

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, July 12, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last night, I have a second agreement between Tantalum and Chemalloy and the MDC to table and I take the opportunity to table that agreement at this time. This is the second of two agreements.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Reports? Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether it's the government's intention to amend The Social Allowance Act to allow graduates of university to be eligible for welfare aid in view of the judgement that was handed down this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, this is very clearly a government policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Inkster): In view of the fact that it's been stated in the House that the welfare - that all that you have to do in order to get money is to go before the Welfare Appeal Board, can the Minister explain how it is that the Welfare Appeal Board denied the claim of the student asking for money?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I didn't get the whole question of the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: In view of the fact that it's been stated in the House by various members that all you have to do to get welfare is to go to the Welfare Appeal Board, can the Minister explain how it is that the Welfare Appeal Board denied the claim of the student that was asking for social assistance in the case referred to?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, that's quite true, they did deny assistance. I would like to clarify and be more specific in answering the Leader of the Opposition. It is a policy of government to be determined.

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

MR. I. H. (IZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. My understanding is that one must rise on a point of privilege personally as quickly after an event has occurred that requires them to do so but because Hansard is running behind, I was unable to, until I confirmed in this morning's newspapers, what I believe I'd heard in the House. Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that on Friday, I said in this House, I stated that the shares that the Government of Manitoba had bought in Tantalum Mining Corporation had been bought for \$1.2 million by Chemalloy approximately a year earlier and the First Minister then said that the shares had been bought by Chemalloy, 30 percent for \$2.2 million, and then subsequently Friday evening, I believe, he made a statement saying --(Interjection)-- Yes, Friday evening, he made a statement that this was not correct, that he was in error and that I was in error. In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is that the First Minister has stated, and it has been carried and broadcast throughout the media in this province, that I was wrong when I said that Chemalloy bought 60 percent of Tantalum for 1.250 million. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, I suggest, has made a mistake, perhaps inadvertently been advised, but nevertheless the record shows that the First Minister says, I am wrong in my facts. I stand here asking the First Minister to withdraw those remarks and to acknowledge as the

(MR. ASPER cont'd) sworn evidence is, as the documentary evidence is, as I am prepared to table, that the shares that I spoke of as having been bought for 1.2 million were indeed bought for 1.2 million. So the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that I am asking the First Minister to withdraw his statement that I was wrong in my figures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege alleged and which took more than a minute to express by the Member for Wolseley involves a difference of interpretation, no doubt. I did rise in this Chamber, I believe - it wasn't Friday evening, it was Monday afternoon - indicating that with respect to the precise amount that was paid by Chemalloy for 60 percent of the shares of Tantalum that both myself and the Member for Wolseley were somewhat in error and the written information which was tabled yesterday by the Minister of Industry and Commerce will bear out what I am saying now, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Wolseley stated that 60 percent was purchased for 1.25 million dollars and within the last twelve months. I indicated that my information was that it was purchased more than twelve months ago - closer to two years rather than one year, probably somewhere around 18 months to be more precise - that it was purchased not for 1.25 million but for approximately 2 million, and I believe that the written answer tabled yesterday does confirm that it was \$2 million. So that there was some point of error on the part of both of us and I made that clear on Monday, so I'm wondering what the point of privilege is all about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Before we get into a procedural dissertation on interpretation and misunderstanding, or understanding, I do think that we can accept the word of both gentlemen that --(Interjection)-- Order, please. I do think that we should have the courtesy to allow me to say what I have to say and then if you wish to disagree, you're entitled to it. But I would like to say that it's a matter of interpretation, a matter of understanding, and a matter of accepting every gentlemen's word in this House and lady, and on that basis I do think that a matter of explanation has been tendered; it was not a matter of privilege, and I think the House can accept that.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order --(Interjection) -- I'd like to raise a point of order with you, Mr. Speaker. With all respect and courtesy to you, Sir, but I don't believe the question before the House is a matter of a procedural wrangle or anything approaching that description. I think it's a question of hard dollars, Manitoba tax dollars, of which there is obviously a disagreement on both sides of the House with respect to the facts of the matter, and the fact as expressed by that side, or this side, in the person of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party is under some discussion and I fail to see your reasoning, Mr. Speaker, as to delegating that, or relegating that to a procedural hassle. I think it's a legitimate question of privilege that the member raises.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): If I may on the point of order. I believe it was a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I believe that if he would take a look at Beausheue he would find the matter of differences of opinion between two honourable members of the Assembly does not constitute a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question then is to the First . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party state his point of privilege - the last one was not.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege I make is that there is no difference of opinion before this House. There is - someone is wrong. Mr. Speaker, it has been put to this House that I am wrong. Mr. Speaker, I am saying to you that I am prepared to file in this House documentary sworn statements that prove that I'm right or that somebody has fraudulently misled the courts and this House. It's a matter of serious privilege. And all I ask is that the First Minister look at the documentary evidence and withdraw his statement that I am wrong in my facts. And as that is a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, according to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, while I understand your ruling on this matter is that there is no point of privilege, nevertheless the matter has been brought before you again de novo, I suppose, and the Member for Wolseley makes an offer to have certain documents presented to me so that I may respond, and I would advise him that whatever means he wishes to

