

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 30, 1971

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 50 students Grade 11 standing of Gimli High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Melnychuk and Mr. Joubert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. We also have 26 students Grade 11 standing of Landmark High and Deloraine Collegiate. Landmark High is hosting the Deloraine Collegiate students. These students are under the direction of Mr. Plett and Mr. Barkman. These schools are located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask leave of the House to table a report? (Agreed) Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the Annual Report of the Public Schools Finance Board for the year ending December 31st, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: I did have an indication before we had recess that there may be another procedure for the Order or shall we go into Private Members'? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we'd be quite happy to continue with the estimates provided that it was included in the hours of debate but not if it is not to be included in the hours of debate. We'd be quite willing to continue with the estimates provided that any time used would be charged up against the normal debating of estimates time, if not then we would proceed in the normal way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: That procedure is not acceptable to us. I laid down, at least I asked for certain conditions, and if they can't be complied with then we'd rather proceed with Private Members' bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and it remains open. I believe the Honourable Leader had concluded his remarks and we were under the question period for clarification. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order. I believe the Orders for Return are to be called first.

MR. SPEAKER: My error. Thank you for the correction.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. An error. I missed the first page.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Charleswood, and it's open. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, having spoken on this previously I could do nothing more than elaborate on what I had said to you when it was introduced, and I believe that you took it under advisement owing to the fact that the Minister of Labour wished to speak on it. You thought that his right had been exhausted owing to the fact that he got up and not adjourned but mentioned that he didn't agree with all the orders that were listed, and you came back the following day and said that you felt that you had made an error of a type and that he could go ahead with it. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that I have said what I have to say and would leave it to the Minister of Labour to pick it up.

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Logan, the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in debating this motion and this proposal it was interesting to follow as best we could the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Government in his explanation as to why this was not accepted on the part of the government. Of course the more the government tries to present the posture that they're different the more they appear to be the same as every other administration that's governed this province.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate in the forthcoming weeks, and I daresay probably until the hustings, the basic arguments that are being presented outside the House and inside the House will be debated that the government in fact are better in opposition than they are in government. They are better in opposition because they appear legitimately more righteous in opposition than they appear as righteous in government. They're better in opposition because in opposition they cannot be corrupted by power. They are better in opposition because they are not unified, they are disorganized and they individually can speak in opposition better than they can in government, and they're better in opposition because their history of administrative competence would indicate that opposition is a better role. This is important, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this particular Order because it deals with the question of open government, the rhetoric of open government, the posture of an opposition party and its experience in government. And, Mr. Speaker, what we find is that the language that was used and has been used is really inconsistent with the practice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, each administration develops its own language touchstones in which they're identified. We have the Federal Liberal Government who call themselves the "just society," and we can have a debate on that. We have the present government who suggest that they are "open government." Mr. Speaker, open government -- (Interjection) -- Open government. Moral government? Moral and open government. Now I would say -- (Interjection) -- More open? I will recite some of the speeches of the First Minister back to him and I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that he doesn't say "more open government", he says "open government." -- (Interjection) -- Oh it's relevant. Mr. Speaker, I think -- (Interjection) -- relative and relevant. -- and I think if we judge, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- My relative -- that's right I agree with the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, relatives are the ones that you hire?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize there may be a sense of levity. . . Would the honourable gentlemen please sit down.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I realize there may be a sense of levity involved in Private Members' resolutions -- and that's not casting any reflection upon the intent of what is being said. The only thing I would like to suggest to the honourable gentleman that was debating the point is that if he would try to indicate to me he's applying himself to the principle of the debate and not other matters which may seem to be relevant but really do not conform to the principles of this Return.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to prove that those on the other side who say that they conduct an open government are being intellectually dishonest and, Mr. Speaker, this is the other terminology, the touchstone that now characterizes an administration. We banter back and forth the words "intellectually dishonest" then we have to examine the course of action and then we really can judge who is being really intellectually dishonest or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other important touchstone in language is that we break with tradition. But, Mr. Speaker, if we analyze what we mean when we say "break with tradition," we mean we exercise our discretion as we see fit, and when we exercise it one way we break with tradition because it's our discretion that we're exercising if we're challenged. Now, Mr. Speaker, this has a relevance specifically to the Address for Papers or the Order for Return that's requested. I recall, and I think those who were in the House at the time, recall the debate on Southern Indian Lake and the demands from this side of the House for a kind of open government that will allow reports that were in the hands of the government to be tabled so that the people who were involved in the important discussions of the day would have all the relevant information that the government had on the other side.

No, those days were not so long ago, but the members opposite have lesson because, Mr. Speaker, we are going to debate, as we have already debated in the past session, contentious issues in this province in which all the information should be filed, in which we should have the pertinent information that the government has to be able to make the kind of evaluation that has to be made for the people of Manitoba. And I can take as an example on the uni-city plan and the question of costs and the report of the external consultant, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) and I think that they are as relevant and as important as the reports both interdepartmental and outside of the departments that were made available ultimately into this House on Southern Indian Lake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I may, read the words of the members opposite, because I think it's always relevant reading when you are trying to find out how they actually conduct themselves in relation to our request for information. They are not going to be done in chronological order, Mr. Speaker, but they're going to be presented as best I can to make the point that I have suggested is the relevant one in this, not the relative one but the relevant one, and that is, Mr. Speaker, that in effect the government on the opposite side, who suggest that they conduct an open government, are being intellectually dishonest.

I'd like to, if I may, go to Hansard of March 23rd, 1970, Page 229, and read the statement of the Premier. "We said, for example, Mr. Speaker, in the last campaign that we would do things to improve the quality of government, that we would bring about open government and that we would let the public in on more of the transactions of government." Hear, hear. Very noble words, but there is no course of action, Mr. Speaker, that in any way proves this honourable course of the First Minister.

Now on August 15th in 1969, the Honourable Member for Morris addressed a question to the First Minister: "Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wonder if I may address a question to the First Minister. In view of his statement relating to the documents pertaining to Southern Indian Lake, I wonder if we could take it from that that this government now are going to table all departmental and confidential documents." The First Minister's reply: "I think I can indicate to the Honourable Member from Morris that whatever documents have pertinence to a problem area under consideration, that we shall feel under an obligation to table them." Now that's interesting, Mr. Speaker, because there are many documents that have been requested that have not been tabled, documents relating to the auto insurance and its study. We've requested to determine from the Minister of Finance what information he has with respect to cost projections and cost implications of the uni-city and, Mr. Speaker, so far no information has been supplied and I doubt if any other information will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, on August 21st, 1969, on Page 119 of Hansard, in the middle of the page in the middle of the paragraph quoting from the Premier, he said, "We shall try to get away from this great reliance on secrecy as a crutch for government to take the easy way out. A government must above all else hold itself accountable, and how can it be accountable if it keeps hidden deliberately, in the face of repeated requests by democratically elected members of the Assembly, refusing to table reports documented, written at public expense, and that is why we are moving to table in this House those two so-called hidden reports relative to Southern Indian Lake."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does our Order for Return ask for? It asks for a list of reports and studies commissioned by government, its boards, agencies, or commissions, to external consultants. The government's answer is that they will rely on the crutch of secrecy. They are going to refuse to table or give us information - and we're not asking for the tabling of the reports - but they are going to refuse to give us the information documented, written up at public expense. Mr. Speaker, one wonders about the intellectual honesty of that statement. -- (Interjection) -- Don't overwork a phrase. I suggested, and I'm sorry the First Minister missed it, but it's my opinion that there are certain characteristics, certain touchstones, certain language touchstones that attempt to characterize a government, one of which is intellectual dishonesty. The First Minister has used it in his application to the members on this side and to the members on this side of both parties. I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that intellectual dishonesty realistically characterizes the behaviour of the government as opposed to its rhetoric, its rhetoric in opposition and even its posture today - and, Mr. Speaker, there's no better example than this denial of the request for an Order for Return, because how can one talk about open government, how can one talk as the First Minister did, that we in the face of repeated requests by democratically elected members refuse to table reports documented and written up at public expense.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't asked for those documents yet, but we have asked for a list of those documents, and they're pretty relevant because government and public funds have been used by the government for these reports and they're relevant for us to make some basis for a decision. As an example, we know that there are rumours that there was a report that the government had in their hands saying that Brandon would be a very expensive cost for the auto insurance head office to be located there. We don't know about that. We only know this by way

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)of rumour. Surely if there was a report at public expense we are entitled to receive information in connection with this, and surely we are entitled to receive information as to who commissioned the report, what public expense was involved and what that report says. -- (Interjection) -- Consultants? I don't know whether they're from Toronto or Montreal with respect to the cost of locating the head office of the Auto Insurance Corporation in Brandon. Now we have asked, -- (Interjection) -- No I'm not asking open Cabinet Meetings. I would suggest that the people of Manitoba would be greatly entertained if television could come in on one of your Cabinet meetings and I would think that that would be probably the best way that we on this side could expose you and win the next election.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you that if, in fact, the government believes in open government, and if in fact they believe that those reports at public expense should legitimately be placed before the Legislature, the first thing we have to do is determine what those reports are and this is all that this request is. We are asking, give us the information and we'll make a judgment as to what reports should be brought forward so that they can be properly discussed with respect to those contentious issues that are before us.

