

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, July 11, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their sixth report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 82 - An Act to amend The Jury Act.

No. 94 - An Act to amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act.

No. 103 - An Act to amend the Health Services Insurance Act.

No. 111 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

And has agreed to report the same with amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 67 - The Museum of Man and Nature Act.

No. 79 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

No. 91 - The Provincial Judges Act.

No. 100 - The Provincial Park Lands Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement in connection with the unemployment figures for the nation and also the Province of Manitoba. I understand that copies are being distributed to those who are entitled to receive the same under the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have just received the latest figures on unemployment as applied to Manitoba. While I cannot say that Manitoba's unemployment rate is the lowest in Canada for June, as I was able to say for April and May, nonetheless our rate for June of 3.2 percent, the lowest in Canada previously has remained constant for the rate for May. Only Saskatchewan had a lower unemployment rate than Manitoba, their rate there was 2.4 percent in June of 1972. The total number of unemployed in Manitoba was 13,000 for June of this year. The same number as for May of this year, but with 5,000 less than in June of 1971. Manitoba's labour force in June 1972 was 409,000, an increase of 7,000 over May of 1972. The labour force in Manitoba in June of this year was 10,000 higher than in June a year ago. From these figures it will be readily seen that the 7,000 additional workers within the labour force, that is increase, obtained employment in the province. From these figures it will again be evident that Manitoba's economy is still expanding and able to absorb the increase in the labour force. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it will be of interest to honourable members to note that the actual unemployment rates in Canada vary from 2.4 percent in Saskatchewan to a high of 8.1 percent in Quebec, and 7.7 percent in British Columbia. Mr. Speaker, it is not to be considered that the Government of Manitoba is satisfied with having 13,000 unemployed in our province, and that we must continue our efforts to provide jobs for all of those that are employable in our province. If I may interject, in addition to the statement, Mr. Speaker, I think it augurs well for the forward thrust of the Government of Manitoba and its policies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, we from this side, of course, like to hear the voice of the Minister announce for the 10th or the 22nd time that Manitoba's rate of employment is probably the highest or the lowest rather, in Canada, but --(Interjection)-- the

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) rate of unemployment lowest in Canada. But I can't help but say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba cannot but be aware that the statistical information that the Minister is using is one that is certainly not all inclusive in that many people that should be considered when we make this kind of an announcement are not included in the figures that the Minister is quoting. I'm not blaming the Minister for it because he's simply repeating what the federal agencies tell him. However let's have the facts straight. Let's not pretend that our situation is that which the Minister announced when in fact we all know that that is not the real situation, and I can't but suggest that I think less of the Minister if he doesn't include in his suggestions that these figures might be well for comparative's sake inter-provincially but when we come to disseminating information to the public of Manitoba, we should be more interested in being more accurate in our suggestion.

Also I would like to see the Government of Manitoba express a little more consistently their point of view, and may I just to justify this statement read from a recent newspaper article, and it's a quotation from the Industry Minister, and I'm prepared to table it should people request me to do so. The Minister of Industry and Commerce said the following: "Industry Minister Len Evans says Manitoba's rate of industrial growth is unsatisfactory since some citizens are being forced to leave the Province to seek business careers". This is a little inconsistent with that kind of an announcement which the Minister has just presented. --(Interjection)-- No. If I suggested this was Gurney Evans I might correct it and say it was Leonard Evans.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the fact that comparatively the Minister says, and we take it at his word, that the unemployment situation in Manitoba might be lower than elsewhere. Let's couple with that however the suggestion that our labour force compared to those provinces, which we like to be compared to, is rather minimal. We don't compare in size of labour force to that of Quebec, Ontario or British Columbia. I know we speak of percentages; I realize that we speak of percentages, but that is also a consideration, Mr. Speaker, that should be included in the statements. I welcome the statements from the Minister, but may we request that his statements be, not only accurate, rather be in all-inclusive.

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

MR. I. H. (ZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the statement is welcomed for what it says, but it must be commented upon for what it doesn't say. We know that almost two years ago, and certainly a year ago, in this Chamber we passed legislation to set up a statistics bureau of government so that we could get meaningful information that was purely related to the people of Manitoba. That has not yet happened and as a result the Minister uses Statistics Canada as his data, for which we don't fault the Minister, but we certainly wonder why information such as Alberta, such as British Columbia is able to present to its citizens is not forthcoming to the people of Manitoba, and the information that would have been particularly meaningful today, as you present these figures, is how many people dwelling in this province do not form part of the labour force and therefore do not form part of your statistics? How many, and the Minister from his seat says the same figure for all provinces, and the answer to that is, that's simply not good enough. If the other provinces fail to present the information that the public is entitled to have, that is no excuse for the public of Manitoba being misled by these kind of figures. There are several tens of thousands, or at least twenty to thirty thousand people in our native work force who are ignored by these figures. And at the same time we do not take into account the depopulation, the braindrain, the net outflow, because all an employment statistic is, as I understand the Minister of Labour, is of the people living here who were seeking work, how many had jobs? When you don't take into account the fact that X thousands of people have left the labour force in Manitoba, as Statistics Canada will also tell the Minister, as you see the quarterly figures of net annual population outflow, it will present a less happy, a less rosy picture that we have been presented today.

The purpose of my saying this, Mr. Speaker, is not to spread gloom and doom, but simply to say to the Minister that let us not rest on our oars, our laurels are not sufficiently bountiful to warrant a smug, we've done it attitude. Let us look equally, as we present this kind of information, the list of companies that have left this province, not because of any scare of the government, because I've never suggested that, but because our economic climate for a variety of reasons is not what it ought to be, and which I think the Minister of Industry and Commerce acknowledges. The individuals that have left, and if you try to say to the public of Manitoba today that, yippee we've achieved the Canada Council, the Economic Council's goal of full

(MR. ASPER cont'd) employment because we're down to 3.2. This would be a terrible misleading thing to say. I'm not suggesting that the Minister is saying that. I am simply saying to the Minister, I am simply saying that the Minister invited me a week ago . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: . . . the Minister invited me a week ago to travel around Manitoba and see what's happening, and now I return the compliment. I ask him to go to the north; and I ask him to go to rural Manitoba; I ask him to see the towns emptying out, the opportunities for our children who are pouring out of the schools, absolutely nil. The forced braindrain from the rural to the urban center, and I ask him to reconsider some of the government's action such as the locating of a plant in Transcona for Flyer Coah, Flyer Industries, when it ought to have been in Morris, and these are part of the employment picture that the Minister ought to report on. It is my hope . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Yes. My point of privilege is this, Sir, for you to consider. The Honourable the Member for Wolseley is intimating that it is by choice and by deliberate design that the Government of Manitoba has chosen not to include in the statistics those numbers of chronically unemployed. I believe it's a matter of privilege because of the degree to which the Member for Wolseley is riding on that allegation. Does the member know that we have made many representations to the Federal Government asking them to include them? --(Interjection)-- Well why are you . . . That's my point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I should like to indicate that the point the Honourable First Minister has raised I cannot consider as a matter of privilege, but I was entertaining the thought of rising just before he did to indicate to the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party, that he was over extending the privilege of the House of replying to a statement by debating the issue. Order please.

Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Honourable Member is finished.

Order please. Will the honourable member state his point of order.

MR. ASPER: The point of order is that when a Ministerial Statement is made in the House, there is the opportunity for each party leader to respond.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: If, Mr. Speaker, if I extended over the five minutes I would ask leave to conclude my statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I did not indicate that the procedure called for any time limit. I indicated that it called for relevancy. In my opinion I think the relevancy was being extended beyond what the statement indicated by the Minister of Labour.

The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for Emerson quoted me, and as a matter of privilege I have been quoted out of context. In that statement I was referring to the long-term structural development in Manitoba, a problem which has existed for 50 years, and the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party made reference to it. I would like to refer members to get it on the record that I have also quoted as saying in the current situation, "business is booming in Manitoba".

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his matter of privilege.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister has indicated that he's quoted out of context. I'd like him to ask the reporter Roger Newman to ask whether he was quoted out of context or not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's not a matter of privilege.

Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. Any others? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in the article referred to already in which the Minister said he was quoted out of context, he indicated that it was the government's intention, the government's

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) intention to enter into more industrial enterprises which will be either fully or partially owned by the Manitoba Development Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I wonder . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I should like to indicate to all honourable members there is no way I can adjudicate whether something is in order or out of order if everyone is talking at the same time. I just can't make sense of what's going on.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce will be in a position to give to the House the details of the new industrial ventures which the government will be entering into through the Manitoba Development Corporation which will either be owned completely or partially owned, that are to take place in Manitoba?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position at this time to give details in this regard, but with respect to the honourable member's question and the thrust suggested in my earlier statement, I'm pleased to note that the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce agreed with my position that private enterprise had failed rural Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce can indicate whether he's now negotiating for the purchase of an out-of-province company through the Manitoba Development Corporation, to bring it to Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I am not negotiating possibly the MDC may be looking at a venture that might make sense for Manitoba, economic sense for Manitoba, might create jobs in this province, and what's wrong with that approach? We need jobs in Manitoba, we need development, and there are many ways of creating economic growth, and let's look at all our options.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we proceed I would hope that the honourable members both in answering and in asking questions try to be brief. I do think that Beauchesne's Citation 181 does indicate answers should be brief and clear, and the same thing applies to questions. Long questions are very confusing; they're very hard to determine, and especially with interjections there's no way of knowing whether they are in order or out of order. I would ask the co-operation of all the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): My question will be very brief and to the point and it's directed to the First Minister. Has he received the resignation of the Minister of Labour as promised in the House yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris - I believe that his resignation was asked for from time to time and it never materialized, and there's no, certainly no greater reason why the Minister of Labour should accommodate my honourable friend than he was able to accommodate those who were asking for his resignation.

MR. JORGENSON: Am I to understand then that the First Minister is going to be condoning false information communicated to this House.