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) follow, whether it be formal or whether it be informal, that if the document in question is presented that it will be forwarded to the same officials of the MDC as prepared the written replies which have been filed with the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and which state in writing in a very simple and clear way that the shares in question referred to by the Member for Wolseley involve the payment of some \$2 million pursuant to an agreement that was entered into more than 12 months ago, I believe approximately 18 months to two years ago, and in those specific respects the Honourable Member for Wolseley was somewhat in error. I must say that again. It's a matter of interpretation no doubt.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Again I must indicate to the House that in my opinion the whole matter is a difference of opinion and a difference of interpretation. We have had tabling of some documents and if the Honourable Member for Wolseley wishes to table any, he's welcome. There's nothing to prevent him from tabling anything he wishes. May we proceed away from this particular question? --(Interjection)-- Very well. This is not a debate this is the question period. The honourable member may do as he wishes. Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister tell me why we are currently passing legislation, labour legislation, calling for the rights of labour to apply for certification if 35 percent of an employee group so desires, why that legislation is necessary when in practice we are now applying for certification with somewhat less than 30 percent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the honourable gentleman is well aware this question is before the House, has already been voted upon once in second reading, is now in committee, so therefore I do think that it is improper to ask that question at this particular time. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary then. Can the Honourable the Minister of Labour tell me was the Manitoba Labour Board acting outside of the current legislation when it agreed to adhere to the certification application by the employees of Clarke Leatherdale, of a funeral services, where 6 out of 19, 6 out of 19, I believe, in my terms that represents about 28 percent who are applying for certification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where my honourable friend from Lakeside got his information. I do know, I do know that insofar as the undertaking profession, or certain undertaking parlours, the employees applied for certification before the Labour Board. The Labour Board considered the application; they were satisfied that all of the provisions of the Manitoba Labour Act were adhered to, subsequently to that an application for decertification was made and as the result of that application through the courts, as a result of that application, a majority of the employees apparently the other day established that they did not want to be certified with the upholsterers union. So I say, Mr. Speaker, in all due deference to the knowledgeability of my honourable friend from Lakeside there has been no violation of the present Labour Act to the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary question on this matter, Mr. Speaker, and by way of information I will forward the information to the Honourable Minister of Labour, but the final supplementary question is then that I ask, does the Minister of Labour disagree with the judgment handed down by Judge Monnin when he criticized the Manitoba Labour Board for entertaining an application for certification when only six out of 19 employees applied for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Mr. Justice Monnin's opinion I believe was a dissenting opinion and, Mr. Speaker, I do want to indicate to --(Interjection)-- Well then, I'm going to answer your question. It was a dissenting opinion, a minority opinion, and I might say now that the matter has been raised in this House that the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Lakeside --(Interjection)-- Will you please allow me to finish my remarks - that I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member for Lakeside and to this Assembly that the Minister of Labour has under consideration an investigation as to whether or not there was coercion in this particular case . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can inform the House whether the \$1,500,000 paid into Tantalum for the issue of 50 percent of the shares is to be used by the company to discharge any of its liabilities, and are any of the liabilities connected with Chemalloy, its associated companies or companies involved with the principles of Chemalloy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the essence of the reply to my honourable friend's question is already contained within the written documentation tabled by my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It is certainly my understanding of the matter that the \$1.5 million in question is pursuant to the agreement to be paid into the treasury of Tantalum Mines for the continued operation of Tantalum Mines. That there is no possibility of diversion of moneys under the terms of the agreement for purposes other than that. And if there is a decision taken by Tantalum to proceed with expansion of additional capacity or a new line of ore production, the money may be used for that purpose but only under the aegis of the Tantalum Corporation and not by any other affiliated companies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I take it from what the First Minister says that the \$1-1/2 million paid into Tantalum will not be used to discharge any of its liabilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, again the question asked is dealt with in the written answers supplied yesterday by the Minister of Industry and Commerce but -- on Page 3 my colleague advises the House -- but if my honourable friend wishes to be reassured on that, that is my understanding that any reduction of indebtedness by owing to General Host that, again pursuant to terms of the agreements entered into, the reduction of indebtedness from \$5 million down to \$3 million is contractually an obligation of Chemalloy and failure to do that would result in the invoking of the guarantee and that in turn would mean that the public would own 100 percent of the operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, again I'll attempt to put the question. I understand the First Minister's answer and his reference to Page 3, -and that deals with the indebtedness with respect to General Host.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is, is the government assured that there are not additional liabilities of Tantalum owing to companies associated with Chemalloy, or associated with the principals of Chemalloy that will be paid out of the operation, or of the 1-1/2 million of working capital to be provided by the government?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable First Minister did answer the question and as we indicated on Page 3 of the document which we tabled last night, at the very top, the money, and this money being referred to is the \$1.5 million which I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is referring to, the money to be invested by MDC will be used for working capital and for the construction of a lithium pilot plant. And then it goes on -- I don't think I need to read this further but if he would look at it carefully he will I think get the assurance that he is looking for and I'm satisfied that the MDC has adequate controls on the utilization of these moneys, not only with respect to membership on the board but with respect to various financial controls that are being implemented and instituted.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked a number of questions about the company over the past several days. We attempted to answer the bulk of them in this statement. There were one or two that were not answered and in order to provide the maximum amount of the information that honourable members may wish, I would like to take the opportunity to briefly answer those questions if I may.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked whether there was an agreement, or whether I could indicate that there was an agreement between Tantalum and Goldrim Minerals Australia Limited, whether this agreement is still in effect. I'm advised that Tantalum has no interest in Goldrim Minerals Limited of Australia and there is now no commitment between