Now Mr. Speaker, on August 18th, 1969 on page 20 of Hansard, the Premier said, in answer to a question by the Honourable Member for Lakeside or a statement, "Well, I think I can tell the Honourable Member for Lakeside that this government, unlike the former government, does not believe that secrecy is necessarily a virtue."

On August 29th, Mr. Speaker, the statement was made by the First Minister --(Interjection) -- let me continue, let me continue. On August 29th, page 314, there is a series of questions and statements, and I would like to read them into the record, between the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, myself, the Honourable Minister of Labour and the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie and this dealt with the question on the issue as to whether we were entitled to receive interdepartmental memorandums or reports because the Premier indicated there was a distinction between those reports that are external and those reports that were interdepartmental and he suggested that interdepartmental reports should not be tabled. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but it has nothing to do with what we did. Remember we are now talking about the new government, the open government and you missed my first words. My first words were that you have been corrupted by power because what you are doing is exactly what previous administrations are doing but you continually keep representing that you are doing something different and in that respect, Mr. Speaker, you are intellectually dishonest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce: "I now wish to lay on the table of the House, two reports relating to the Churchill River Diversion and Southern Indian Lake. They are Churchill River Diversion, a preliminary investigation of resource implications, popularly known as the Task Force Report and 'Transition in the North' Volumes I and II. I believe there are ample copies for each party in the House to have two or three copies.

"Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

"Mr. Spivak: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can indicate whether the first report of the series of reports that he is filing is interdepartmental reports or not?

"Mr. Paulley: Possibly I can answer that. It is the report that was promised by this administration and refused by the previous one. It is now tabled and I would suggest that the question of the Honourable Member for River Heights can provoke an argument.

"Mr. Spivak: Mr. Speaker, my question is appropriate. I have asked the Honourable Minister whether it is an interdepartmental report or not.

"Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, this question was put to me by the Honourable Member for Lakeside or a question approximating this one and my answer at that time was that yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer was that yes it is but this is a very special case and the people of Manitoba are looking for it."

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie: "Mr. Speaker, I ask the House Leader does he think the Conservative Party will be taking their copies of these secret reports because they certainly didn't want the members of this House to see them two months ago."

The Minister of Labour: "Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer for the Conservative Party, thank goodness. All I can answer for is the fact that this Government has tabled a report that was refused in this House previously.

"Mr. Weir: Mr. Speaker, may I just advise the House that the Conservative Party doesn't need anybody from that side of the House to answer for them."

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

And then myself: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable First Minister a question. Can he inform the House whether it will be the policy of the government to file inter-departmental reports when requested in this House?"

The First Minister: "Mr. Speaker, the question of interdepartmental reports or other documents and whether or not they will be tabled, I would like to answer as follows: that it is discretionary with the government of the day to decide whether or not they will table in this House any interdepartmental documents. If they feel that it is in the public interest they will table it. If they feel that it is not, they have the right to refuse to table it. In the specific regard to these documents that were just tabled, it is our judgment that it is in the public interest that they be tabled."

And Mr. Speaker, that goes to the heart of the matter. That is intellectual dishonesty, because you are exercising discretion, just as every other government exercises discretion but you suggest, you suggest on your side that you are an open government, except that when you are requested for information you exercise your discretion, you do not give it. We ask in this Order for Return, a list of reports, studies, commissioned by the government, its boards, agencies, or commissions, to external consultants and I'm going to read you back what the Minister of Labour replied on your behalf.

Well it obviously is the discretion of a government but I'm simply saying that it is intellectually dishonest to suggest and go around on the basis that we are a more open government, when in effect -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that you'll have a statement to make after I finish. You are an open government, you would like to believe that you are an open government. You would like to -- (Interjection) -- oh much more. Now I must say that this is the first use of the word "more" that the Premier has more, more, not absolutely. Well, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, then you may not be a little bit intellectually dishonest, you may be a great deal intellectually dishonest. That's a question that's relative as well but Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting by the refusal of this Order that the government has in fact acted as every other government, no different and I'm not in any way quarrelling with that; what I am quarrelling with is this posture of righteousness that we, you know, we sense coming from them, we see from them and you know, we hear it from them all the time. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon - two saints, I thought they were talking about St. Borowski and St. Mackling.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read in the record the Honourable Minister of Labour's answer with respect to this request and it's not a very intelligible one, but let me just read it because I think it's important in terms of indicating the government's position but I am sure my honourable friend is quite aware of the line of action and response taken by my honourable friends opposite which is just the reverse, just the reverse of what my honourable friend is saying now and I want to say to my honourable friend, I want to say to my honourable friend that having the knowledge of that, I am somewhat surprised that he would introduce such an Order for Return. We accept the reasoning and sometime I'll admit the past administration in some respects was rather reasonable and it, I must confess Mr. Speaker, was the exception rather than the rule but we did accept on a number of occasions for Orders for Return of this nature the arguments of the then government that studies were underway, that studies were of such a nature that they could not and I repeat, could not be produced readily because they have been prejudicial to the administration and to other agencies as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Deputy Leader was saying was that we know that the practice of the previous government, and we're going to follow the same practice, except that you are now asking for something different; you shouldn't have asked for something different because when you were on the other side, when you were on the other side, you refused it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept that. Fine. We accept, you know, the logic, the reasoning and we understand, we understand the necessity for that kind of position but, Mr. Speaker, we have to reject the concept of open government, we have to reject the posture of the government and we have to suggest that they continue to keep talking about it whether it be a little open government, more open government or a lot of open government and in effect, we are talking to people who are being intellectually dishonest in this respect.

Now, the final, Mr. Speaker, words on this come from the First Minister -- and I think this is important because I think this is really what has taken place. On August 29th, in the first session of the present government on page 316 the First Minister made the following statement "In the end, this administration - like the previous one, has to exercise judgment as

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . " . . . to what material it will table and it is just a question then of who was right and who was wrong in the exercising of judgment with respect to this particular question."

Now let me repeat that Mr. Speaker. "In the end this administration - like the previous one, has to exercise judgment as to what material it will table and it is just a question then of who was right and who was wrong in the exercising of judgment with respect to this particular question."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that has been the tradition of this House and we do not see the necessity, obviously on the other side they do not see the necessity of breaking with that tradition and, Mr. Speaker, we are not quarrelling with that but we suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government who is not prepared to present to us the list of the reports and studies, the government who is not prepared to in fact, ask for or give the information requested in this Order for Return, is no different than the governments of the past, has no right to try and represent its position as being different and that continues to use the words "open government" more or less, is committing an exercise of intellectual dishonesty and Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising is to put on the record the statements that have been made and once and for all dismiss as hogwash the representations by the honourable members opposite, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the First Minister, as hogwash - the concept that their government is more open, that in effect they are so different. We can argue the relative merits, Mr. Speaker, of whether their administration is better for the people or not, better for the people - that's a question of judgment - that's a question of judgment. I'm not quarrelling on that, I'm not quarrelling on that; we can argue that but we cannot have this continual representation which is expressed in the most righteous manner here and outside that we are so different and I come back to the basic argument which I think, Mr. Speaker, is an argument that will continue in this House and outside as to whether the government is better in Opposition than in government because in Opposition they can be righteous; they do not have to show by experience their actions. In government, because they have to exercise the power their actions speak better than words and Mr. Speaker, their actions on open government, with the exception of the tabling of the Southern Indian Lake documents which were requested, with the exception of some disclosure items in the Manitoba Development Fund, none of which in any way, none of which, Mr. Speaker, equalled the language that was used by the members opposite or even suggested by them in the debates and Mr. Speaker, if we want to discuss that I am quite prepared to go back to the Hansards and I'll read those statements because I'm well aware and as the First Minister should know in which the language has nothing to do with the actual practice and I think it's time that we lay this to rest, Mr. Speaker.

The government is a government exercising its function, carrying on as in all previous situations. It breaks tradition because of expediency and we have this in the acreage payments to the farmers. It rationalizes its position because we can break tradition because it doesn't make any difference. It follows tradition -- (Interjection) -- I'm not opposing anything. It follows tradition it follows tradition when it suits its purpose and it tries to appear as something that it isn't. Mr. Speaker, the government is exercising the normal function of government. Its judgment of it can be made on members of this side and others, no doubt was made to a certain extent in the by-elections, no doubt will be made in the elections to come. However, -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Are you, is the honourable member for or against an open government? Does he feel that it's beneficial for the people to have a government that's open or one that isn't? -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPIVAK: No, I think it's very important Mr. Speaker. I'd like to answer that question. I recognize that the First Minister and the members on the opposite side have to exercise their discretion. I recognize that and I say to you that I, you know, that has been undertaken by every government that I know of in the last decade. They have exercised discretion, some good, some bad discretions.