MR. SCHREYER: The member's question affords me an opportunity to clarify what I really believe to be an unfortunate misunderstanding. --(Interjection)-- No, no, Mr. Speaker, the --(Interjection)-- I am of the understanding that the Minister of Labour gave an undertaking that there would be a meeting of the committee on Industrial Relations to consider Bill 81 and other bills, and that to that end the committee would be called so that it would be in session certainly 48 hours after the passage of Bill 81 --(Interjection)-- 48 hours and thereafter and later, and certainly by indicating to the House that those who are unable to make it sooner there will be a meeting of Industrial Relations Thursday morning, which is more than 48 hours, and if necessary Friday morning, and if necessary Saturday morning. I really fail to see what complaint my honourable friend has. It seems the Minister of Labour has been more than accommodating and more than lived up to his word.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please. I should like to indicate to the veteran Member for Morris that the rules of the House ask for a member to be recognized before he is allowed the floor. I have no idea as to what he was saying, not one word was taped. Would he wish to repeat his question, if it's a question. If it isn't, it's out of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I would like to ask the Minister of Labour then if he is going to hand

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) in his resignation as a result of the false information that he communicated to House yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order. The Honourable Member for Morris has accused me a member of this Assembly, an elected representative of the people of Manitoba, the constituency of Transcona of being a liar. I allowed the honourable member a few days ago to get away with that accusation because it was a mistake, that is true. I allowed the Honourable Member for Morris to get away with that accusation a couple of days ago in respect of the building of a plant in the community of Transcona. I did so at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, because I recognized the emotional make-up of the Honourable Member for Morris, and I did so, Sir, at that time realizing that particular situation. I question, Mr. Speaker, now on a point of privilege, whether I should allow the Honourable Member for Morris to continue his reference to me, as a member of this Assembly, as being a liar. I question as to whether or not this is in accordance with parliamentary procedure. I question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not on the second occasion that I should allow to go unchallenged the assertions of the Member for Morris or any other member of the Assembly as to accusing me of being a liar. -- (Interjection)-- I'm not in trouble at all may I say to my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney. I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to leave this Assembly now and to leave to the discretion of you, Sir, and the members of this Assembly as -- Oh my friend from River Heights is laughing after what he did to Maitland Steinkopf, and I know it, and he knows it. But, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, I am prepared to leave this Assembly at this moment to allow the members in my absence to discuss as to whether or not I am a liar. If I am a liar then the accusations of the Member for Morris will be substantiated by this Assembly. I do not think that I am a liar. I have never been a liar in my own opinion. That's right. You jackals over that side may laugh, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that in my own opinion I am not a liar, but if that character who happens to be the representative for River Heights and the representative for Morris can convince the members of the Assembly that I am, Mr. Speaker, then I am prepared to withdraw from my political career.

I am not a liar and I resent the accusations of the Member for Morris. I believe, Sir, that I am fulfilling all of my responsibilities and all of my obligations in respect to my commitments to the members of this House and if the smug look of the Member for River Heights means anything, and it is a smug look --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Of all the characters that's ever been seated in this Assembly he is the outstanding character who prosecuted and persecuted an honourable member previously, but, Mr. Speaker, I will not be persecuted in this Assembly. So, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I ask you; I ask this Assembly to adjudicate the allegations of the Member for Morris as to whether or not I'm a liar. After over 30 years in the public service of Manitoba I resent and I reject from the Member for Morris, and even the lady member for Fort Rouge who just interjected, that I am a liar. I have more confidence, I have more confidence, Mr. Speaker, in democracy. I have far more confidence, I have far more confidence in the capabilities of the people in this Assembly and outside, as to their adjudication as to whether I am a liar or not. On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Member for Morris to withdraw the allegation that I am a liar. I gave an undertaking in respect to the Labour Relations Act, Mr. Speaker. I feel that I am adhering to that. Mr. Speaker, I am now leaving this Chamber and I ask my colleagues in this House to make a decision as to whether or not I'm a liar.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on that question of privilege, before the Minister leaves. The record speaks for itself. I have nothing more to say. Yesterday in this House the Minister made a commitment. He has not lived up to that commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the extent to which the Chair feels that it can adjudicate on this particular problem. I am aware that the Member for Morris and the Minister of Labour had a conversation with respect to the timing by which the committee on Industrial Relations would be convened and as I understand the Member for Morris his principal concern is that those who wish to make representation with respect to Bill 81 would have the assurance that the committee would be meeting, would be meeting not less than 48 hours after the passage of Bill 81. Now I gather from the Member for Morris that that is essentially the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) understanding that was arrived at. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have an unfortunate play on words here and consequently a misunderstanding, because the Minister of Labour last evening subsequent to the passage of Bill 81 advised the House, and the media for broader dissemination, that the Committee on Industrial Relations would be meeting Wednesday, he also announced Thursday, and consequently by just sort of practical, reasonable interpretation, I certainly conclude that all those who could not be reasonably expected to be present on Wednesday, they have an ironclad assurance that the committee will be meeting in any case whatever the circumstances on Thursday. So therefore in what way, in what way has the undertaking been substantially, or in any respect, not lived up to. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Morris on reflection would admit that the undertaking not only substantially, but in its entirety, has been lived up to. If no one is prepared to make representation on Wednesday, so be it, but Thursday is assured. So the Minister of Labour can hardly be referred to as somehow going back on his word, which I must say the Minister of Labour, as much as any single person here, puts very much store on. If it gives the Member for Morris any comfort I will tell him that if there's fault to be assessed here, it should be to me because I suggested to the House Leader that it would be a reasonable undertaking to proceed by way of Wednesday and an ironclad assurance on Thursday as well, which really should meet my honourable friend's requirements.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we get too involved I have no desire to adjudicate on the merits of the statements. I should like to indicate that all members are well aware of what parliamentary expressions are allowed and which ones aren't. I do believe that we all are here as honourable people of integrity; we should also accept each other in that light. I believe if there is any withdrawing to be done every one will have to utilize his own conscience to come to an assurance whether it's necessary or not under the circumstances. I do not think that it's necessary for the Chair to play the role of saying you must, or you must not do that. We are all honourable people in this Assembly and I'm sure that on that matter and on those terms we may be able to proceed.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): I think the Premier has covered the situation very well. I just want to add on the point of order a further observation to this effect. There is a commitment that the meeting will hear representations on Wednesday and Thursday. Those who are unable to make representations on Wednesday have a commitment that the committee will meet on Thursday. Now surely those who might find it inconvenient to make representations on Thursday, might welcome the opportunity to make their representations a day earlier. It might suit their interests better in arranging their plans to make their observations to the committee as soon as possible. Now in what way is this jeopardizing the interests of those who want to make representations and to accuse, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of doing something altogether different and wrong, and adverse to the interest of those who want to make representations is itself misconstruing a state of facts and I implore the Honourable Member for Morris to reconsider his observation and withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . I was prepared to allow this matter to ride and to rest, prior to the unfortunate and stupid interjection from the Attorney-General. Everybody in this House heard the Minister of Labour. Now I'm going to accept the word of the Premier and that he suggested to the Minister of Labour that perhaps the committee could be called on Wednesday. That wasn't the commitment that was made. But I'm prepared to let it go at that. But the Attorney-General has made an interjection that I cannot allow. He has suggested that some way or other I have not interpreted the facts correctly. The statement that was made by the Minister of Labour was heard by every member of this House, and on this side of the House we accepted it as being a commitment. Subsequently, that proved not to be the case. As I said, Sir, I'm taking the First Minister's word that there was a misunderstanding, and I'm prepared to let it go at that. But the Attorney-General for the remarks that he made, I think should be called to task for interfering in a matter that did not concern him in the first place. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSON: And making comments that were not in accordance with the facts. Everybody heard the Minister of Labour in this Chamber yesterday. And it was on that basis that I accepted his word and I, rightly or wrongly, believe that the Minister of Labour did go

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) back on his word. But I'm prepared to allow the matter to rest as it is right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I really believe that we are narrowing the area of disagreement and/or misunderstanding. The Member for Morris, I really feel disappointed, Sir, still speaking to the point of privilege, I'm disappointed that the Member for Morris does not accept in a very simple and outright way the fact that the Minister of Labour was prevailed upon to advise the House that the Committee on Industrial Relations would be convened for Wednesday and Thursday both with the implicit clearly, to my mind, clearly understood assurance that whatever happened on Wednesday, in the event that there were not sufficient numbers wishing to make representations to utilize the full committee meeting, that in any case the committee would as a matter of commitment and undertaking here in this House be convened Thursday, which means clearly fully and in every respect the assurance that was given to the Member for Morris as House Leader on the Opposition side. So I really would hope that the Member for Morris can accept it in that simple and stark light, that having the House Leader, the Minister of Labour, having guaranteed that the Committee on Industrial Relations would be meeting Thursday in any case as well as on Wednesday, in what significant or substantial way was the commitment not being honoured. And this is what has caused the point of privilege and the great feeling, the intense feeling on this side on the part of the House Leader. Now if we can simply get an admission from the Member from Morris that the undertaking is substantially, and in every major respect, honoured by virtue of announcement to the House last night that the committee would meet in any case on Thursday, then I believe we have the matter settled, and I don't believe it's an unreasonable request.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I believe that what the Minister is doing is rationalizing. That was not the commitment that was made. I have always taken the position that when a Minister of the Crown makes a statement to the House, you must accept that. Everybody heard what the Minister of Labour said yesterday. I was accepting that at its face value, 48 hours after the bill was passed before the first committee would be held. Now, if it makes them feel any happier that they're going to call it on Thursday in addition to Wednesday, that's fine, that's fine, but that is not the commitment that was made, and it's on the basis of the commitment that was made and heard by everyone in this House, that I base my objection. I am prepared to let the matter rest at that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, so am I because I really believe that the essence of the matter, I believe there has been an agreement with respect to the substance of the matter. The Member from Morris, if he will check the record, if he will check Hansard of last night approximately 11 or 11:15 P.M., he will note there the words of the Minister of Labour which assure that the committee on Industrial Relations will be called Wednesday and Thursday, Thursday is specifically specified regardless of what transpires on Wednesday, and that I believe, I really believe, Sir, meets the substance of the undertaking, therefore what is our problem?

MR. SPEAKER: Are we prepared to go on to the Oral Question Period? I hope that we can leave the matter because I do believe we're just getting more embroiled. --(Interjection)-- I didn't hear what the Honourable Member for Thompson was saying, but if he insists - Order please - but if he insists on shouting, I'll have to recognize someone else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the same point of privilege. A member of this House has been called a liar. I'm not a rules expert, Mr. Speaker, but I've been here three years and I know members that have been expelled, or threatened to be expelled, for much less serious infractions. I recall several years ago the now Minister of Tourism and Recreation who suggested to Gurney Evans who was the minister at that time, that he was misrepresenting something. He was going to be expelled from the House and he finally had to withdraw that remark. We do have rules. I don't agree with them. I think they're suffocating, stupid, undemocratic, but they are rules that we have to live by, and if anybody is to be blamed in this House, Mr. Speaker. I regret to say that your ruling and your Chairing of this has brought about this thing here. No member is allowed to call any member a liar. You, Sir, know that rule. You have allowed it to go unpunished on two occasions, and is it any wonder we are in the present situation. The Minister has been called a liar; he has

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) walked out of the House. It is your duty, Sir, not ours, your duty as the Speaker to ask that member to withdraw and apologize, and I suggest that that be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for Thompson is correct with respect to the interpretation of the rule, but what is unclear to me, Sir and I hope it's clear to the Chair, is whether the Member for Morris made the statement within or outside of this Chamber, and I would regret, Sir, if we had to, if we had to deal with the specific point raised by the Member for Thompson, which is valid, because it was my understanding from the Member from Morris that the misunderstanding, having been clarified, that by definition his statement was being withdrawn, and it would only take a little bit of an act of grace on the part of the Member for Morris to get us out of this predicament on both sides of the House and the Chair as well.

