall here, remember that March for Millions type of thing. There were 25, 000 younger people got out and did something because somebody presented a picture to them, presented something to be done and they rose to the challenge. So really, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite shocked at some of the arguments that are coming from members opposite in derision of this program that is put forth by the Minister, because I think it is one of the most imaginative programs and is going to take an understanding by the people who are charged with the responsibility of carrying it forth to the people of the province.

The first job I had when I graduated from University was with one of the larger corporations. The gentleman asked me, he said "Do you like the products you sell?" I said, "Yes I do." He said, "Okay, do yourself and the company a favour. If you ever change your mind, leave." And I mention that appropos of people who are charged and the people of the province of Manitoba have a right to expect them to take plans and programs which are resolved by this House, the elected members of the province, and carry them forth into the community and make them work, because people who drag their feet and don't implement the policy as resolved by this Legislature, do themselves and this province a disservice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, perhaps if a farmer took as much time feeding his cow or his cows hay to produce some milk as we take in discussing this problem here, I doubt if he could afford this, financially at least. However, it is important and I think what the Member for Winnipeg Centre just brought up is with good intentions because these are not only rural problems, they become city problems very quick, and we just have to look at our welfare boards and what have you and we can see what is happening.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd)

I think we must agree that while the Department of Agriculture is already quite large, I think we've reached that time where we have to tie in rural development with the Agriculture Department. There's no question in my mind concerning that point.

As the Minister mentioned, the community and family programs and the farm management courses that they are planning are in a pilot stage at this time. I must admit from what little I've seen or what I have seen, they definitely are in a pilot stage, but I hope something more can become of some of the plans than presently, but I was rather disturbed when I overheard the Member for St. Vital while some of the members here were speaking, and he was suggesting, well, do you want slave labour? I think this is part of the point and we've seen it recently with radio stations and not too many of the other news media, but coming right out and saying, encouraging the boycotting of meats, for example; and I think under this program the half a million dollars more that are going to be spent than before, I think this is a good time where we can tie in rural and urban Manitoba or this province, probably give them a little bit more publicity, probably a little more education on what the farmer is going through, because on one hand it's hard to understand that the cost of farm products is rising continually - there's no question about that and no argument about that; on the other hand, if farm prices due to perhaps the world conditions finally do reach a stage where the farmer can actually pay the minimum wage and perhaps even a little bit more, what do we get? Either they're not informed correctly, many of the people living in the urban areas, or something is wrong. Perhaps a little bit of money and time should be spent in this respect to see to it that these people are informed of what is really going on, and I do hope that this farm management course is going to succeed.

It's not simple, and I think enough has been said as far as the farm labourers. I agree with the Member for Arthur, and not politically, I say I agree with him on this point. There is no question that the conditions have become worse, not better, and I hope that these courses are encouraging farmers to improve themselves but I also hope we can get to a point where a rural farm job looks inviting, and if we can keep up the prices that we have today I'm sure we'll see more farm labour appear, because there are a lot of people that are interested. It isn't that they aren't so much disinterested, it's a matter of they've got to make a livelihood too, and I hope that some advancement can be made in trying to keep the urban people better informed of what the farmers are really going through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. ENARSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few further comments. I listened to the Minister when he was talking about all the farm management courses that have been going on. This is a fact. These have been going on for quite some time. They have no relationship, Mr. Chairman, to the problem that we're discussing, namely, farm labour. These management courses, these management courses, Mr. Chairman, are courses that have been taken by farmers, bona fide farmers themselves, and have nothing to do with labour. Now if I understand what the Minister was talking about, if I understand it correctly, there are many farmers themselves who have been engaged in these courses whether they be four weeks, six weeks or fifteen weeks, over these past winter months. The problem we're concerned about, Mr. Chairman, is that we're not getting the information from the Minister and I appreciate his position on this matter, namely, farm labour as it pertains to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba. Can he tell us how many people does he have engaged in this farm pool that he's talking about, that he wants to try to train so many young people, and what age groups are they?

I'd like to show an example, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to ask the Minister if I'm correct when I say this. I'm seeking information now by way of an example. A farmer's son leaves his father's farm, goes to work for another farmer, the Department of Agricultural is paying for this young fellow to work on another farm as a training program. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether this is correct, it's an understanding I have, and I would like the Minister to inform me as to whether it is correct. Or he doesn't necessarily have to be a farmer's son. Can a farmer take on a young fellow, whether he be 20 or 25 years of age, take him and teach him how to do farm work, and is he being paid by the Department of Agriculture or does the farmer have to share a portion of this? These are the things that we're trying to seek by way of information, Mr. Chairman, and it's the farm pool that we're talking about, not the management courses that are going on. I don't think that has any relevance.

SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think I'll have to come back to one or two things again. I, too, feel like the Member for Rock Lake, that very often it's not just the cost of labour on the farm, the actual pay that the labourer gets, it's the matter of training of farm labour. That can be very costly. It can be almost as costly as paying for the labour itself, and this is one thing that we have to take into consideration in this whole deal. I know we already passed an item, research for the University of Manitoba, of over half a million dollars. I wonder whether we should not indicate to the University of Manitoba in their research program whether some of that money could be spent for this purpose. We haven't even got the report yet so far as I know. In other years this report was tabled and we got a report before the item was passed in the estimates.

I, too, would like to know from the Minister, has there been any assessment made at this time in point of the number of people that would be available or could be made available for this type of a program? How many people have been employed of the ten or eleven -- ten additional men? Have they been appointed, and if so could he name them so that we would know who we're dealing with, and have they been assigned to the different points in the province? You know, there's other things that come to mind when we discuss community and family programs - that's the item we're dealing with. I just noticed today that there was another sale advertised by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation of a farm in my area. How does that tie in? Are we thinking of these people under this program? Those that go into receivership? What is the government's policy in connection when a farm goes into receivership and where the Agricultural Credit Corporation is the main creditor, the chief creditor? As I understand, they take first charge whenever they make a loan so in most cases of these type when they go into receivership or in bankruptcy it becomes the property of the government. What is the government's policy in connection with such farms? Is it being leased back to them or are these operators in the main employed by the government to run that particular farm and carry on? Certainly . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be better to put that question under the proper item, which we have yet not reached, the Agricultural Credit Corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Quite correct. We have an item under there.

MR. FROESE: Or we can deal with it at that time. It says -- the item we are under now, it says Community and Family Programs. I would like to know, then, what we mean by Family Programs under this item. It used to be that we would discuss Friendly Family Farms when we discussed agriculture. It seems to me that we've come off that one finally. Well, let's hear from the Minister. Is it still a liability to the government or is it still in the hands of the government or not? --(Interjection)-- The Minister says it's going into receivership pretty soon. The Member for La Verendrye says, "Like fun." I don't know who is right and who we should believe. I recall when the Minister of Labour - he is out now - but when he sat on this side of the House he argued for \$3.00 wheat for the farmers. I haven't heard him -- now that he's on the other side I haven't heard him speak once about \$3.00 wheat for the farmers in this province. So -- but will the Labour Act in any way apply to any parts of this or is it completely exclusive of that Act when we talk about this type of labour pool? And what does the Minister envision in this program, let's say when we project it for the next three to five years?

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