Let me read the Premier's statement again. Would you like to hear it? "In the end this administration, like the previous one, has to exercise judgment as to what material it will table and it's just a question then of who was right and who was wrong in the exercise of judgment with respect to this particular question." -- (Interjection) -- August 29th of 1969. Fine, good, but don't suggest that you're an open government. Don't suggest, oh please, don't suggest that you're an open government and don't suggest that you are more righteous than everyone else and don't suggest that you are exercising your power in a different way because I must say

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) to you, Mr. Speaker, you have been as corrupted by power as any other administration. Your patronage record and everything else that goes with it, is the same and you can argue all you want - you're no different, you're no different. That's fine but I want to tell you when you suggest that you are, Mr. Speaker, you are intellectually dishonest.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: process of answering my question and then he swung to something else. I would like to have the answer if at all possible.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I assume that I have still twenty minutes to answer that question. I understand, I believe that the government has to exercise its discretion but -- (Interjection) -- I also - well, just let me explain it. I also believe - and here my views I think are probably similar to the views of the Premier but they haven't been expressed in action so far here in this House, that in those areas in which we are involving contentious issues, there is probably a greater responsibility to bring forward all the information relevant, external and internal and I think we have two contentious issues in front of us in which we are entitled to receive the information which has so far not been forthcoming.

One is the auto insurance issue, where I think that the external reports on the auto insurance should in fact be tabled, all of them.

The second has to do with the uni-city plan because once we have now accepted -- and I read the remarks of the Minister of Industry and Commerce who indicated the documents were filed were interdepartmental -- once we accept that premise and I think we have by the government filing that, then it would appear to me that all the relevant material, particularly that material relating to cost implication and I for one cannot believe that that government would be so irresponsible to introduce a One City Plan without some basic cost projections prepared within the department and I -- (Interjection) -- oh no, no I don't think so. I don't think so. Well, we're in opposition. I said that when you are in opposition you can disagree, that's why you get on this side and it will be better, you can disagree on this side. -- (Interjection) -- Well, we'll see. So I'm suggesting to you that in those two areas, particularly the uni-city that it would be important and relevant to have the material and had the government accepted this Order for Return I believe that we would have had sufficient indication of who the external consultants were. We know the people were hired from Toronto, whether they were hired as a consulting firm, whether they were brought in as people who were associate deputies, as now is the case in another department or whether they worked and were paid a civil service salary, I don't know. I don't know any of the details but I know that people from Toronto were involved and it would appear to me that it will be important to find what kind of information was supplied, because I believe we have the right to ask for that information and Mr. Speaker, I must say something else to you. I believe that the government has in its possession the working papers of the Boundaries Commission and I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that that's a relevant document to a very contentious issue and if I accept the premise of the Premier which has not been put in practice, which is my premise, which comes to my answer to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, you exercise discretion. In those contentious issues you produce all the information so that in fact the people of Manitoba, who have paid at public expense for the reports to be filed, will have a right to see it so that there can be an intelligent discussion of the issue that is before us that is contentious and this is one contentious issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier believes in open government, and if the Premier does not want to be intellectually dishonest, produce the Local Government Boundaries Commission's statistical information, produce it so that we can see it; produce all the cost information with respect to the One City Plan. Give us the opportunity to see the working papers so that we ourselves can relate that to our basic position - and who knows? You may convince us; you may even convince the people of Manitoba. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, if that information isn't produced, then we have to believe, on this side, that something is hidden.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the entire speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition makes it clear that his main interest is not so much obtaining the information that is sought here in this Order for Return but rather to take advantage of this motion in order to launch an attack or a speech with respect to the issue of openness of government.

It so happens that on a number of occasions, speeches made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition have left me with a pretty poor impression, but I must say that there is one

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) saving grace about the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, particularly in recent days and weeks - in addition to the change in his physical appearance which is, I must say, becoming to him - one other change I detect is that he has acquired the faculty of being able to be humorous while trying to be serious and that is something that not too many people succeed in being able to do. Because what was the whole thrust of the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition? He was attempting to make the case that this government had somehow changed in the past 20 months or so and had been corrupted by power - as Lord Acton warns all governments eventually are corrupted by power - and that we are inconsistent with respect to this issue of openness of government.

Frankly, after listening to him quote back to me my remarks and statements of two years ago, I have to marvel at the amazing consistency that my colleagues and I have demonstrated with respect to this issue of openness of government. What was the quotation that he read from August of 1969? It was to the effect that I said, immediately after forming the government, that the question of whether or not certain documentation reports would be tabled would be determined by the government in the exercise of its discretion and judgment. We said it then when we were still uncorrupted; and we say it now. So therefore, I think it follows logically in this respect at least we have not become corrupted with the passage of time. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition surely knows, and I'll quote back to him one of the favourite statements of his former leader, Premier Roblin, a favourite statement of his, he so often liked to use, that "the policy position of government was not to be compared to the laws of the Medes and the Persians, laws which never changed for all time but rather governments in modern times had to react to rapidly changing conditions and circumstances, had to change policies, change statute laws" and so on. Therefore, I think I have a right on behalf of my colleagues to claim the same right to freedom of action in dealing with problems.

But it's not as though we have changed in any substantial way, in any significant way whatsoever our basic position in respect to our responsibility for the tabling of information. I will confess to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, if it gives him any comfort, that a couple of years in office have tinged our idealism with a greater sense of realism, but that doesn't mean that we have become corrupt. It's necessary to set forth - and I'll attempt to do so to the best of my ability - what I regard as being the rational, logical guidelines in deciding whether or not certain of these reports and documents can be tabled while keeping consistent with the public interest.

When you look at this Order for Return that has been moved by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Killarney, the first part of it is quite all right; it's straightforward; it's a manageable request. But then he gets into questions 3 and 4 where he's asking for a list of all reports and studies, including those of a very casual and intra-departmental nature of which there are, as my colleague the Minister of Labour indicated last week literally hundreds, literally hundreds, and then in the last part of this Order the honourable member asks for a list or the number of reports of studies yet to be undertaken.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's like the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking earlier in this debate reminded me of the constituent who wrote in to her congressman and said - it could have been her Member of Parliament for that matter - said "Dear Sir: Would you please send me a catalogue of all those things that have yet to be invented because I am interested in invention."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Honourable Minister or the First Minister has read that last item correctly. It does not ask for reports that are yet to be introduced but those which have been commissioned and yet have not been received. That's all that item asks for.

MR. SCHREYER: if there's a slight revision there, Mr. Speaker, but surely the main point before us is whether or not the request that has been put forward is a manageable one or whether it is unrealistic and unreasonable in the quantity of material and the amount of research that it would require in order to fully answer the questions. I would suggest to my honourable friends opposite that there have to be certain criteria that we have to abide by and I would like to take the time now to try and enumerate what these criteria, in our opinion, ought to be.

First of all, we've often said - it seems to me we can agree, I hope we can agree - that documents and correspondence that relate to matters that are under current negotiation that it's not in the public interest to table documents of that kind, simply because they could in some way

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) or another jeopardize the successful conclusion of such negotiations or jeopardize the possibility of more favourable terms being won for the public.

A second criterion would be that documents, papers that are of an interdepartmental nature, as I indicated two years ago, we don't feel that these should be tabled because they would impinge upon the free flow of communication between the various departments and agencies of government. Also, I think that matters, the request for documents and papers that pertain to a subject matter that is sub judice or that is under investigation by an official enquiry, proceeding under the Evidence Act, that it is not really in order, in accordance with the traditions and usages of Parliament and this House to table documents of that kind for obvious reasons.

Now my honourable friends, I know what they are going to throw at us; they are going to say, Ah, but when your colleagues were in the Opposition in 1969, the spring of '69, they insisted upon the tabling of one or two reports that had been done internally for the Department of Mines and Resources pertaining to the South Indian Lake question. Mr. Speaker, I would say that when a government presumes to use a report by quoting directly from a report in this House, they should feel under some obligation to table that same report. And furthermore, if they are going to ask this Legislature to perform an administrative function or duty, namely that of agreeing to the passage or the issuance of a license, as was being demanded by the government of that day, then it seems to me it follows very logically that if the government is going to expect and demand the Legislature pass an administrative regulation or Act, that it supply to the Legislature the same fullness of information that it has available to itself.

Those are the two differences, the two reasons why there is a difference between the situation in - what was it, April or May of 1969, when the Opposition was demanding two internal reports and the situation now when they are asking for internal reports from which we have not quoted in this House and for which we do not relate to any demand on our part of this Assembly for the passage of licenses or whatever matters of an administrative nature.

Having said that, I think that I should make it clear that I can visualize it as being very logical and reasonable and in order, very proper, to ask for the tabling of reports that have been commissioned, studies that have been commissioned and performed by outside experts or consultants, and also such studies and reports as have been - I'll revise that, Mr. Speaker - all reports that relate to studies that have been commissioned or established pursuant to an Order-in-Council, formal studies commissioned by Order-in-Council. Reports of such studies certainly are logically to be produced in this House upon the motion for an Order for Return.

But I make a great distinction, Mr. Speaker, between reports of those two kinds and reports that are prepared for a Minister or senior staff of a department entirely within a department, not pursuant to any Order-in-Council but merely on a ministerial directive and order so that the Minister and the senior staff can be better informed on the details of a particular subject matter.

So those, Mr. Speaker, are the criteria and I really believe that they are reasonable criteria and ones that we will try to follow in dealing with these various Orders for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. With respect to the list of reports and studies commissioned by the government, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to assure us that all such reports are on file in the government and none have been destroyed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the question, if I heard it right, shocks me, really shocks me, the idea that reports, documents in the files of the government are destroyed. It's simply ridiculous, unless my honourable friend is trying to let me know in a staged manner that this was a practice that he and his colleagues used to follow when they were the government, but the thought hasn't even occurred to us.