MR. SPEAKER: May we proceed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Morris lacks grace then I do insist that the rule be enforced. Let us ascertain --(Interjection)-- well I'm on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let us ascertain whether the statement was made in or outside of the House. If it was made within the House, then I'm afraid, Sir, that the Chair must deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: The determination of the actions of the Member for Morris will be his own, not that of the First Minister's; and the determination of this House will be yours, Sir. My suggestion to you would be that you take this matter under advisement; that you review, Mr. Speaker, that you review the record of Hansard of yesterday and of Hansard of today, and on the basis of the explanations given by the Honourable Member from Morris after the First Minister had spoken, and where he indicated that on the basis of the representation made by the First Minister he was prepared to alter his remarks, whether that in itself has not been sufficient --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm afraid you may not have been listening -- is sufficient to indicate the acceptance of a position with respect to this that was not understood by any other members in this House, because it was obviously dealt with between the First Minister and the House Leader. And my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that particular statement, would be for me to suggest to you that you do take this matter under advisement and have the opportunity to be able to look at the Hansard and be able to see what the record actually shows.

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Honourable Member from Selkirk did say after listening to the words of the First Minister that he was ready to accept -- from Morris, excuse me -- that he was ready to accept the explanation. In other words it was clear to all members of this House that there had been a misunderstanding. This was accepted. Now there is only one thing to do and that is for the honourable member to withdraw his remark because he did make an accusation here that one honourable member was a liar, and this was repeated. Now as I say it was accepted that this was a misunderstanding and I do agree that he should be graceful enough to withdraw these accusations.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, without wishing to interfere with your ruling which you will be called on to make obviously, I do want to point out that the events that have preceded the fact that the public business of Manitoba has now been held up for half an hour while the niceties of whether something was done right or wrong, or illegal or legally, this is the culmination of a series of events that have occurred in this House for some time now. Mr. Speaker, I concede that I've only been a member of this House for a few days but I have participated in Chambers throughout this country and I have never, ever, regardless of whether it's Bourinot, Beauchesne, or the blue book, I have never heard anything like the insult, the trading of names that provokes any honourable member to the point where he responds emotionally, but during the course just of the last few minutes as this grave matter was being discussed that could interrupt the entire business of this province, I heard name-calling from government, I heard the Attorney-General use what would normally classify as profane language --(Interjection)-- Right now. And my point, Mr. Speaker, is that if we are going to deal, if we are going to deal with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest the honourable member was trying to pour oil on troubled waters but it turned out to be oil on fire. I do think that we

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) are getting ourselves into a depth from which we will not be able to extricate ourselves because the more we proceed, the less we proceed with logic. I would appeal to the Honourable Member for Morris if he would come to the conclusion that as all honourable people in this Assembly, we are entitled to retraction on expressions that are unparliamentary. Order, please. As I said, I would appeal; I do believe we are all people of integrity in this Chamber, we do err, including myself, and I would suggest that my appeal is directed directly to the Honourable Member for Morris. The easiest way to straighten out the situation is by him retracting the accusation he made. The Honourable Member for Morris. Order, please.

I appreciate the assistance of all the honourable members but I do not appreciate getting us into any further depths of trouble and unfortunately the honourable member was talking about provoking, and he was provoking, and I don't think that's the issue before us. The issue before us is whether we can get an agreement from the Honourable Member for Morris to take something back which was unparliamentary. Provocation may have been on both sides but the rules call only for what is unparliamentary to be withdrawn and that's the only thing I'm appealing to the House at the moment and to the Honourable Member from Morris. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: The point I was making, Mr. Speaker, and it's a very brief one is that the event which you are called upon to adjudicate --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do think we'll proceed more judiciously if we do it one at a time. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the single issue that you're being called upon to adjudicate in the point of privilege cannot be detached from the other event which preceded this one. When the Minister of Labour in the process of raising his point of privilege used the inflammatory language that he did, it is merely symbolic calling my colleagues on this side of the House "jackals". In previous evenings we've been treated to oratoricals of the same sort. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the resolution of this matter is for an admonition to issue forth from you to all members of this House to restrain the invective, to restrain the insult, to restrain the use of badgering when people are speaking, so that this Chamber, which is, in my judgment, in some disrespect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I can only take one issue at a time. The point of order is at the moment on the floor.

MR. ASPER: My concluding comment, Mr. Speaker, is that the whole matter has brought not only all of us into question, but the dignity of this House in the eyes of the people of Manitoba, and this is something that I've heard for three years as I've travelled in this province, and I'm calling, I'm calling, Mr. Speaker, on an adjudication which will not only encompass the particular event but have a salutary effect to all problems facing this House in the same manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise now on a matter, not of personal privilege but of parliamentary privilege. I believe, Sir, that if one considers carefully the remarks just uttered by the Member for Wolseley, and the broad nature of his remarks, they cannot be interpreted otherwise than as a criticism of the way in which you, Sir, have conducted your office and your duties in the Chair of this Assembly over the course of the past year or two. And nothing can be more inappropriate nor irrelevant than for a member of four days of experience in this House to lecture the Chair as to the proper course of the carrying out of the duties of parliament and of the Speaker's Chair. The rules which govern procedure of parliament are quite different, and have always been different, than in a court of law and my friend the Member for Wolseley has a considerable degree of temerity after four days or five days as a member to suggest to you, Sir, how you are to conduct yourself. What is important to the Chair, I suggest at this moment, is whether the Member for Morris who has had 15 years of experience in parliament whether he does not regard it as completely appropriate, and required of him at this time, to take what to my mind follows so naturally and so logically from what he was prepared to admit a few moments ago that there was in fact some genuine misunderstanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I have stated, and I will state again, that the record is quite clear in this matter. Whether it is a false interpretation of what was said or whether it's the correct one, I based my accusation to the Minister on the basis of that statement that the Minister made, and that commitment that the Minister made, to this House last evening. I have

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) no desire, Sir, to continue to keep this matter boiling as it has been for the past half hour and indeed, Sir, to place you in the difficult position that you are in as a result of some of the comments that have been made, and comments that I believe to be extremely unfortunate with regards to your personal self.

When a statement is made in this Chamber by a Minister, if there is one rule that has been the basis upon which we can conduct parliamentary business, it is the rule that when a Minister offers a statement of policy or otherwise, that we can accept that statement as fact. There have been Ministers over the years, Sir, that have resigned on less than the accusation that I have levelled at the Minister of Labour, and that is a fact and that is a matter of record. But, Sir, in order to bring this matter to a head, in order to ensure that the business of the session can continue and not be prolonged unduly, I am prepared to withdraw whatever I have said against the Minister of Labour and let the matter now be put to rest. But I hope that, Sir, when questions are asked of the ministry or statements are made, there will be no need to question whether those answers are accurate or not, because unless we can have that assurance this House cannot continue.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to thank the Honourable Member for Morris and commend him for his remarks. I should also like to indicate to the House that it is with the co-operation of all members that we can proceed and carry out the work of this House. The Chairman cannot do it alone and if there's any reason to suspect that the job hasn't been done well, I should hope that it would reflect on my own person and not on the office of Speaker, but as I said again it is with the co-operation of all members that this job can be done, not by my force or by my will alone. Oral questions.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege which arises out of the comments of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party who made an accusation that some moments before in this Chamber I used profane language. I would like him to withdraw that statement because no one in this House other than him, I believe, has any conception of what he is talking about and I would like him to withdraw that unequivocally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the comment I made is not withdrawable. It is a report to you, Sir, that during the course of the speech by the Member from Morris, there was inflammatory insulting language which I said could be described by some as profane. I would describe it as profane language yes, the words used twice or three times from his chair by the Attorney-General --(Interjection)-- yes, it makes a difference perhaps, Mr. Speaker, from --(Interjection)-- let me remind the House then in answer to the Attorney-General's statement that it makes a difference from whence you make a statement, that the statement which was just withdrawn by the Minister, the Member from Morris, was made from his chair, --(Interjection)-- yes - if, Mr. Speaker, my friend the Minister is suggesting that what one says from his chair with his microphone turned off but is clearly audible doesn't count, if the -- I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, when I commented that the words used were made from his chair, if that makes the difference. Would Mr. Speaker ask me to repeat what was said?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest to all honourable members that when they are on their feet they should address their remarks to the Chair. Unfortunately what occurs is too many members have the habit of discussing person to person, instead of debating the issues properly as they should in the parliamentary fashion to the Chair, and that's what gets us all into hot water - the comments, the quips, the interjections from both sides. One other thing I should like to mention is that if an accusation is made, it has to be proven, it has to be recognized by all. Unfortunately hearsay evidence is not necessarily of any validity. The honourable member is making an accusation, I have the words unfortunately to take of every honourable member in this Assembly that what they say is true, and consequently if an honourable member asks for a retraction of something which - or a withdrawal of something that has not occurred, you have to take his word for it. We may also be in the dilemma of having to accept another honourable member's word that this is what he heard and leave it at that. It may be an anomaly but unfortunately we have to accept the word of all honourable members in this Assembly. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Chair having succeeded in bringing us through a rather difficult procedural problem minutes ago is facing yet a second. I would hope that the honourable members that are involved with this second procedural difficulty and point

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) of privilege would follow the exemplary conduct of the Member for Morris so that we can settle the matter. It is certainly not clear what the Member for Wolseley had in mind when he referred to the Attorney-General as having made some profane remark from his seat, and I certainly cannot fault my colleague the Attorney-General for wanting to raise it as a point of privilege, because the word profane connotes in the minds of many if not most, a rather sort of use of foul language. However I understand the word profane can also be used to connote a feeling of irreverence. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't fault the Attorney-General at all if he had uttered an irreverent remark about the Member for Wolseley. Therefore, perhaps the matter can be allowed to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee proceed with oral questions. Order. Order please. May I once again appeal to all honourable members not to shout or interject from their seats. If they have a desire to be recognized, we have much time yet, I am willing to recognize everyone. Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In regard to a statement that he made that private enterprise had failed to develop, to bring about the necessary development - could he inform the House why?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure what the honourable member, the sole member of the Social Credit Party in this House has in mind, because I know the honourable member has some criticism of the existing economic system under which we are presently operating. I could only say, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question would take me a long time. What I will say though is the facts speak for themselves, and that is we have not had the required degree - in my opinion at least - of industrialization in rural parts, selected areas of rural Manitoba. I realize that not every town and village in Manitoba can have a smokestack or a factory or a large industrial establishment. We recognize this, but the facts speak for themselves, we have not had the degree of industrialization in selected rural points of Manitoba and we are operating under a system, an economic system which allows private enterprise or private investment to make those decisions, the fact is those decisions have not been forthcoming and we have not had the jobs created in rural Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a Return to Order of the House No. 21, a motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and ask him if he would pray tell this House how the government and government owned businesses have fared any better in decentralizing industry.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think as a deliberate policy we have had some successes, some progress, not as much as we would have liked -- I think Gimli is an excellent example. I admit we didn't put up the building in Morris, but certainly the bus operation, the manufacturing facility, the activity, the jobs, were put there by the Schreyer administration.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and in the light of the preceding discussions I'll choose my words carefully. In view of the, shall we say, conflicting information as to the purchase price by Chemalloy or the shares which it now sells us in Tantalum, when will the Minister table the documents which tells the whole story of the transaction?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have been endeavouring to prepare a suitable statement making an effort to answer all technical, legal and accounting questions that have been asked by honourable members of the House. Unfortunately, as each day goes by there are additional questions asked which causes us to make modifications and additions etc. If all goes well, I would hope to at least answer some of those questions by this evening -- if all goes well.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Inasmuch as the session appears to be coming to an end and in view of the statements, -- (Interjection) -- in view of the statements made yesterday on radio that the Minister would be tabling

(MR. ASPER cont'd) his paper, his White Paper on medical care in the province, can the Minister now tell the House, is the White Paper prepared and ready for filing and when will it be filed?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health)(Springfield): Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I can't recall being interviewed by any radio stations yesterday; they could have used a tape that they took off of me days and maybe weeks ago. There was a commitment made by the premier himself quite awhile back that the White Paper on health would be tabled during this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker my question would be to the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or to the First Minister. I wonder if you can indicate to the House whether the government has received any submissions from private carriers about the activities of the Manitoba Government Air Service.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. We receive correspondence frequently from private carriers in Manitoba, usually asking to help them in some way or other, and I can very happily tell the House that we have given considerable assistance to many private carriers in Manitoba, but I'll take the question as notice because I'm not that up on my mail as I'd like to be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, by way of information and I'm assuming he's taking the question as notice, the submissions that I would be referring to would be submissions that would be dealing with the interference of the Manitoba Government Air Service in their operations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I would like to direct a question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: A question was asked of the Minister of Mines and Resources and/or myself, I believe, and I can advise the Leader of the Opposition that I certainly have not received any representations from any third level carrier that the activities of the Manitoba Government Air Service are in some way inimical to that of the third level carriers. However the Minister of Mines and Resources has already undertaken to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. While the hospital at Lynn Lake is equipped to allow surgery, is it correct that only emergency surgery is allowed in the community of Lynn Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, because of lack of different types of equipment that are needed in that facility, certain surgical procedures have to be referred elsewhere, that's true.

MR. BEARD: Well, does the northern air ambulance allow for transportation between Lynn Lake and Flin Flon for selective surgery?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, it's an understood policy by this government that when a patient is referred from one hospital to the other by a physician, that this is covered.

MR. BEARD: A last question then, is the minister aware of the doctors in Lynn Lake being refused the right to undertake surgery in the hospital? If so, I'll table a complaint that I've received today.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, in turn I will withhold any comments until I do see the complaint.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister - can he confirm that which of -- the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Public Affairs and Public Works is in charge of the computer services for the province that service the Autopac division?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact - as a matter of fact, neither. The computer centre is now and has been to the best of my knowledge, at least four years with the Management Committee of Cabinet, the former Treasury Board -- comes under the aegis of the Executive Council and under the ministerial responsibility of the chairman of Management

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Committee which is the Minister of Education in his capacity as chairman of Management Committee.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in view of that information, I suppose I'll direct my question to the Minister of Education, simply to ask whether he can advise whether an eastern Canadian consulting firm has been engaged to work on the computer program to correct the errors that have shown up in the Autopac billings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any errors in the operations of the computer centre and hence no firm has been retained to correct any.

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

MR. ASPER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is the minister's answer "no, no eastern consulting firm has been engaged to observe the workings of the computer and to correct the mistakes?"

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can satisfy my honourable friend at least temporarily, and the question can be taken as notice for more specific information, for more specific detail. But I can advise my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party that while there have been some errors in connection with the operation of the computer, the IBM computer facility, specifically in regard to the operation of Autopac -- quite a number of errors in fact 4,000 in number in recent weeks -- nevertheless to keep the sense of perspective the 4,000 must be measured up against the 400,000 plus computer entries and motor vehicle registration, which accounts for a margin of error of something in the order of one quarter of one percent -- which is pretty good, 99 3/4 percent accuracy is pretty good in any league, my honourable friend should be aware of that.

The other part of the question, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member was asking whether an eastern based consulting firm -- I assume he was referring to a Canadian eastern consulting firm, to the extent that geography is important to my honourable friend -- I can advise him that not now but more than a year ago a Toronto firm specializing in certain aspects of computer operation was retained. But my honourable friend is trying to make a point that they are somehow alien to our way of life here in Manitoba -- they are fellow Canadians.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister anticipates my motive. My question is this: Can he advise the House if the estimated cost of the computer corrections are expected to be in the neighborhood of a million dollars of fees paid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question just extemporaneously because . . . -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I don't know what comment my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition was trying to interject or ejaculate, but be that as it may I advise the Leader of the Liberal Party that this figure of a million dollars, if he's talking about error corrections, is greatly, greatly exaggerated, by a magnitude of many many times exaggerated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I do have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has he advised the four or five thousand people that have double billings for Autopac that they do not have to pay double for their auto insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be mentioned here and now that the billings which did go out indicated on those billings that if in fact payment had earlier been made then the billings should be ignored, so that in fact that notice was included with the very billing itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the Government of Manitoba been able to establish the identity of a potential major partner in the ownership of Tantalum Mines, i.e. the person or group who have the rights to two million Chemalloy shares which would thereby establish them as a major owner of Tantalum?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is either the same or a related question to a question that was asked a day or two ago and as I've indicated earlier, we are taking these questions as notice and hope to issue a statement which will answer most if not all the honourable member's questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Government of Manitoba enter into an agreement to take equity in Tantalum Mines without being aware that an option on Chemalloy shares, for two million Chemalloy shares did exist?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I must remind the honourable member that he should distinguish, although we take full responsibility, he should distinguish between the activities of the Manitoba Development Corporation and decisions made by its board. I would simply assure all honourable members that they take all precautions and do the necessary research required before making any financial commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, a moment ago in answer to the Leader of the Liberal Party I indicated that within the past month approximately there were 4,000 errors in terms of double billings through the computer centre on Autopac, and I indicated this was a margin of error of one quarter of one percent. I really should apologize to my honourable friend as 4,000 errors of total Motor Vehicle Registration entry of 400,000 plus would make it approximately one percent and so the accuracy is 99 percent not 99 3/4.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. I wonder if he could indicate as he promised a few days ago, how his program of placing welfare recipients on jobs in Thompson and elsewhere in Manitoba is coming along?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the members of the House a few days ago that a press release would be prepared within the next few days. I haven't completed the preparation of the press release on the success of the job placement officers that we have within the Department of Health and Social Development and the success of these positions in the Thompson region. It should be coming very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a further question, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the request that the doctors of Manitoba made to the government to disallow speeding for ambulances, will the Minister be recommending his colleague to bring that into the present Highway Traffic Act which is being amended during this session?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all the letter from the Manitoba Medical Association was sent to my colleague the Minister of Highways and a copy to myself; and my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Highways and myself are looking at the possibility of having a joint reply.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In view of his statement in the House yesterday or the day before to the effect that Omnitheatre Limited was going to be carried on, will he confirm that the company is (a) almost 100 percent owned by the MDC; and (b) that it has lost \$150,000 approximately to date?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I made the statement in the House. Possibly the Premier made the statement. I'm not in a position to confirm the honourable member's allegations.

MR. ASPER: Will the Minister take it as notice and respond at a later date?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter. As I've repeated several times in this House, we do make information available on a quarterly basis and the Chairman of the MDC is accountable to the Legislative Committee on Economic Development on those companies in which we have equity participation. But it is not good business practice to discuss business matters which may affect the future economic health of a particular enterprise and it's not my business to try to put people out of work.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance. Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It wouldn't be necessary except for the answer. Is it not true that the staff of Omnitheatre, with one or two exceptions, has already been put out of work?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I understand there has been some layoff.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill 59 for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Colleges and Universities that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 59, The Mineral Acreage Tax Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 59, The Mineral Acreage Tax Act. (Clauses 1 to 4 were read and passed). Clause 5 (1) (a) -- The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to hold up the House discussing this. This Bill has managed to go through first and second reading with very little comment because there seems to be general and universal approval of the bill. I would simply add that the charging section, which is the section we're at, is quite acceptable insofar as it purports to tax acreage mineral rights held by corporations but is unacceptable insofar as it does not tax three-quarters of the mineral rights held within the province.

Mr. Speaker, my position on taxation matters is that where a tax is levied, except in matters where progressivity is required to reflect ability to pay, taxes ought to be universal, uniform and non-favouritism being practised, non-discriminatory in the sense that one person is taxed and another isn't. Mr. Speaker, based on the information that we have one-quarter of the mineral rights will be taxed and three-quarters will escape tax. And they will escape taxes, if I understand my honourable friend the minister correctly, simply because the assets are held by an individual rather than a corporation, as though the act of incorporating were something which we punish through taxation. And though I don't suggest for a second that where one holds acreage and where one concurrently owns mineral rights in that acreage but that the ownership of the mineral right is an incidental aspect to the use of the acreage such as for farming, nevertheless it escapes me why we say mineral rights owned by corporations will be taxed but mineral rights owned by individuals will escape tax. I can see as I say, Mr. Chairman, an exception being made for the person whose ownership of the mineral right is inadvertent or incidental to his real use of the land, but where a man goes out and options up mineral rights and he chooses to operate through a corporate vehicle, he will be taxed, whereas if a group of men go out and form a syndicate and do not operate in the corporate form, they will escape tax. And that is not an equitable system. And I hope we'll hear from the Minister on the point. Because the tax is a good tax, the rate of tax is not a good rate, it's a low rate. And here's an area where the public of Manitoba can legitimately without fear of the doom and gloom, without fear of being called noncompetitive, without fear of being punished by the financial writers of Canada levy a tax, and while I commend the government for the tax, while I approve the bill and am prepared to give it speedy, immediate third reading, I ask the government, which as we all know is always searching for new sources of revenue, here is a legitimate source of revenue. And my quarrel is twofold. I would ask the government to consider raising this tax because it is a tax which does not affect adversely the very vast majority of Manitobans. Moreover, because taxation must be competitive, if we were to raise this tax to 20 cents as opposed to 10 cents we would merely be in the same competitive position as Saskatchewan is in. So our competitive position as a prairie resource centre would in no way be impaired.

I could quite easily support and even increase tax over and above what the bill provides

(MR. ASPER cont'd) at 10 cents, 20 cents. My view is 50 cents. But I think exploration can be made to even increase the tax beyond 50 cents and it's moral and proper to do it because these are resources that by the constitution of this country belong to the people. This is no case of red-eyed socialists nationalizing taking over assets; these are assets we already own. And when we rent those assets to those who only take them for the purpose of individual gain where more is an appropriate place to levy tax.

So Mr. Speaker, I will hope that in this area the two changes I'm suggesting will be seriously considered. The first, that the tax be raised to at least the Saskatchewan level of 20 cents and I indicate to the First Minister and the Minister of Finance that he will see no quarrel from the Liberal section of this House if he were to raise it beyond that because of the propriety of the tax. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Yes, I think this is a tax where you can quite properly go as high as a dollar without impairing your development. -- (Interjection) -- No. I want to respond to what the Minister says from his chair, he's speaking of the farmer. That was not what I said. In no way should any tax be levied where the ownership of the mineral right is an incidental aspect to the operation and the use of land. This means that the farmer who happens to own the mineral rights, has no intention of exploring for them, should not pay a tax. So let it be very clear, what I'm after when I want individuals to be included in the charging section, is that those speculators who simply trade in mineral rights should pay a tax and the mere device of unincorporating makes a mockery of the tax.