MR. SPIVAK: A question to the First Minister. I can assume that you're not aware of any reports that have been commissioned by your government that have been destroyed?
-- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable First Minister wish to put that on the record?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth putting on the record, Sir. The fact that to the best of my knowledge, no report -- (Interjection) -- Well, obviously I can't reply in a definitive way for something that is outside my knowledge. To the best of my knowledge, my firm conviction that no reports that have been compiled at public expense and which are on file of the government of this province have ever been destroyed while this administration

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) has been in office.

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

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): I have a question for the First Minister. Is he aware of the truckloads of files that were removed from the government offices and shipped to the P. C. Headquarters after the change of government?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it's in order to answer that but assuming that it is, I would simply have to plead ignorance as to what happened to the files that were in the offices of my predecessors and my colleagues' predecessors. I assume that there was some consternation as to what to do with them but I don't know what actually happened to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: matter of privilege, because I was President of the Progressive Conservative Party for a period of time, albeit after the election, and I can assure the honourable member that no such files were ever delivered to the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The matter of privilege was not one of this House. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if I may, through the First Minister, ask the Member for Crescentwood if he has the evidence to which he's referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Are you ready for the question? Order, please. I had the Honourable Member for Swan River on the floor; I heard no other comments in my earpiece. I can't see that there's a matter of privilege before the House unless it's on record. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JOEGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a matter of privilege. By sheer innuendo the Member for Crescentwood has implied that members of this House removed files from this House, removed files from the government offices to a headquarters and that implication cannot go unchallenged.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I have the floor, Sir, I do believe that the Honourable Member for Morris is suggesting to you, Sir, that there is a point of privilege because of suggested innuendo on the part of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. Then it must be borne in mind, Sir, that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition certainly phrased his question to me in such a way as to have elements of innuendo to it. By the mere means of asking me whether or not records were destroyed, he was suggesting that possibly they were.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I do think that we shall not deal in innuendos. It doesn't add to the debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege - Mr. Speaker, in the debate that preceded the last few remarks, request was made for reports and studies of the government. That request was not granted. The question that was posed was a legitimate question to the honourable members opposite and to the First Minister as to whether those reports still remain on file.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege of the House or of a member? The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to delay this debate, but really I can't let some of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition pass unchallenged. In fact I was trying to get the Premier's attention because I think we should save our big guns for more competent people in debate. Implicit in one of the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, when he says that we are becoming as corrupt as other governments, implicit in the remark is that other administrations have been corrupt. Now whether this is a confession on his part or not, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest

MR. SPEAKER: a matter of privilege by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, at no time did I suggest that the members opposite were corrupt. I suggested they were corrupted by power and there is a distinction. On a point of privilege, if it's required to explain the difference between being corrupt and being corrupted by power

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable gentleman is stating an argument. I'm sorry. The Honourable Member for - - may I remind the House that there are no points of privilege.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) There are matters of privilege of this House or of a member. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, you afforded me the opportunity a few moments ago on a matter of personal privilege. I put my question through you to the First Minister and asked for an answer, and somewhere along the way it lost itself. I'm asking for an answer to that remark that I made.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I must suggest to the honourable member that a question as a matter of privilege is not a matter of privilege. Are you ready for the question? I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I would be only too glad to check Hansard tomorrow to see exactly what the Leader of the Opposition said, but it is my recollection that he said that we are becoming as corrupt as other administrations, and I repeat, I do not know whether this is an admission of guilt or not, but when he says that power corrupts and the First Minister made reference to Lord Acton, there is a relationship between, apparent relationship between the concentration of power and its ability to corrupt. In fact, I would suggest that it proceeds exponentially. In other words, as power is concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, it becomes more corruptive. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not in a classroom, but dammit I expect somebody to have better than average intelligence before they come into this place and if they don't understand English it's about time they started to understand it and learn a little bit, and especially some of the publishers of newspapers in this province.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, some of the accusations that are hurled across the floor of this House, I would have answered for example the Leader of the Opposition's question of the First Minister, I would have said nothing more but "Honi soit qui mal y pense." (Evil to him who evil thinks.) The question itself comes from a mind that suggested that this would have been past practice, but, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't sit back and let this example of ineptitude of an opposition party go unchallenged.

Now the First Minister said that he could accept the first part of this Order for Return. I sincerely hope when the First Minister said that that he didn't go beyond the preamble, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information, because the rest of it I find ludicrous. I think the people of Manitoba should just take a look at this Order for Return. Now I don't know how many in this Legislature are familiar with the old idea of hunting ducks. What they did when hunting ducks was if a guy was a lousy shot, he bought a pump-gun. It was a great big gun, and he packed rocks and salt and bed springs and everything else in it and they fired it up and they hoped they hit something.

Now they have got some competent members on that side. I think particularly of the Member for Morris who is a good ferret, he gets in and he gets reasonable questions to ask, specific questions to ask. I can think of the Member for Fort Rouge and her trying to solicit and seek information relative to the Department of Health and Social Welfare. These are legitimate, well thought-out questions and a proper approach by an Opposition party to solicit information from the government. When this government was in opposition the opposition members at that time ferretted out enough information to realize that they should file for specific information which they needed to form an opinion in opposition.

I recall a few years ago when Mr. Roblin was Premier of this province, he put a 10 percent, I think it was a 10 percent tax on fuel to collect a certain amount of dollars for a specific purpose relative to education. It was for a specific amount and they over-subscribed this amount by \$5 million, and I remember the efforts that our present Minister of Finance spent in trying to ferret out the information where that \$5 million went, that it seemed to go from department to department to department and I really don't know whether he ever did find out where the \$5 million went.

What I'm getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that I think the Province of Manitoba should really take a look at this particular demonstration, the ineptitude of our friends opposite, because they think by just not doing any work, by firing volleys from pump-guns at this government that they're going to effectively form an Opposition and come up with reasonable alternatives, and I suggest to you - or through you, Mr. Speaker - that the accusations suggested by the Leader of the Opposition that this government is becoming corrupt by power, I would recall for the Leader of the Opposition that when, oh when the debate was going on, who is the leader of this party. You know, this is a different party than has ever been in power in the Province of Manitoba before, so when the First Minister was saying that his philosophy of being the leader,

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) this leader of this particular group doesn't concentrate the power in one individual. No one individual solicits or seeks or wants the power that other groups have demonstrated they wanted. So I would just ask the Leader of the Opposition to rest easy, that this party is not on the road to corruption. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that debate be adjourned.

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

. . . Continued next page

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, because of the work of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, a new focus on the education of women has brought to light more information than has ever been available before. There has been considerable improvement in the position of women in the century since Confederation. In pioneer days, educational opportunities for young girls were limited. Among the so-called upper classes, the schools for young ladies were designed to carry their pupils to matrimony with unquestionable virtue, social graces and the air of delicacy that was then so much admired.

But that day is gone forever. Women over the years have not fared too well. About the time of Confederation, subsidies for education were paid according to the number of students attending a school, and it's interesting to note that in Ontario high schools a girl was counted only half a student. Co-education of course gradually came about and many women entered normal schools to become teachers. In the late 19th century women began to be admitted to universities. Their admission to the professions was particularly slow and seems to have been quite a reluctant concession. At the present time, women represent about half the population, a little more than half the population I think, and yet they constitute only one-third of the college and university enrolment. However, there has been a steady progress with a marked increase during the past decade in their enrolment.

Some universities still have quotas on the proportion of women in certain faculties, or they may simply require a higher academic standing than they do for men. In three of our universities at the present time, women wanting to enter pre-med school from Grade 13 are required to have a 10 percent higher average than our men. In vocational training, females constituted 19.4 percent of the total enrolment in 1968. They tend to conform to the prevalent sex typing of occupations and go into such fields as fashion or millinery or hairdressing courses.

Now, the charts of distribution of student loans by sex indicate that in 1967 and '68, females received 31.4 percent of the monies that were available. Now in spite of the common sense of the young girls receiving training which would enable her to be self supporting - and she can be left as sole support of a family so easily - in spite of that girls have tended to have low occupational expectations and many think no farther than a romantic marriage and fail to ensure that they can look after themselves if circumstances ever make it necessary.

Research conducted for the book "Sex and the Public Service" by Dr. Kathleen Archibald, a study commissioned by the Public Service Commission of Canada, reveals interesting information regarding the distribution of full-time employees of the Federal Public Service by salary and by sex. The Federal Government is the largest employer of women and its practices may be considered as representative. Statistics show that only one percent of all women prepare themselves for careers through post-graduate study as compared with 10 percent of men. This is a factor affecting their eligibility for promotion. In 1967, only three out of 349 senior officers were women. It may well be that there is here a self-fulfilling prophecy, that a woman in a public service has little expectation of promotion to senior positions, therefore it isn't worth her while to prepare herself with additional education, and without that education she obviously is not a candidate for more responsible positions.