Mr. Chairman, a tax is only acceptable when it cannot easily be avoided. And here we have a tax which if anyone wants to avoid all he does is simply go through the process of de-incorporating and he'll save himself the tax. That's why when you make an exception which is an emotional exception, which is maybe a political exception, that we say individuals won't pay the tax but corporations will, you simply invite the corporate speculator to de-incorporate, to wind up his corporation or sell the mineral rights from the corporation to the shareholders. And the advice I'm giving -- which I in other days might have charged heavily for -- the free advice I'm giving the Minister is if he doesn't want to see tax avoidance he must include individuals in the tax or he must amend the bill to provide that where individuals in syndicate or in speculative conditions which are best defined as being individual who buys mineral rights for the purpose of purely exploiting them rather than using the land in which they're located for other purposes, should be taxed. So without wishing to take up a great deal of time of the House I'm putting a proposition to the Minister and to the House; that the tax can be made to work more smoothly more effectively and more equitable if it is (a) raised; and (b) made more universal so that there are no loopholes, and this is a loophole. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

. . . continued on next page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was waiting to see if members of the Conservative Party or any of the Independent members have any comment to make on the points raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I'm sure the Member for Rhineland would have some comment to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister of Finance probably wanted to respond first before any of us responded to it, because on second reading I think I made it quite clear that as far as the farmers being subject to a tax of this kind that I oppose it very strongly because of the situation that we have today where we are taxing the farmers I think to the hilt, to the limit and that too much of the cost certainly in respect to education, too much of the revenues have to be derived from real estate taxes and this would be yet another burden that the farmer would have to assume. And therefore I certainly can't subscribe to what my friend here has to say, although later on I think he made the suggestion that it should not necessarily apply to farmers or to those people that would not be developing the mineral resources; so I think that would definitely include the farmer, so that he necessarily doesn't include the farmer in his suggestion. I doubt whether his suggestion would have wide appeal in Manitoba and whether this would gather him many votes. I think it would have the opposite effect, too many people, especially farmers when it comes to taxing properties and also the matter of taxing resources of this type they -- well I probably shouldn't use the word resent, but immediately take exception to any such mention even of such a thing, and as I mentioned that many of the farmers in Manitoba have mineral rights to their farm holdings. More so in Manitoba than in any other western province; I think this has been pointed out on past occasions. I think this is why the Alberta government was very fortunate that few of the farmers out there had mineral rights if I'm correct and I stand to be corrected if the -- I'd like to hear from the Minister on this if I'm not correct, but I think this is the correct --(Interjection)-- so --(Interjection)-- but, I don't think that many farmers in Alberta have mineral rights. They may well tax them but I don't think the farmers own their mineral rights. I think that a lot of the -- in most cases the Crown owns the mineral rights, and therefore they could well probably impose such a tax but it wouldn't affect the farmers. So I think we should definitely exempt the farmers from taxation of this type and I commend the government for taking this action and not imposing that tax on the farmers.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Honourable Member for Rhineland. Would he then suggest as a logical consequence of what he said, that farmers should be deprived of their ownership of mineral rights so that they're in the same position as farmers in Alberta?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: No, why should they? Because when they bought the land and if the minerals were part of the title, they bought the minerals with it -- and I don't think that we should confiscate or in any way tax these people, because they may never develop them. And I don't agree with this principle that they may have a resource on which they will never realize any revenue or any income out of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I find this point very interesting. We're talking about corporations and we talk about the mineral rights. There are many farmers who own their farms and they own the mineral rights -- that's written into the title if they have a title to their property. Now if I understand the bill correctly if I incorporate my farm, I own the mineral rights, I'm then going to be taxed on those mineral rights, is that correct? If so, I think, Mr. Chairman, that is an injustice insofar as the agricultural industry is concerned because, why are we incorporating, those farmers who may want to incorporate -- there are various reasons why they want to incorporate their business. One of them I can say, Mr. Chairman, is a very valid one because of the economic bind that the farmer finds himself. And if there is any advantages to incorporating because of tax reasons he does it because he's forced into it, because he finds it that much more difficult as the years go by to operate his business and keep his head above water insofar as the financial aspect of his operation is concerned.

The other thing is, Mr. Chairman, is the changes in the tax law both federally and provincially that the farmer finds himself is another valid reason why he sometimes likes to

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) incorporate. Now the mineral rights that a farmer has to his farm really it doesn't mean anything, it has no value really. He's not exploiting and he's not exploring them; they're there, unless some oil company wants to come and lease his property for the option of exploring to see if there is any minerals on his land. This has been done years back, but I know, I had the experience where companies have come to me and wanted to lease my property for just a tuppence, 10 cents an acre - it doesn't mean anything hardly. But the implications that farmers got themselves into, and I can give you one good example, Mr. Chairman, where my father bought a quarter section of land from a farmer; he had leased his mineral rights to an oil company for 10 cents an acre. Before that option was up another oil company took on the option of leasing after that first option had run out. You know, Mr. Chairman, that person who owned that property at that time didn't realize what he signed when he signed the second lease, and when my father come to buy that land he asked for a Torrens title or his title of certificate he discovered that the oil company owned an undivided interest which was half the mineral rights of that farm. This created a real problem and so I just quote, Sir, this as an example of what a farmer finds himself in when we talk about mineral rights as it pertains to the farm that you own. And I want to say very strongly to the Minister that if he's going to apply tax to the mineral rights to a farm because it's incorporated I think it's totally wrong and I hope that he will reconsider that point.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I feel perhaps some clarification of my remarks is in order, I may not have made myself clear. I would hope that the Minister would appreciate that he will not find the Liberal Party his foe when he seeks to levy new taxes which are fair and equitable and appropriate. And if my honourable friend from Rhineland makes the point that by taking this position I will not endear myself to the electorate, I think it's time in this Chamber that we all face our obligation to speak for the province and what is required of a province regardless of whether we win popularity contests for so doing.

Now my position that may have been misunderstood is this. Where tax is levied that tax must be levied universally, and the mere fact of being a corporation or being a non-corporation should not influence whether the tax is levied. There are exceptions when one chooses to tax a right. If it's a dormant right, one does not tax it; if it's a right in action which has a commercial value, one can tax it. And therefore when I made my exception - my exception to the amendment I would ask the Minister to consider, is this: That where land is used for a purpose, a prime purpose - and there is legislation in other jurisdictions which determine what the prime purpose is, just as we do in residence in determining where one resides, where one's prime residence is; where land is primarily used for a non mineral purpose, e.g. farming. That land already contributes to the tax system by being taxed on property tax, and therefore presumably taken into account in the value of the land against which real property tax is assessed, is the fact that there are mineral rights. That's the notional idea of property tax, the wealth tax.

So in no way am I suggesting that when I include individuals in the tax that I would include those who have their land and hold mineral rights and incidently have the mineral rights and they should therefore be taxed. No, I'm not suggesting that at all, that's the exception. But where a mineral right is owned by anybody, partnership, individual, corporation, syndicate, limited partnerhsip, there are many ways in which one can hold assets and one should not receive a tax benefit nor should one pay a tax penalty simply by virtue of the method by which he chooses to hold his assets. So if the tax is appropriate, and I'm suggesting that it is appropriate that we tax mineral rights which are held for speculative or for production gain - if the tax is appropriate, then it must be applied universally. And one can only conclude, Mr. Chairman, that if the government is not prepared to do it, it can only be because there are expedient or disadvantages, certainly not of a fiscal nature but of a political nature which inhibit the government from doing this - in which case I would be saying the tax on purely corporations that own mineral rights would have to be classified as discriminatory, and therefore it would be a bad tax.

So the support that I offered the Minister was on the condition, and I'm not going to raise anything more about tax rates because we may change our rates from year to year, but the support I offered the Minister was on the condition that he make this bill fair by applying the tax to all those who for the purpose of gain and not as an incidental asset hold mineral rights regardless of the means by which they held those rights. Because otherwise you leave open

(MR. ASPER cont'd) the door to the most widespread avoidance - I'm using the kindest word I can here - of this tax. If we want to trade in or speculate in mineral rights this act gives the technique whereby we can do it tax free and surely that's not what we want to do. So our support is based on it being a universal tax with the exception that I noted for farmers and those who use the land for purposes other than mineral rights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: With respect to this suggested change which on surface certainly seems to have merit, that the taxation should apply to all, not just corporate entities but to all for whom the mineral value is not incidental to their main earnings. If one were to adopt that criteria, what then would be the case with respect to the CNR, the CPR, Hudson's Bay Company as opposed to a mining company because in the latter three cases it would seem to me that the holding of mineral property is incidental to their dominant and primary corporate operations and earnings and therefore would be excluded, which I don't think is what my honourable friend is suggesting.

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

MR. ASPER: Could the First Minister clarify? You say the Hudson's Bay Railroad Company or the Hudson's Bay Company?

MR. SCHREYER: . . . CNR and CPR.

MR. ASPER: Well, when you speak of the CNR and the CPR, Sir, you speak of a situation that we inherited at confederation, one which is morally wrong and one which through renegotiation of the constitution of this country, I would hope we will renegotiate. I carry no sympathy for the Canadian National Railroad or the Canadian Pacific Railroad for the concessions that were granted to these institutions, and I would in that case be quite happy to see an exception and that they would be taxed because they received their --(Interjection)-- I'm prepared to re-write history, yes. --(Interjection)-- That's what we're talking about because the Canadian National Railroad and the Canadian Pacific Railroad received unwarranted benefits, and history has recognized that where these kind of colonial deals are made that it is morally right to re-write them - as happened when the Suez Canal company was nationalized and a world saw this happen and said, yes, it's morally right. Yes, there may have to be some compensation, that's the kind of thing that is achieved by negotiation. But the Hudson's Bay is the same thing, it's a charter that goes back to 1670, and the world has changed - and we must ask that people understand that it's a new form of world so that if there's aggravation and anger, I'm afraid there will have to be aggravation and anger. But these things have feudalized this province for a long time, and it's time we set them right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I'm just having difficulty understanding my honourable friend. The legislation that is being presented by the Finance Minister to Committee will do the things that the honourable friend is talking about; it will tax the CPR, it will tax the CNR, it will tax the Hudson's Bay Company. Rather than waiting for my honourable friend to re-write history, the Minister of Finance has already started to do that. The distinction that my honourable friend made in his speech would have the effect of not taxing them because as the First Minister has pointed out they may hold these properties --(Interjection)-- but, Mr. Chairman, if he clarifies, I don't want him to clarify in such a way as to pretend that he wants to tax these people and we don't. The legislation that is now being put to the House is to tax these people. The argument that was presented by my honourable friend that we not tax where it is not held for a commercial purpose. --(Interjection)-- Well, all right, sorry. Then I'm not -- I don't want to put words into my honourable friend's mouth but that there is a distinction. --(Interjection)-- I'll let you clarify in a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. One member on the floor at a time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I will let the honourable member clarify in a moment. All I wanted understood is that the bill that is being presented by the Minister of Finance does those things which my honourable friend says that he would do if he had the chance. They tax the CNR, the CPR and the Hudson's Bay Company on minerals that are owned under land which they are holding.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, for the third time the Member from Inkster has made a speech on matters which he alludes to my having said which I did not say. Perhaps I should raise this on privilege but what I said was that there be exemptions for individuals where the