Now it is a fact that in a public service, women of university degree, a Bachelor or higher, earn 30 percent less than their male counterparts. They also suffer penalties in fringe benefits and pensions. There have been erroneous beliefs concerning working women. Managers have assumed a short lifework expectancy and have felt that women were less dependable and therefore they have not been amenable to giving the women responsible positions, but the women who then were less challenged lost interest and frequently have quit, and this has contributed to the turnover of female employees.

Part of the reluctance of employers has been due to the myth of the illness gap between men and women but this was disproved by the Treasury Board surveys in 1966 or '67. Men were shown to be absent 4.09 days and women 4.41. Statistics also show that only two percent of female workers actually takes maternity leave per year. Now, there have been several new programs undertaken on the federal level to improve the employment situation for women. One of these is the appointment of a co-ordinator of equal employment opportunity, a woman who is going to assist women who want to return to employment to see that they are able to secure the courses that they need and so forth. There is also talk of a specific minister being appointed to take charge of the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the

(MRS. TRUEMAN, cont'd.) Status of Women. There is a new labour code which is to be brought before the Federal Government which would eliminate wage discrimination and would also permit maternity leave.

Now, I've been particularly interested in the amendment that was passed last year to the Statutes - 160, section (5) (h), because in my opinion — well the purpose of the amendment was to permit allowance to be continued for a son or daughter who was 18 years of age and hadn't completed his education. The purpose, as I understand it, was to see that their assistance was kept up and that they could stay in school, and I suspect that amongst girls in poorer families, that they are expected, perhaps after finishing high school, to go to work and to earn, to help earn money for the family.

Now if we could ensure that some of these young girls were receiving further education, technical programs, university if they prefer or whatever, they would be then in a position to support themselves at a later date if it was necessary to do so. As things are now, if they do not receive that type of support, I suspect that they take an uninteresting job, are soon married and, as I frequently remind the House under ordinary circumstances something like 50 percent of the people on our welfare rolls are sole support mothers. In my opinion this amendment provided an opportunity to stop the poverty cycle by helping the girls as well as the boys to be able to continue their education.

Now the Minister, when he responded to this Order for Return, said something about discrimination which was rather startling to me. I got the impression that he felt I wasn't entitled to ask how many males and how many females were receiving the assistance but on the contrary, if this is the way he feels, then from now on there would be no way of finding out when there is discrimination, would there? So this would indeed be self-defeating. I think this is a perfectly reasonable request. It was not a frivolous request on my part, I'm sincerely interested in receiving this information and I hope that the Minister will give favourable consideration to supplying it.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there's one very important reason why it's quite difficult to answer favourably to this Order for Return. As you can notice, Mr. Speaker, there is no dates included in the Order for Return and it could be quite difficult to go back to 1928 or earlier to give you the information that you require here. If the honourable member -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: This amendment has only existed since the last session so it would only be this school year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like the honourable member to so specify in amending the resolution, the Order for Return, -- (Interjection) -- No, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect the honourable member is talking about an amendment that we brought to the Social Allowance Act, Chapter S160 Section 5(h) as amended at the last session but so far as the information required here, it's not specified from what time to what time she requires this information and I would like the honourable member to so specify and if it is possible to answer adequately to number two that is required and here again I'm not quite sure that we can, that we actually separate so far as male and female on the application. As you so well know when a family applies it's not always the male or the female, it's either one not both and you know we may not have the answer that you require here. But if we can give you the information after you submit us with dates we so will.

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

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I feel I must rise at this time to say a few words as this does concern the situation in my constituency. I don't consider this as a welfare program in its true sense, Mr. Speaker, and once more I'll try and explain my stand. There are only 50 applicants for assistance and they must sign a form. And I'd like to read this form, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, through you can I ask the honourable member - I do believe he wants to make comments on the Order for Return made by the Member from Lakeside and this is the Order for Return made by the Member from Fort Rouge.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak on this Order for Return other than to - in order to avoid the necessity of reintroducing this Order for Return. The Minister has indicated that he would be prepared to accept the Order for Return insofar as it is possible for him to provide the information requested, if it was amended to state a specific time is contained in the motion that says that "an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information under the Social Allowances Act Chapter S160 in the Manitoba Statutes, section 5 subsection (8) as amended at the last session." What the Order for Return is asking for is information from that time forward to date as recent as we can possibly get the information, let's say the end of this month.

Now if it's agreeable to the Minister to accept it on that basis then it is not necessary for us to reintroduce it; we can just pass it now and let it go at that and my honourable colleague, the Member for Fort Rouge has suggested that the dates, the effective dates be from the date of proclamation to May 1st; if that is satisfactory to the Minister, well then can we not allow this resolution or this Order for Return to pass on that understanding?

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, I think that it would expedite proceedings here if we were just agreed by leave that the motion is to be taken as amended so as to refer to the time period ending April 30th. Is that what you mean? -- (Interjection) -- That's fine, by leave.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I had indicated that we could not support this Order for Return. First of all, when applications are taken by the regional offices of the Department of Health and Social Development we do not give assistance to strikers; we give assistance to people who are in financial need and it is not possible for the Department of Health and Social Development to give information that we do not have and the information required here regarding Flin Flon, as an example the strikers in Flin Flon, this is actually provided for by the City of Flin Flon and not by the provincial government and we have no access to their statistics and I would humbly submit that this Order for Return could be asked to the City of Flin Flon and not to the Department of Health and Social Development.

So far as the number of applicants, the amounts that has been received for welfare by all people concerned, not only the strikers in the City of Flin Flon, and that equally is applicable to Motor Coach Industries, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. We do hope, Mr. Speaker, one day to be able to compile and present statistics that will include the statistics from all the municipalities, all regional offices of the Department of Health and Social Development and all financial assistance given by the Federal Government so we can have a true picture of the provincial situation. But this is not possible at this time and this is the main reason why we cannot comply with this Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Is the Minister - by way of a question - is the Minister telling us that he does not have access to the community records when they apply to the province for funds to reimburse the local community? Surely he's not suggesting to us that he does not know what is happening in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman is making a statement as well as a question. He may lose his right to speak. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to try and answer that question. We do have access to the records of the different municipalities that do actually cost-share with the provincial government so far as the assistance is concerned, but I say that the statistics that the honourable member is asking for are not readily available to the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It's not entirely clear to me that it's in order for the Member for Swan River to be asking questions of the Minister at this time. The resolution or the motion here has been moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, was adjourned by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, who has spoken and now we seem to be getting into a question and answer dialogue as though it were before Orders of the Day. I'm not suggesting, Sir, that I am certain that it is out of order but it is not clear to me.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable First Minister. The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Swan River on a point of order.

MR. BILTON: I appreciate the opinion of the Honourable the First Minister but rather than make a long-winded address I was taking advantage of my position to ask a few brief questions in order to clarify the thing in my own mind. It wasn't that I wanted to take up the time of the House in the half an hour speech to come to - I'm asking a couple of questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I feel I must rise at this time to say a few words as it does concern the situation in my constituency. I don't consider this as a welfare problem in its true sense, Mr. Speaker, and once more I would try to explain my stand. There are approximately 50 applicants for assistance and they must sign this form. With your permission I'd like to read this, Mr. Speaker. "The City of Flin Flon. The enclosed cheque represents the amount to which you are entitled on a welfare budget basis for groceries or rent for one-half month. In accordance with Section 444 of the Municipal Act, the total amount you draw is considered a debt due to the City of Flin Flon and may be recovered by action in a court of competent jurisdiction. You may therefore be required to repay to the City of Flin Flon all monies advanced to you while the present situation continues. Such total is therefore, in effect, an interest-free loan. Repayment will, of course, not be expected until a reasonable period has elapsed after you return to work which we all hope will be reasonably soon."

These people are not necessarily strikers. Some are steel workers and some are tradesmen who do not, for some reason, belong to any union. I feel strongly about this latter group, Mr. Speaker, and my sympathies are mild concerning them. Nevertheless, they are in need and this episode may be a lesson to them.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Member for Lakeside, who isn't here today, on his concern about the situation in Flin Flon, who went to see, to receive first hand the problems of that fair city. I would also like to commend him for his attitude during the meeting on March 20th, 1969 at the Westminster Hotel. This meeting, Mr. Speaker, was for the purpose of providing a mine inspector for the North as at that time accidents were frequent, often fatal. A mining inspector was a necessity. I'd like to quote his answer. "I am not interested in safety. My interest lies wholly in production." -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the member would address himself to the Order for Return. I know he was touching on Flin Flon but I cannot see that the last remarks were in context to the request.

MR. BARROW: This does tie in, Mr. Speaker. I question his concern on anyone but himself. I don't use the word "hypocrite", Mr. Speaker, because I realize it is not parliamentary. -- (Interjection) -- unparliamentary, pardon me. Pardon me speaking while you're interrupting. -- (Interjection) -- People who attended this meeting, Mr. Speaker, were Len Stevens, Area Supervisor; Roy Simmons, Steel Rep; Wilf Hudson, steel representative; and committees from the North representing the Manitoba Federation of Labour. I don't think the honourable member should be given any information whatsoever as his concern about this situation is two years too late. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: I move, seconded by the Member from Charleswood, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, please. My apology.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Member for Radisson. (Stands)

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Could we have this stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. We were at the question stage at the end of his address. I find

(MR. SPEAKER, cont'd.) it open on the Order Paper. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I move that debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon.