(MR. ASPER cont'd) land is held, not for corporations, but for individuals where the land is held as a primary producer of other goods and where the mineral ownership is an incidental, inconsequential aspect of land ownership, so perhaps I could have saved the Member from Inkster from making a speech. In response to the First Minister's question, in response to the First Minister's question he asked whether my exception for individuals would apply to certain corporations and the answer is no. We offer you co-operation, we offer you assistance and we find ourselves being debated with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance. Oh, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words to the Minister of Finance and to members on the opposite side about the intention of the bill here. And it alarms me to some extent, Mr. Chairman, where government will bring forward legislation which is aimed specifically at a purpose to get at a particular company or companies, and to do it in this way; and then in doing so, if they don't provide for the exemptions for others who can quite innocently be hurt by the actions of government, is a matter of real concern for all members of the House. And I would ask the Minister to consider the implication of this taxation to those corporations which are not interested in mining; that do happen to hold mineral rights whether they be dormant or otherwise; but may very well be engaged in farming and can be financially hurt by the action of this bill, because I don't believe that is what the minister intends. I think his intention at least as expressed, or the intention that was expressed by the Member for Inkster was they were certainly intent on taxing the holdings of the Hudson's Bay Company, of the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific, but if their intention was to tax the two or three farmers that joined together and formed a small company, they are engaged in agriculture; and because they hold mineral rights, if they want to tax them, tell us that, but don't just pass an umbrella type of legislation that can hurt some people because they are not primarily engaged in the use of their mineral rights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the discussion we've had in this last period of time has been extremely useful, and one which will continue because we are interested in seeing the impact of this kind of taxation. The only experience of which we are aware is Alberta and Saskatchewan - Saskatchewan they have exempted individuals, they are taxing only corporations. Just how they are dealing with the specific point made by the last speaker of taxing corporations that operate farms, I really have not yet got a clear answer to. It is our intent as stated in the act to tax all corporations, that is to tax in accordance with the definition we have already passed; that "individual" means a person other than a corporation, and later you will find that individuals are exempt. So the answer I would have to give is that corporations of any kind are taxed, and I would have to go further and say that they are not being taxed for the use of the minerals that they own. Probably it's more correct to say they are being taxed with the minerals that they are not using and for which the province is not getting any benefit. And that is the point, because mines that are operating, minerals that are being produced are being taxed under royalties and are not taxable under this act.

The fact is that many corporate entities or certain corporate entities own many acres of land and are sitting back and waiting for somebody to come along and bid up a good value for the mineral rights, and we feel that there should be development of mineral rights rather than speculators sit back; and when I say speculators, that includes anybody who may have owned the land for 200 years and is still waiting. Now we are coming into this new area of taxation, we will have to set up a new - not a new structure, but we will have to extend our administration to include this and learn from experience. The points made by the honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party have validity but I would not want to accept his suggestion and just say, let's tax everybody who owns mineral rights - every person, every individual, and then exempt those whose ownership of the mineral rights are only incidental to the use of the land, because one thing we should not do in taxing statutes I believe is to be so vague as to rely a great deal on discretionary decisions as to what is the incidental use or what is not, what is the main use what is the main purpose.

And clearly, and I think I can say that to the honourable member, we are not thinking of taxing individuals who are farming and deriving their livelihood out of the production of produce off the farm, and the way we are doing it is in the same way as Saskatchewan is doing it. I am not aware of problems that have arisen. but one of the reasons why I don't accept the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) Leader of the Liberal Party's suggestion that we have the taxes say 50 cents or even a dollar, is that I want to know and we will learn that in the next year. I want to know and so will members of the legislature want to know, what is the impact on various people about whom we have not yet got the full picture. And that's why this tax is not an onerous tax - it is one which can be dealt with in such a way that we can gain from experience. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party made mention of competition with Saskatchewan. The fact is that this act as drawn is very similar to the Saskatchewan act, although they've used the Alberta Act as well in preparing it - and the only difference with Saskatchewan is that we are proposing at 10 cents per acre whereas Saskatchewan this year has doubled their tax from 10 to 20 cents.

I don't want to rule out the possibility of changes. I want to indicate to all members who have spoken that the points they have made are points that I don't cast aside at all. And it is something which my staff will watch in the coming year as we learn more about the incidence of taxation and the impact of it. At this stage we are stepping into a field and frankly, we are stepping into it cautiously, and we want to assess the impact because the information - and we have acquired a great deal of information, but the information is yet incomplete and we will get more information when we first start dealing with the tax bill.

The point made by the Honourable Member for the Liberal Party, the leader, - I'm sorry he stepped out - is the subterfuge idea of somebody, instead of having a corporation which would own it as individuals is really not practical for the companies that own large tracts of mineral rights to land, and is one which I don't think is really a - it may be a theoretically valid point but I don't think that it is one on a practical basis, but we'll study that further. And therefore I can only say that I want to consider all the suggestions made - I do have the right of course to come back next year and report, as I will have to do under the estimates if no other way, on the result of what this imposition of tax has, the impact it has on various people within and outside of Manitoba at which time we can re-assess the impact and come to further discussions on the rate and the exemption aspect.

At this stage I would not want to tax land that is owned by individuals other than corporations. I think we should not do it. I would say that there is the possibility that people who never intend to harvest the mineral rights but own large tracts of land for grazing or other purposes, might well be asked to give up their mineral rights because they are certainly not planning to make use of them - maybe they have no value. If they have no value, they could give it back to the province as suggested by the Leader of the Liberal Party so that the province can again become the owner of the resources of the province that are underneath the land.

I'm not proposing anything that drastic or radical at this stage. I really think we have to watch to see what develops and come back next year or two years from now, report on what we have learned and then deal with it. If there is a really unfair situation created, the cabinet always, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Executive Council does have the power to make adjustments so that any undue or unfair impact can be alleviated; and I think that we would want to use that rather than not use it in order to create some form of equity which all members have already spoken to.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister had indicated that it is not their intention to become involved in the taxing of agricultural land, so I would ask him would he make a specific exemption for corporate farming or co-operative farming? Surely that's not too hard to do.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member quotes me as saying it is not our intention - I have to say it is not our desire, and that that is somewhat different. I am not prepared at this stage to make a specific amendment because I have to know what are the implications and I really won't know that until we start carrying out the effect of this act. I may say that we have provided in the last section that the act will come into force on proclamation - we want to study these things and when we learn more about the impact; and I think at this stage there is very little. I might point out to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that you can have corporate farming without corporate ownership of land. There are various ways in which you can operate without actual ownership. If ownership is designed as a tax planning method, then that becomes another problem but as I say, I would rather follow the limited experience we know of in Saskatchewan and Alberta, excluding that feature in Alberta which does tax individuals and does tax farmers. In Alberta there is no exemption I am aware

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) of in this respect, but nevertheless we don't want to do that, we would rather proceed cautiously and proceeding cautiously means that we shouldn't make any radical changes at this stage without knowing the full impact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 5 to 6 of Bill No. 59 were read and passed. In the first line following subsection 7 it should read instead of "any exceptions" it should read "any exception".

MR. CHERNIACK: Will you repeat that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Following subsection 7 where it reads in the first line thereof "less the number of acres specified in any exceptions" it should read "exception". With that correction (7) passed -- (Interjection) Page 4.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, are we dealing with section 6 (1)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 6 (1) (b) through to 10 of Bill No. 59 were read and passed. Section 11 (1) --

MR. CHERNIACK: When I introduced this bill on second reading I indicated that there was one feature that I felt was a little too strongly in favour of the minister's method of acquiring land when there is default, and for that reason I referred specifically to section 13 which dealt with the acquisition of title to mines and minerals by the province through a certain procedure. I indicated on second reading on introduction of the bill that I wanted to have another look at the procedure. I have done that, discussed it with the legislative counsel, and as a result we have I think made a little more certain that the government -- that is the Minister of Finance had to go through proper procedures of proof which would satisfy the District Registrar of the Land Titles Office to make sure that notices have been properly given, given in a proper manner. And that default continues, so that I have already distributed, I think it was yesterday, copies of proposed amendments that take care of that. Therefore without any further discussion on my part, unless this be required I propose to move these various amendments all of which are designed to tidy up the procedure, and more importantly which are designed to protect the individual who has a right to land against the Finance Minister's mistakes, let us say, in preparing and presenting proper material. So at this stage, Mr. Chairman, I move, that subsection 1 of section 11 of Bill 59 be amended (a) by striking out the words "by registered mail addressed" in the third line thereof and (b) by striking out the words, "at his last address known to the Minister" in the third and fourth lines thereof. Jake, do you have a copy?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11 (1) as amended . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I'm not rising to take exception to the amendment that is being proposed, but I am rising on that particular section 11 (1) where it says that "one year in arrears". I think this is too short a period of time. Certainly we should be allowing more time than one year in arrears for the purpose of this. I feel that this should be amended so that we would give it more time.