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

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

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

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid we moved through the program a little faster than possibly we anticipated in reaching this. I haven't read this resolution, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — I mean I haven't read it to the Speaker. Now, let's not get smart.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that WHEREAS livestock producers in Manitoba have requested the provincial government to pass enabling legislation that will permit a voluntary check-off on all livestock sales in Manitoba; and

WHEREAS monies so collected will be used entirely to further the promotion and research in the red meat industry for the benefit of the primary producer; and

WHEREAS a check-off program in Manitoba will make it possible for Manitoba producers to contribute and participate with national promotion and research programs as sponsored by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, The Red Meats Council, etc., for the benefit of the Canadian livestock industry nationally; and

WHEREAS the livestock producers are to be commended for their desire and willingness to seek out means - other than direct government involvement - to assist and promote their own industry for their benefit and for the economic well being of the province generally;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this government at this session do implement "check-off" legislation similar to that already passed in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario as requested by the Manitoba Livestock Growers Association.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now we'll carry on with the resolution at hand, and contrary to some of the beliefs caused possibly by the Attorney-General that we have to be coached in our resolutions, I can tell you very firmly, Sir, that we do not have to be. All the smart fellows are over on that side when it comes to the comments -- (Interjection) -- Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Now this resolution is in line with the Conservative philosophy in Agriculture of an expansionist program rather than as a regressive one. We believe that there is an opportunity in Manitoba and in the world to promote the livestock industry and this, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, is promoted not through government support, not through committees, not through a conglomeration of starting at the top and working down, simply, as the resolution states very plainly, a voluntary check-off from the individual producers and no one else is involved in it. It's not involving government spending at all. The levy is not this large. It's being used to promote -- basically the aims of this check-off would be to encourage education, information, advertising and promoting programs; the marking of a uniform high quality; to initiate, sponsor and encourage scientific research in the marketing of cattle; to co-operate with organizations having similar purposes that may be established in Manitoba and other provinces of Canada; and to gather, compile and distribute statistical information relative to the production and marketing of the regulated product.

Now this is the aim of the Cattlemen's Association, Mr. Speaker. The levy set roughly in the other provinces that have this initiated - Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia - roughly is 15 cents on mature animals over one year and 10 cents on calves and animals under one year. Now I think that looking at the domestic market in Canada, the projection - and projections are only as good as the date they are projected at; ten years from now they may mean nothing - but the projection is a 7.5 increase in domestic consumption from 86.8 pounds in 1968 to 100 pounds in 1980. We feel - and I'm a cattle grower, a stock grower, Mr. Speaker - that we can reach this target.

We feel, we've stressed it to government at both levels, federal and provincial, that we do not want the sticky fingers of government in our operation and we basically stated our

(MR. FERGUSON, cont'd.) position, that we would appreciate it very much if we could go along, develop our own markets and compete in any place in the world market. We have a product I think that we can market anywhere price-wise; this will have to be decided on. This levy would be one of the things that this would establish. It would give our representatives capital to go out into markets of the world and possibly try to sell our products. The United States has been doing this for years. The markets that we are going to have to penetrate, which we are doing, is United States and Japan. Basically we have the United States market if our price goes a little bit lower. It's not going to be a collapse like we had in the Hog market where the farmers were encouraged to produce and produce by the MACC, by the credit corporations in Manitoba. We had them in here yesterday on the lot, and it was 18-cent hogs, today they're 19.30. They were giving eggs away. I would like to ask the honourable members on the other side of the House how many of their wives would wash a dozen eggs for 11 cents, let alone take those chickens home, raise them and put them out. There isn't one of them. They can sit over there and laugh. They can go out there yesterday and go around glad-handing, trying to make an impression, but I would like to ask them, there isn't one of them sitting over there that would go out and wash a dozen eggs for 11 cents, let alone raise them. -- (Interjection) -- How many eggs have you washed, my friend? How long have you been in the farming business? -- (Interjection) -- It possibly doesn't meet your parking tickets.

However, Mr. Speaker, we'll get on with the thing at the moment. However, the basic fact is that we as farmers were encouraged to produce efficiently. Efficiency was the thing that was preached to us time and time again - be efficient - we'll get markets for you. This was preached in wheat and this was preached in everything. Consequently here today - the markets weren't there, but we had a 40 percent increase in our hog population. Oh my God, there's no way, there's no way without any salesmen, without any way of distributing our product. How many representatives did we have out in the world? Charter an airplane, load it up with hog products, the rest of the parts of the trade, take them over and go around the world. How much money would it take? How far would this \$4 million we got as a handout go to do this? I'm sure that the rest of the farmers would certainly be quite willing to go along with the idea, that if there's \$4 million that the Province of Manitoba wants to invest, we will certainly go along and say okay, on this time around give it all to the hog producers. Let them go to the world market, go out and show our product, then see how many export orders you can pick up, see what the price is going to be. Have we got a salesman any place outside the Province of Manitoba? I doubt it very much. I doubt it very much.

Now basically this is what we're trying to promote in this resolution right here. It is a simple fact that we want to take a levy, we want to have a few dollars, we want to have some money to go out and finance some salesmen. I don't think this is too big a thing to ask for. It's not going to cost the government one cent. It's not going to cost the people of Manitoba a cent. It's a simple fact - and this is requested, not by anyone else but the simple fact of the stock producers of Manitoba, and I think it's certainly right that they should be given the opportunity. Every other product that we have, every other raw product - we're being looked after by marketing boards; we're being looked after by bureaucracies; we're being looked after this and the other thing. We don't want it. No way do we. It's only going to take another year or two possibly to go out and try this. We may not have this much money raised by this levy. I think the proposal is probably \$100,000. But try it. If it's not a success, fine.

But I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, and any of the members that care to listen, just take a look at your daily paper today. The price of cattle is still quoted at 33 cents, the price of hogs is 19.80. Okay. The consumption of hogs in Manitoba doesn't vary much in 50 to 54 pounds. Our projection here is up to 100 pounds by 1980. We're quite willing to compete on the domestic market, on a world market, and we're only asking for the fact that we would like to go out and have the opportunity to take this levy, get out in the world market and see what we can do.

Mind you, I realize the fact that Australia and New Zealand can produce beef an awful lot cheaper than we can. They can't produce the product that we can and I think that right today that we are in a perfect position - not a great deal of funds, but we have a lot of sincere men involved in this Stockmen's Association. To mention a few names in the Province of Manitoba, you have Ross Mitchell, you have Jack Simpson, Lucien Kincaid, and these fellows are giving time - Ross Mitchell at the present time is down fighting this Bill C176 in Ottawa, which was another fast shuffle in the committee stage through our Federal Government, and consequently I think that these men are sincere. They're not out to make a buck for themselves, they're out

(MR. FERGUSON, cont'd.) to promote an industry for the Province of Manitoba, and I think that given the opportunity, going along with this check-off, I think that we're not asking for much. It's been requested from this present government, and in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be given a chance and I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture will take it into consideration and will do his best for the livestock industry in Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is not new subject matter so it doesn't require a great deal of research. I have not done any research on the subject matter in recent days but I can recall many discussions that we have had for a number of months with different groups within the industry, some wanting this kind of check-off system for purposes of promotion, others wanting a system of check-off for other purposes, and some not wanting check-off at all. So it's obvious to me that there's a great deal of discussion required in order to obtain the kind of consensus before we can proceed to pass compulsory legislation. Voluntary - my friends opposite like to choose - but it really in effect would almost mean compulsion in that everyone, as proposed here, would be checked off on every animal that is sold and would have to request for a refund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone on a point?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes I am, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order?

MR. FERGUSON: Yes. I would like to ask a question of the Minister if I could possibly, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. FERGUSON: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry - just how I am going to phrase this question, Mr. Minister. However, I'll just make it a quick statement of facts, Mr. Speaker, that this would be a voluntary check-off of course, and the money would be refunded if that applied.

MR. USKIW: Well, the Honourable Member for Neepawa suggests that a check-off is voluntary, even though the check-off has not been requested of the individual. I don't know how you can interpret that as a voluntary check-off unless there's concurrence in advance. So it is not voluntary it is compulsory. The only so-called voluntary feature of it is, as I understand the proposition, is that one can request a refund. Now that is a little different than being voluntary, and I know that many people would not be bothered with putting in a request for a refund and therefore in essence, because of the cumbersome approach involved, it would end up being a compulsory check-off even though an individual did not wish to have a check-off for promotional purposes of any product or sale of a product that was related to his farm enterprise.

(a) I am not opposed to the concept, never have been, because I have always believed that if producers want to get together to do things for themselves that that is a very positive approach and in many instances requires less governmental action and therefore it's a relief for government to find that producers are willing to take upon themselves a greater deal of responsibility in this field.

But, you know, the Member for Neepawa made mention of the fact that this has always been Conservative philosophy and if they were only in power they would do it in - I don't know, maybe they would even make it retroactive, I don't know, but that's how strong he feels on this issue. But I want to remind my honourable friend opposite that maybe he feels that way as an individual, but he wasn't a member of this House, Sir -- that's right, he wasn't a member for very long, and the people that had responsibility on this question over the last number of years have procrastinated on the decision.