MR. CHERNIACK: On this point, Mr. Chairman. The notice has to be given after the taxes have been in arrears for one year and then the people who have an interest in the land have an additional year to redeem before the Minister can apply for the title to pass, so that it's really a full two years, or let me say, it's a minimum of two years and beyond that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11 (1) -- passed; 11 (1) as amended -- passed; 11 (2) -- passed. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I move -- I don't need a seconder do I in committee. I move that section 11 of Bill 59 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the following subsection - Heading: Notice by Registered Mail. 11 subsection (3). A notice unto a person under this section shall be sent by registered mail addressed to the person's last address known to the minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: New subsection 11 (3) -- passed; 12 (1) -- passed; 12 (2) -- passed; 12 (3)(a) -- passed; 12 (a) in the second line note there should be a correction in spelling - the word "separate", add an (e) after the (s). 12 (a) as corrected -- passed; (b) -- passed; 12 (3) as corrected -- passed; 12 (4) -- passed; 13 (1) . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection (1) of section 13 of Bill 59 be struck out and the following subsection substituted therefor; Evidence for a district registrar - 13 (1). Before the district registrar accepts a notice in respect to minerals for filing under section 12 the minister shall file with the district registrar evidence satisfactory to the district registrar (a) that the notice mentioned in subsection (1) of section 11 has been sent to the owner of the minerals and copies thereof have been sent as required under subsection (2) of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) section 11 at least one year prior to the filing of the notice under Section 12; and (b) that the default in the payment of the tax in respect to the minerals has not been remedied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: New 13(1)(a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; 13(1) as amended -- passed; 13(2) . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I move that subsection (2) of section 13 of Bill 59 be struck out and subsection (3) of Section 13 renumbered as subsection (2) of Section 13.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by the Honourable Minister of Finance -- passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Are you serious, Jake? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 59 was read section by section and passed) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On Section 25, this act comes into force on a day fixed by proclamation. Could the minister indicate as to when he thinks this bill will be proclaimed?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I expect that it will be proclaimed in this calendar year in sufficient time to put it into effect. There is no -- the effective date is in the bill, it's January 1, 1973 and I would expect it to be proclaimed of course prior to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported, Committee rise, Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 59, has directed me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

. . . continued on next page.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

THIRD READINGS

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 59, The Mineral Acreage Tax Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we could put out that . . . The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are at the report stage as I understand on Bill No. 63. I have an amendment to propose in connection with Bill 63 which requires a message from His Honour which I have received. So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General the proposed amendment to Bill 63 as follows: That Bill 63 be amended by adding thereto, immediately after section 26 thereof, the following section: Clause (b) of Sub-section (1) of section 39 be amended as follows: That if the workman is in receipt of a permanent disability pension in respect of the original injury (i) any disability benefit payable for any total temporary disability arising out of the recurrence shall be calculated on the basis of his average earnings at the time of the recurrence, and while the total temporary disability benefit is being paid, the permanent disability pension shall be discontinued; and (ii) any additional disability benefit for any additional permanent disability arising out of the recurrence shall be upon the percentage of the disability not covered by the original permanent disability pension and shall be calculated on the basis of his average earnings, at the time of the recurrence. And, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is pleased to accept this recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any great controversy over this matter because it was a matter which was discussed very briefly in the Industrial Relations Committee the other day and it was the intention, I believe, of the Minister to introduce the amendment at that time, but because it needed a message from His Honour I suppose he was unable to do it and therefore he chose to do it now. We have no objection to this amendment, Sir, in fact we're in support of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Speaker, I take it that there is concurrence, that the report with the amendment is concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: I haven't put the question yet.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent at this second meeting when this bill was discussed. I was present for the first time and it was suggested at that time that there would be further consideration given. I am pleased to see the amendment brought forward and certainly I endorse it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: . . . some comment in third reading, Mr. Speaker, and it doesn't only relate to this particular bill. I would like it recorded that I believe we've had six or seven

July 11, 1972

4073

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) labour bills introduced in the House this session and the bill in question is one of them which we support wholeheartedly along with all the labour bills, with one exception.

(BILL No. 63 was read a third time and passed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering -- the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, I note, Sir, has just re-entered the Chamber, I'm wondering if he is now in a position to consider the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General in respect of Bill 110, the Statute Law Amendments Act of 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes. We have examined this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I might say the amendments are excessive and go into many many departments of the government. We would like to see this bill moved to committee, Mr. Speaker, and any questions we may have of the Attorney-General regarding explanation of clauses on this bill, we would ask them in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out, and I hope that all members did receive a copy of the notes which Legislative Counsel prepared for me giving the rationale for each of the proposed amendments. I believe that each member of the Assembly ought to have received a copy and the explanations are there, but Legislative Counsel will be with the Law Amendments Committee and if there is any particular problem in respect to any one of those very numerous sections of the bill, I trust that we'll be able to answer then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave or your permission I could comment on one aspect of the bill or the presentation of the bill to the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Do we have agreement or leave? (Leave) The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Attorney-General on --(Interjection)-- and I know I'm being looked at by many people, but I would like to compliment the Attorney-General and also one of the other Ministers who gives us a complete rundown Sir, of all the items within the bill, an explanation. If all the Ministers would be kind enough to give that kind of an explanation when they present a bill, I'm sure things would go much faster.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would kindly call Bill No. 98, the Natural Products Marketing Act.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I won't take very long speaking to this. I took adjournment on Saturday, I think it was Saturday morning or Friday evening, I just can't remember. In reviewing this bill, Bill No. 98, in reviewing the very sections of this bill which I can't speak on at this time because I'm supposed to speak on the principle of the bill - but the bill disturbs me very much because as I remember marketing boards, and as I remember they were set up back about eight or nine years ago by the government of which I was a member at that time, I was always concerned about the individual person who might be involved with one of these marketing boards. And when I consider the principles involved - and I must say, Mr. Speaker, it's the first three sections deal with the act itself, and the remaining sections from 4 on deal with the regulations of the Natural Products Marketing Act - it disturbs me more than ever because always I think its the regulations of a particular bill that affect the individual more than the bill itself.

When you look at the penalties, Mr. Speaker, of this particular bill and the increases involved in these particular penalties, you wonder what the government is trying to do. First, one section here increases the penalties from \$50 to 250; another section from \$100 to 750; another section from \$1,000 to \$5,000 - and that applies to corporations. Well I don't know what kind of a board that a person wants to be involved in that's got penalties of that nature because they are mandatory, minimum fines and maximum fines, and the individual that's involved with them on the Producer's Board that doesn't meet the requirements of this particular board, is going to have the book thrown at him and I mean in no uncertain way.

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Another factor as mentioned by the Member for Morris when he was - that the government does control the Marketing Board in the Province of Manitoba under this bill. This is one thing that does concern me as a farmer and as a member of the Legislature, and I don't think it's right. If we are going to give the powers to the board, let them have them - let them control the board but not have the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as it says here, may amend or revoke any regulations, order or directive made by a producer board. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not the kind of government that I want as a farmer and as a member of the Legislature and I'm going to speak in no uncertain terms when this bill goes to committee on that particular section, because if we are going to put the faith in the producer board and give them power to operate, let's hope that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council don't revoke all the rules and regulations that that particular board made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's many other factors involved in marketing boards as I see it as a farmer, and the one that you throw out the window is the whole meaning of supply and demand as we know it and have known it over the years. And when you involve production control and also involve the other controls of fixing prices and telling the farmer when he can deliver his product and so on, and telling him how much he is going to get for it; and also the fact that he's got to pay a fee or a charge for selling his product, I think the farmer - a lot of his privileges have been taken away. I know this isn't the first time these privileges have been taken away, because we lost a lot of them when the Canadian Wheat Board came into existence, telling us how and when we are going to sell our wheat, oats and barley and this was removed at that time. But I think the mere fact that you're telling the farmers as you are here in this particular bill and repealing the sections that were in the old bill, I think constitutes a real error on the part of the government of the day. And I want to ask them to review this particular bill - I don't know who's in charge, whether the Honourable Member for St. George is looking after this bill at this particular time or not, but whoever is in charge, before we go to committee I hope you would recaucus your position here on this bill and take a second look at it.

Mr. Speaker, the word efficiency as we know it in farming is the only way that you can make a dollar, and the mere application of this bill is going to remove efficiency because he can't sell enough of his product to make a profit, and the only way we can exist in farming is making a profit. You are destroying the efficiency of the farmers - you are taking production controls, and I would say as I mentioned before that government should take a second look at this particular bill. Mr. Speaker, all over our country we are giving the farmers more control, management control, production control. This is not the only province that is doing it, every other province in Canada are leaning towards that system, and if the farmers of the Province of Manitoba are going to exist we are going to have to get back to the old system of supply and demand and let the farmers sort their own problems out. As long as government are telling the farmers what they are supposed to do more farmers will go bankrupt and go out of business, and that isn't the kind of life that we want in the Province of Manitoba. We don't want to chase the farmers off the farm, we want the farmers to continue to operate, and if they can't make a profit in growing pigs they'll try something else. But as long as you have to be licensed in order to sell your product it makes it impossible practically for many farmers because production controls will be put on this particular farmer on anything he tries.

The farmers over the years have always hoped that government would stay out of their business, but every government whether it's federal or provincial have been getting into the farmers' lives more and more and into the farmers' pockets. And I think it's about time - and I would suggest to the government that they withdraw this bill because it's not going to do anything for the farmers in the Province of Manitoba. The farmers come and tell us what they want. Mr. Speaker, I thought when the Agricultural Committee went around the province that we would be getting more enlightening education on what the farmers want, but I don't imagine that very few farmers asked for this bill, in fact I wasn't on that committee but I can't imagine many farmers wanting that kind of control. Maybe if we let the farmers decide what they want for themselves it would be a lot better than the government of the day. Mr. Speaker, that's about all I have to say other than I am going to oppose this bill right through to the bitter end and I hope it gets defeated.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to speak on the amendment to the Natural Products Marketing Act, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that you can deal with the

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) particular clauses in the bill and the particular intent of the bill without really taking a look at the over-all picture of what marketing boards and the Natural Products Marketing Act will do to the farmers in Manitoba, in western Canada and in fact in the whole of Canada as compared to the farmers in the rest of the agricultural producing countries of the world.

We find here in Canada at the present time that there seems to be a very definite trend, an intention on the part of government to move farmers into a restrictive type of marketing system - to lock them into a marketing board type of operation which in my view, Mr. Speaker, is restrictive and does not act in the interests of the farmer. And yet in other aspects and looking at other countries in the world we find that the very opposite thing is happening in the United States of America.

In the United States of America they are - instead of putting more restrictive controls and trying to subsidize the marketing price, they are actually working in the opposite direction. They are freeing the marketing of agricultural products. They are removing the subsidy from the marketing price and they are applying subsidies in other ways to the agricultural communities. And the reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is that if you can keep the price of your product competitive on the international market, that you have a better chance of selling it - it's as simple as that. Here we find we are operating in a different direction entirely, the whole purpose and intent of the Natural Products Marketing Act is to keep a high price for the produce so that the farmer will get a fair return. And those that advocate that, they continue to say that they are acting in the interests of the farmer, but I say that they are acting in the interests of our competitors on the open market. Every time they talk this way they are helping the American farmer, they are helping the farmer in Germany, they are helping the farmer in France, because they are inflating the price of our product to the point where we can't sell it on the international market.

Mr. Speaker, they also realize that - or some of them realize anyway, what this does, and they realize they won't be able to sell their product so they say we'll put controls on - we will control the production. And we find in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that intent very clearly spelled out because under the old Natural Products Marketing Act we had producer boards and we had marketing boards, but here we find the emphasis is being placed on the producer board and the control of production. This is the intent of this bill as I read it, the emphasis is being placed on production control rather than the market, and to me, Mr. Speaker, this just means that we are restricting our market or restricting our production; we are building a wall around the Province of Manitoba which will lead to the Balkanization of Canada and could possibly contribute to the destruction of this Dominion of ours which has existed for over 100 years, and if that happens, I can point my finger directly across this Chamber and put the blame squarely on your shoulders. This act, Mr. Speaker, is not in the interests of Canada; it is not in the interests of harmony in this country; it is not going to help the farmer; all it is going to help is those people who were appointed to boards, the NDP hack that these people want to appoint to the boards. Mr. Speaker, when the agricultural economy of this province is being handled in this manner, I say it's not in the interests of the farmer.