The Minister of Agriculture in the last year of the Tory administration did not see fit to proceed with check-off legislation. It was not even one of those speeches that died on the Order Paper, as did many other important pieces of legislation during the session of 1969. Nor did the Minister, the Member for Lakeside, the Minister that held office for about two years prior, nor did he take action to bring about this kind of check-off. So you had two Ministers who had the responsibility in this area when you were in government and no action was taken. And I can understand why no action was taken. No action was taken simply because there was too much division within the industry on this subject. And that's a logical reason not to act, and I want to say to my honourable friends opposite that it is evident to me that today there is equally sufficient division on this subject and therefore it is very difficult to pass this kind of legislation.

I want to make reference to a procedure that has been used by the poultry producers, the egg producers in recent months, who undertook to prove to the Minister of Agriculture and to the members of the Legislature that they were indeed in favour of such a plan and they held

(MR. USKIW, cont'd.) . . . a referendum to determine that, in which case 79 percent voted in favour of a check-off for the promotion of poultry and eggs. Now that is a good indication of support and I'm inclined to give that kind of indication a positive reaction. Indeed last week an Order-in-Council was passed to indeed set up a promotional board in the poultry and egg business and it involves a check-off as well.

So I am not dogmatic or hung-up on the question, merely I'm waiting for sufficient consensus of opinion of the people concerned to bring about this kind of legislation. And I want to say to you that the people who have been with me in my office on a number of occasions have indicated many points of view on this subject. Some people believe that a check-off ought to be used for the promotion of a strong farm organization. They would agree, but that the fund should be channeled to help organize the farmers to give them a better bargaining position.

Others would argue that a check-off should be used to fight Bill C-176; others would argue that a check-off should be used to support Bill C-176; and there you have your contradictions within the industry. So as a matter of fact -- and I wish I had a copy of a paper or a magazine from Alberta wherein it was mentioned in an article that Alberta was in a most fortunate position to have their check-off money to fight Ottawa on Bill C-176. You know, it was drawn to my attention in Manitoba that if that is where money is going to go, vis-a-vis to Canadian Cattlemen's Association for example, that they would not want to participate in that kind of a check-off because they want Bill C-176, so you have a real division. I had indicated to the industry, to the stock producers or stock growers of Manitoba, to the bureau, to the Farm Bureau, I've indicated to the Farmers Union that we are prepared to go ahead with this providing there's some degree of unanimity on how the money should be used, how much the check-off should be and so forth. Does the honourable member want to put a question?

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you. Mr. Minister, would you specify who was promoting Bill C-176? Did you say the stock growers in the Province of Alberta?

MR. USKIW: My statement was that it was brought to my attention that the cattle industry, and I don't know specifically which organization in Alberta, had some comment in some newspaper or periodical in Alberta, suggesting that they were fortunate that they had the check-offs to help them finance their fight against Bill C-176. Now how accurate this is I don't know, but it was brought to my attention and I simply pass this on to show that there is some concern on the other side of the question.

Now, I had indicated to the producers and the stock growers, the Farm Bureau and the Farm Union, that I am prepared to go along with this providing we have agreement as to the procedure, as to the amounts, as to what the money would be used for, and that I would not want to proceed unless I had reason to believe that a good percentage of our producers want it, the check-off, and that I was undertaking to try to set up either a poll or some sort of a referendum of the beef producers in particular in this case, to find out whether there is sufficient support, and if I can determine that, then there's no hesitation on my part to bring about regulations similar to what we had done with respect to the poultry and egg industry to allow them to develop some sort of a promotional program.

So I simply want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, I'm not opposed to it. I think that if the wording was changed here that I could vote for the motion, and the wording really should be "to consider the advisability," because that is precisely what we are doing at the present time; myself and my department are considering ways and means of finding out whether there is sufficient support within the industry to bring this about. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stands)

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have this one stand. (Agreed)

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

(Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

WHEREAS the increase in cattle rustling in Manitoba is causing serious concern among

(MR. GRAHAM, cont'd.) cattle ranchers in the province; and

WHEREAS it appears that operations for organized rustling are being centered in Manitoba because of the lack of comprehensive stockyard inspection regulations such as are in force in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government pass amending legislation at this session of the Legislature requiring that brand inspection be carried on at all killing plants in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate & Internal Services)

(Burrows): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I realize that you've put the motion to the House, but I'm just wondering, looking at it, whether it is properly before the House or not in view of the fact that this is a Private Member's resolution. I believe that our rules say that it must be in abstract form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm responding just to idle chatter, but the reading of the resolution doesn't constitute a ruling that it is receivable. The Minister is merely asking whether this resolution shouldn't be worded in the abstract. I don't comment on it, the point of order has been made by the Minister for Consumer Affairs, but I don't think that the reading of it constitutes a ruling that it has been received.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, the Chair has considered this matter and has allowed it to go. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would first ask the members of this Chamber to consider the economic situation that has existed in western Canada in the last four or five years; the results of government policy and government leadership in trying to influence the farmers of western Canada in a switch from grain production to livestock production and the resultant effect that it has had on the agricultural economy of the farmers in western Canada.

When the Federal Government got into trouble with the movement of cereal grains in any large quantity into the market places of the world there was a little bit of panic on the part of the government and they felt that they should urge the farmer to be more versatile and to move into other fields of production, with the result that in Saskatchewan in particular there were many farmers who were basically on farms which were designed primarily for cereal grains, farms that did not have the proper shelter facilities or the feed and water necessary for agricultural production or for livestock production, through economic necessity were forced into the area of livestock production, and we found that in Saskatchewan in the last five years that the cattle population has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, with the increase in the cattle population, we also found some other disturbing factors were creeping into the agricultural industry there. With large herds of cattle in the sparsely settled area, we have found that there was an increasing number of cattle mysteriously disappearing. Constant police checks showed various degrees of success in recovering some of the animals or in some cases tracing some of the carcasses, with the result that the Government of Saskatchewan passed legislation somewhat similar to what we have in Manitoba here, although I believe while our registration of brands in Manitoba is voluntary, I believe they made it compulsory in Saskatchewan. But they also went one step further, Mr. Speaker, and they carried out a brand inspection at the various abattoirs and the result was a significant drop in the number of cattle that were rustled or stolen from the farmers of that area. A similar situation occurred in Alberta, and at roughly the same time in the Province of Alberta legislation of a similar nature was introduced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a cattle rustler; I am not familiar with the operations of cattle rustlers. I am not even a horse thief, although some members opposite might at times put that label on us on this side of the House. However, Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the people involved in the cattle rustling business, and from some of the law enforcement officers that I have talked to, they claimed it was a fairly well organized operation, and with the event of the compulsory branding and brand inspection in Saskatchewan and Alberta, it seriously hurt the rustling business in those two provinces and we now find that here in the

(MR. GRAHAM, cont'd.) Province of Manitoba there seems to be an increase in the incidence of cattle rustling in this province.

Now whether this can be traced to the activities of rather dubious Manitoba citizens or whether these are actual people moving in from the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta or from the northern United States, only convictions can really tell us. However, I know in talking with the RCMP and a particular detachment in western Manitoba, they tell us that cattle rustling seems to be higher in the area in Manitoba that's closer to the Saskatchewan boundary, and they also tell me that in the past year at that particular detachment, the incidence of rustling has increased over 500 percent.

Faced with those facts, Mr. Speaker, I felt it was incumbent on me as a member of that area living close to the Saskatchewan boundary to see if it was possible in some manner to do what we in this Legislature can do to provide some added protection to the livestock industry in the Province of Manitoba. We already have a voluntary brand registration system in practice in this province. I suppose if we in our collective wisdom wish to we could make it compulsory, but Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are many people, small farmers who maybe only have two or three or four cows, who might object to a compulsory branding system because they could conceivably treat their cows almost as pets and they do look after them with far greater security arrangements than occur where cattle are in large pastures in large numbers.

It is my belief that by a careful regimentation or surveillance of the killing plants in the Province of Manitoba, plus I would suggest the border crossing, that we can effectively assist the law enforcement officers in this province in their effort to stamp out this form of crime. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that while there may have been a little bit of debate or question raised in the mind of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regarding whether this in effect did call for the expenditure of government funds, let me assure the Minister that if the legislation is drawn up in the proper way it does not call for the expenditure of government funds and I am sure that a small fee can more than cover the cost that would be inherent with a program of this nature.

If we can in this Legislature pass legislation which will assist the law enforcement officers to prevent crime, to assist the law enforcement officers in their efforts to apprehend criminals, and if we can pass legislation which protects the property or assists in protecting the property of individuals and groups of individuals, then I sincerely hope that I can get the co-operation of all members of this House in this type of legislation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETE ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from St. George, that debate be adjourned.