There's another point that is rather significant in this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I think that it only emphasizes what I have said so far. In the past we had producer boards and marketing boards which were encouraged by government to be set up and controlled, and controlled by the producers. They said this is your board, you put your own members on it, you set your own regulations, you run your own business. But now we find, Mr. Speaker, a particular section in this act which deals with the revocation of board regulations and that section, Mr. Speaker, says that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may amend or revoke any regulations, orders or directives made by a producer board or a marketing commission. So we find that the producer board or the marketing board that has been set up by the producers is relatively harmless, because the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is going to run it and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council means the entire Cabinet - or does it? Because I'm sure that the Attorney-General is not going to be too involved in the quality of an egg or the price of an egg; He's going to say, well I have - my desk mate is well versed in that. And so he will probably go along with the recommendations and the decisions that are made by the Minister of Agriculture, because if he doesn't the Minister of Agriculture is going to feel very frustrated and he might say: Well look, if you fellows won't abide by my decisions, there's no point in having me as Minister of Agriculture and I'll resign.

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)

So really we are having producer boards in this province, marketing boards, run by the Minister of Agriculture. He's got the power to set the regulations, revoke any of the orders or directives that have been passed by the producers who have been acting in a conscientious manner and all the power is going to rest with the Minister of Agriculture. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't any one man in this province who can effectively control to the best interests of the farmers of this province the agriculture that exists in this province.

MR SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I was not sure whether I was going to enter into the debate on this particular bill or not, but I came across a letter in my desk which I read into the record the other day and this is from one of the well known farmers from the area that I am proud to represent and this is an indication of the frustration of the farmers in our province today. This is one of the leading farmers of this province, has devoted over fifty years of his life to agriculture, respected and highly thought of by everybody. And he says in a letter to me, he says: "Wally, everything I have done or tried to do has been negated by a matter of government policy. The farmers are restricted to producing at half their capacity, two thirds of them are going to be liquidated and sent to the urban ghettos, the railway tracks are being torn up and the elevators torn down. If I had my life to live all over again I would be a hippy and I'd go in the drug business."

Now there's a very interesting statement coming from one of the leading farmers of this province who devoted all his life to agriculture, respected by all, and he's faced today with legislation of this nature --(Interjection)-- Bill No. 98, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act. And, Mr. Speaker, I say at this stage of the Federal-Provincial game that's going on in established agricultural policy in this country for all our farmers is quite evident to me and it's quite evident to a large number of farmers with legislation such as we have here before us in Bill No. 98, and the other changes that are suggested in other provincial bills across this great Dominion of ours Mr. Speaker - the net result and the policy changes are shaking the farmers and Canadian agriculture of this great Dominion right to its very roots.

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the member was quoting from a document or letter he stated he received. Is he prepared to table that document.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: That's a good letter for the record. And the name will really shock you when you find out who it is.

Mr. Speaker, the government of this great Dominion for some unknown reason to me seems deliberate in their attempts to abandon Canada as a single market for its farmers. And why they are not able to establish an agricultural policy in Ottawa I do not know. And we find today as I read, we find the words "import" and "export" are entirely two different words. The words "import" today and "export" are used at the provincial level. In my knowledge in agriculture and the farmers of this great Dominion of ours they use the terms "import" and "export" as a national word. And here we have with this type of legislation before us today those words being warped and changed around, and now we have them talking about provincial boundaries. And these words, Mr. Speaker, it's shocking to anybody today that thinks that he has a future in agriculture or a future in this country of ours. They're being used in agricultural terminology to mean trade for farm produce to most farmers of this province. And that's been known all over. We have the high population provinces of Ontario and Quebec in full agreement, Ottawa's patting them on the back, and they've spearheaded a move somehow which will give the provinces full control over the farm produce that's entering those provinces from outside their provincial boundaries; or if you use the word "export" - that's being shipped outside their provincial boundaries. And that dream of this new National Products Marketing Act, Mr. Speaker, or so-called make believe farm policy that we're debating here in this House tonight is a very interesting one to me, because it reflects how far some of our socialist economists in Canada and in this province and some of our farm leaders will go on trying to build a new and a better Canada. But the fact still remains to me, Mr. Speaker, that our Canadians all across this country want to make this Canada one country, a Dominion which it was 100 years ago. And I believe everybody in this country wants to retain that status. And I say we must retain that status if Canada is to survive. But Canada cannot survive with agricultural policies such as this, where each ten provinces of this country has their own marketing plan and their own marketing scheme; different agricultural policies for different agricultural areas. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it will not work. Across our great Dominion,

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) agriculture is by far the largest single industry and it has been and still is today, and I say that we must establish and we must maintain some type of a national agricultural policy if we are to survive. And we're not going to survive nationally with this type of legislation where we're setting up our provincial ghettos and trying to set this as an agricultural policy for our future.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there has been some progress in evidence over the past few years, and I support that, in trying to put a farm policy before the farmers of this country. But as I stand here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that as far as I know there's no national grains' policy in Canada today. --(Interjection)-- Well, he says there is. I would like to have it spelled out. And what will this bill do? What's this bill that we have before us here going to do to try and remedy that unfortunate experience? It's going to do absolutely nothing. Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister here and we have a government, socialist government jumping up today with joy and saying that we can fill that slot, we can fill that void, we're going to establish a grains marketing policy for all of Canada. We're going to attempt to establish through this bill, through a national products marketing act a policy for all of Canada. It won't work, it won't work, it won't work - and Mr. Speaker, they're going to try and make it fit with the agricultural policies of the other ten provinces in this country. Can you tell me how that can be done politically? And there's no other way you can put it together.

The first obstacle that we face as we try and make this type of policy a national policy, Mr. Speaker, is that we've got to overcome the political ideologies and the philosophies of the various Ministers of Agriculture that we have across this great Dominion. And that obstacle alone, that's No. 1 obstacle in my mind, Mr. Speaker, provides the one structure and the one hurdle that proves that this legislation will not work.

And how can we compare wealthy Ontario or Quebec with Manitoba? Is there any way? Can we compare them politically? No. Can we compare them populationwise? No. Can we compare them wealthwise? No. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers through this legislation will be able to bargain with Ontario, with Quebec, or with British Columbia on an equal basis. There's no way it can be done. And, Mr. Speaker, add to this the problem of farmers from different provinces serving different provincial laws and serving different regulations. How could any man with a normal mind figure that you could make that system work? Ten provinces with all having different provincial laws, all having different regulations, and meld a bill such as we have in my hand here with those jurisdictions and establish a policy.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's quite evident Manitoba barley farmers are covered how? They're subject to Ottawa controlled Wheat Board, right? Ontario corn growers are covered how? They're covered by the Grains Corn Council. And each is covered by a provincial legislation and regulations. And I must respect, Mr. Speaker, the Ministers of Agriculture from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta who over the past few years have banded together to try to establish some political, not agricultural policy amongst them. But how can they do it politically. It can't be done. We have two Ministers with a socialist philosophy and one happens to be a Tory. Is there any way that they are going to sit down at a table and bargain? Is there any way that they are going to try and seriously co-ordinate a policy for western farmers? But tell me, how about the eastern provinces who again have different political ideologies? How are you going to negotiate with Quebec at the political level? How are you going to negotiate with Ontario at the political level? It can't be done. It can't be done, Mr. Speaker, because politics is the way our system works. And, Mr. Speaker, who are the ones that are being suckered into this great bill - the farmers. The farmers are being led today to believe that this plan is going to work and I say, Mr. Speaker, it just won't work. It just won't work. We have Alberta today favouring the expansionist program. Read the remarks of the Honourable Minister Mr. Horner and his policy for Alberta, talking **expansionism**. What have we got from the Minister of Agriculture of this province? Farm management controls, and that's the solution to the problem. Is there any way that those two Ministers can meet at any level when they are talking on two different worlds? It can't be done, Mr. Speaker. There's no way that that type of policy making machine or that policy making process can give the farmers of western Canada anything that's fair and square because the politics of it will not let it happen.

The Atlantic provinces, Mr. Speaker, I see that the Atlantic problems I've been following they've been trying to co-ordinate their ideologies, and they've been trying to establish a unified

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) policy for the benefit of the Maritime farmers. But unfortunately I read the other day, Mr. Speaker, that those negotiations have broken down. And why did they break down, Mr. Speaker? They broke down because of politics, because the Ministers of Agriculture could not agree when it got to the political level. And, Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest the other evening the remarks of an economist by the name of Dr. Warley, University of Guelph, considered to be in Europe and the United States as one of the leading agricultural economists of the world. And he spoke out recently on this very type of legislation that I have in my hand here this afternoon, on Canada's farm policy and the way we're heading today. And his warnings are very timely, Mr. Speaker, as we deal with this type of legislation. Dr. Warley is alarmed at the rising tide of provincialism that we have in Canada today as far as the farmers are concerned. And the way we are moving to supply management with controls and with quotas, Dr. Warley is most alarmed that this is where we're heading in Canada today as far as our farmers are concerned. And the crux for Canada he says as I read his statements, Mr. Speaker, will involve around the issue of hogs and beef. And if we were to impose restrictions and controls on the production of these products, I submit that Dr. Warley submitted that we condemn our farmers to a future of nothing but poverty and frustration. Nothing but poverty and frustration and instead of dealing with this type of legislation we should be today, Mr. Speaker, condemning Ottawa. We should be condemning Ottawa for its complete failure to provide leadership for our farmers and an agricultural policy. There's where we should be standing up in this House and nailing them every day for. But we're not doing it, nor are the other provinces - and the reason is quite simple, because it's political. Nobody goes down there and crucifies those guys and say come up with an agricultural policy. You don't do it because it's political. So, Mr. Speaker, due to our political imbalance, the Premiers of Canada and the Ministers of Agriculture and the provinces of Canada; they can't meet that challenge, and it's that simple.

So, Mr. Speaker, looking towards you and looking at the national level and looking at this bill, we find the provinces of Canada today are turning their backs. They're turning their backs from that challenge that we should be meeting, and they're taking a sort of a protectionist approach to a policy for agriculture. We're going to isolate ourselves - or as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell says, we're going to Balcanize ourselves into little wee cells - and then we figure we're going to arrive at and deal with the national problems of agriculture in this country. Mr. Speaker, it's a dream and it's not going to work. At this day and age of our history I think it's regretful that we who are politicians - and we have political leaders all across this country, farm leaders today that are wrapped up in this gospel, in this dream of farm management and provincial self-sufficiency. That's a good one, I found that one the other day. Provincial self-sufficiency. Remember that one, Mr. Speaker. What a regressive step that we are meeting in the country today. This bill in my hand - farm management, self-sufficiency for farmers in Manitoba - sure, the Minister of Agriculture, he's going to give them a little bit for their waterworks and he's going to give them a buck when there's an election; and he'll hand them out a buck whenever he can, but he's not going to solve no problems that will meet the needs of our farmers today with this type of legislation. No, Mr. Speaker, we're moving into a shell.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment having arrived the honourable member will be able to continue when this order comes up on the Order Paper again. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance that the House do adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote the House adjourned until 8:00 p. m.