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

. . . . continued on next page

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden. (Stands)

On the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Member for La Verendrye. (Stands)

On the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Member from Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie,

WHEREAS this House recognizes that it is the prime function of the State and all Governments within it to enhance, improve, and extend, as well as to protect the inherent and fundamental rights of all citizens within our society and to ensure that those fundamental rights are the cornerstone of freedom and justice;

AND WHEREAS the fundamental human rights of every citizen, and the institutions which protect and guarantee those rights, are threatened in many areas, and by many forces in our world society, and it is no longer adequate to rely, for the protection of those rights, on precedents and custom, but that it is now necessary to enshrine those human rights into a Declaration and Bill of Rights, in order to guarantee that they be protected by the rule of law;

AND WHEREAS it is important that the people of Manitoba be guaranteed their basic freedoms and the preservation of the dignity and worth of the human person, and in the equal rights of men and women through a widely understood and commonly accepted Bill of Rights;

AND WHEREAS under the British North America Act, it is lawful and proper for a Provincial Government to legislate in the field of civil rights;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House favors the enactment of a Bill, to be known as "The Manitoba Bill of Rights" and that such Bill be designed to set out and preserve by law those rights and freedoms of the individual in our society which are generally accepted as being the fundamental human rights; And further, that the Government is instructed to present and submit for the consideration of this House a Bill of Rights during this Session of this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions that I had an opportunity to take part in the debates on the Estimates of the Minister of Labour in this House, I have advocated and asked for a Human Rights Commission on those occasions to deal with discrimination in housing, labour practices and in accommodation, and I know that after repeatedly asking for this legislation it had become fruition in the last year when this House passed the Human Rights Commission. If I'm not mistaken, I believe the legislation was drafted by the previous administration -- (Interjection) -- No? No such thing says the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Well that's immaterial, but I did ask for this legislation on many occasions during the Labour Estimates and last year we saw the legislation become law and on the Statute Books.

So, Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party believe in the simple philosophy of equality of opportunity for all. We believe that every act of this Assembly, every item of business that we handle must adhere to this philosophy. We believe that in providing an equal opportunity for each of our citizens we are in fact safeguarding the rights of all individuals. It is because of this that we proposed this resolution, Mr. Speaker, urging the government to introduce a Bill of Rights, specific legislation to ensure for all time that the rights of each and every Manitoban, each person that comes into our province, and that this legislation will give assurance that his rights and privileges as a member of free society, a just society are protected.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to present a brief -- Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to present a brief outline of the history of individual rights. The concept of individual rights is an ancient one. In the dawn of our civilization they were referred to as natural rights, rights to which all men were entitled because man is endowed with a moral and rational nature. Through the centuries these natural rights evolved into what has become the western world's modern concept of individual freedom and equality. These rights have become dear to our society and many other societies as well.

But one may ask, Mr. Speaker, if these rights are commonly acknowledged as an integral part of our concept of freedom and justice, why then is there not a need for a formal declaration of these rights. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we in Canada at this time have no legislation which spells out distinctly what the individual rights of our citizens are. Even though these rights are commonly accepted, many of them are not protected by our laws. No province

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) in Canada with the exception of Saskatchewan has a Bill of Rights, yet under the British North America Act it is within the prerogative of provinces to legislate in the field of civil rights. And I may add, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Bill of Rights was introduced in the province by the CCF government. Would it not be fitting then, Mr. Speaker, that this government also introduce a similar bill and that due credit could be given to this present government. At least we can say that there is one good thing done by the NDP government in Manitoba.

Nevertheless, I believe we all recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is a need for such legislation. We have at the Federal level the British North America Act, but this Act contains few guarantees of specific liberties. We have the 1960 Canadian Bill of Rights of former Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. This bill in practice has had a limited application because our courts have held that it does not expressly override any provisions inconsistent with those which may be contained in earlier Federal statutes. In short, existing human rights measures in Canada, including our own Human Rights Bill, is limited in scope. Most provincial legislation is confined to prohibiting against discrimination in employment, admission to trade unions or the provision of accommodations. The Saskatchewan bill which I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, does go much further and embraces political and legal rights as well. The Freedom of Worship Act enacted during the pre-confederation union and still in effect in Ontario and Quebec gives some guarantee of freedom of religion.

Mr. Speaker, a Bill of Rights should contain more broader guarantees. It is our belief that these guarantees fall into five areas: political, legal, egalitarian, linguistic and economic.

No. 1. Political Rights - Political rights, Mr. Speaker, covers those freedoms of speech, conscience, religion, assembly and association, those freedoms which we all take for granted. but in a world of ever-increasing controls from all quarters, must be assured. Each person should have complete freedom of speech to express his views and opinions without fear of repercussion. The same applies to the freedom of conscience and religion. All people are entitled to the right to think and worship as they see. The freedom of assembly and association, the right to gather and petition must also be safeguarded, but at the same time freedom of assembly must be consistent as must all freedoms for the preservation of public order and safety.

No. 2. Legal rights - Every person in Manitoba should have legislative safeguards that their general security of life, liberty and property will be preserved. Each person should be guaranteed equal protection before the law regardless of financial position, class or individual circumstances. A practical application of this provision would assure legal aid, services of a lawyer in all cases, criminal and civil. How many people, Mr. Speaker, are forced to plead guilty to a charge simply because they don't have the money to pay for legal services. A safeguard of individual equality before the law would eliminate the commonly used term "there's a law for the rich and a law for the poor."

Tied to this freedom is a provision that no man once convicted of a crime will be subjected to a cruel punishment in any institution. This means, Mr. Speaker, that even those persons who are incarcerated should be afforded the basic right of human dignity. At the same time, a person arrested or detained must be guaranteed the right to be promptly informed of a reason for his arrest, the right to prompt legal counselling and the assurance that he will receive a trial with all possible speed and won't be detained for an extended period of time without trial.

Mr. Speaker, recent proposals for changes in legislation at the Federal level simplifying bail procedures will go far to protect this right. A person facing the courts must also have the basic right that he is presumed innocent until proven otherwise. And in cases where language may become a barrier to the administration of justice, the person should have available the services of a competent interpreter. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member has a question - he's repeatedly interrupting, and if he has a question I wish he would get up and ask a question and I would reply.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Has the Member for Radisson a question?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I would just ask the Member for Assiniboia if he just found this out about the rights of men?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have talked about the Human Rights Commission in this House before the honourable member was a member in here.

No. 3. Egalitarian Rights - I use this term in reference to the broad area of

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) discrimination. I feel that there must be the same equality for all people. The term refers to guarantees against government action which would tend to distinguish certain persons or groups for different treatment on the basis of race, national origin or other factors unrelated to the purpose for which the distinction is made. Our existing Human Rights Bill takes steps to end discrimination in the private sector, but there are no safeguards to prevent discrimination by government.

This also covers equality of the sexes, a form of discrimination which unfortunately still exists today in Manitoba. We urgently need legislation to guarantee that women doing the same work or similar jobs as men receive equal pay. This, too, applies not only to private business but to the government sector as well. How many women, even within the government civil service, enjoy wage parity with men?

No. 4. Linguistic Rights - This area, Mr. Speaker, is also safeguarded to a degree by the British North America Act which guarantees the use of either French or English in the Federal Houses of Parliament and before the courts. However, the preservation of linguistic rights elsewhere has either been legislatively ignored or considered only on a piecemeal base. This applies particularly to our legislation on the language rights in our schools and other public institutions, and I feel that some attention should be given, Mr. Speaker, to consideration of the rights of those whose mother tongue is neither French or English.

No. 5. Economic Rights - The kind of rights referred to here are those which seek to ensure some advantage to the individual and which require positive action by the State. The universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations, for example, includes such rights as the right to work, the right to protection against unemployment, the right to form and join trade unions, the right to social security, the right to rest and leisure, the right to have an adequate standard of living, the right to education and the right to participate in the cultural life of a community. The guarantee of such economic rights is desirable and should be the ultimate objective for Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outline of what we are calling for in this resolution and we are especially concerned that such legislation be introduced during this session of the Legislature. As Manitoba enters its second century, in this first year of our second century we could take no more meaningful step than to entrench firmly in our statutes those fundamental rights and liberties which we possess and cherish. A Manitoba Bill of Rights would reflect and protect the high degree of freedom enjoyed by Manitobans. A Bill of Rights would form the first stage in the continuing process of redefinition of the Canadian Constitution. It would be a valuable guideline to other provinces and it could provide the focus and set the pattern for the expectations of Canadians to be formulated into reality. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a worthwhile task and a task that we should undertake with vigor and dedication.

On behalf of the Liberal Party and the people of Manitoba, I strongly recommend to the government and to this Assembly the enactment of the Manitoba Bill of Rights, and I'm sure that all members in this House would support, and I would greatly appreciate to hear members from all sides of the House to participate and take part in this resolution. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

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

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

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. He's absent.

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

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, No. 16. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can the resolutions up to No. 22 stand please?

MR. SPEAKER: Inclusively? (Agreed)

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

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)

Gentlemen, we have reached the end of Private Members.

Second reading of Public Bills. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is one debate that we could move into and that is the debate relative to the rules of the House Committee. I can't for the moment remember whose name it stood in. -- (Interjection) -- In the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand. I'm not prepared to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that members are in a mood to go home. I'll move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I would just like to check first whether Law Amendments is definitely on on Monday morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it appears in the Votes and Proceedings that Law Amendments is on Monday morning, and on Monday afternoon I expect we'll be moving into the adjourned debates on the bills that we have been moving regularly, followed by again the adjourned debate on the resolution which is standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland followed by the Estimates of the Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I wonder if it has been established in the Estimates who will follow the Estimates of the Attorney-General and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: The Minister of Agriculture will be following the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.