(MR. EVANS cont'd) Tantalum and any Australian Mining Company. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that whether Chemalloy has any other independent interests in Australia is irrelevant in this case to Tantalum.

Another question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was with respect again to Australia. He says, "Will the MDC be required to raise additional money in connection with commitments in Australia and can he give us the information on their shares". And my answer is really the same as previously, Tantalum has no commitments in Australia.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked whether we could indicate --(Interjection)-- the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition asked whether I could indicate whether anyone from the government inspected mining claims in Quebec owned by Tantalum, and I can advise honourable members that the Manitoba Development Corporation does have a record of claims but did not consider it necessary to have anyone from the government inspect them since no work is being done or contemplated on these claims at the present time.

A supplementary question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Official Opposition: can the Minister indicate whether it is the intention of the Provincial Government to provide funding for mining exploration in Quebec? I believe I indicated last time, but I repeat, the answer is no. It is not the intention of the Provincial Government to provide funding for mining explorations in Quebec. This of course is in keeping with current policy, MDC moneys go to investments within Manitoba.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked whether, if within 12 months before the purchase in Tantalum there were any transactions, interest, agreements, or rights, transferred out of the company to Chemalloy, and the answer is no. On the contrary, Chemalloy I am advised, has invested money in Tantalum within the last 12 months.

I'm sorry there is one other question. The Leader of the Opposition asked whether I could indicate if during the period of negotiations with respect to Tantalum there was discussion with Chemalloy about development at Rusty Lake and I believe Ruttan Lake, and the answer is there were no negotiations with Chemalloy regarding development at Rusty Lake or Ruttan Lake, or any property, other than the one in the Bernic Lake area.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that we have done our best to answer all questions asked by all honourable members. We will check the record and if there are any that have been left unanswered we will endeavour to provide those in due course.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry. In view of the fact, or in light of the fact that David Winchell, the President of Tantalum Mining swore an affidavit on the 26th April, 1971 stating that the shares of Chemalloy had been bought from Goldfield for 1.25 million, will the Minister still stand by or withdraw the statement he made to the House last night to the effect that the shares were bought for \$2 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have just said now on three occasions in this House that, and it's provided in the written answer, that the consideration for the purchase of 60 per cent of the shares of Tantalum by Chemalloy from the Goldfield Corporation was for an amount of \$2 million. And then I gave an undertaking earlier today that if the Honourable Member for Wolseley will forward the document in question it will be forwarded to the MDC staff that prepared the written answer so that we may have a reconciliation of these two apparent conflicting figures. I say apparent they may not be real conflict.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I thank him for his answers, and particularly for his answer with respect to Goldrim properties in Australia. I wonder if the government has taken notice of the fact that the Financial Post survey of mines has indicated in the last three years that Tantalum is responsible for the development costs of a mine in Australia called Goldrim and has entered into such an agreement. And I wonder if the Minister can truly say at this point that in the last year there have been no transactions which have taken assets out of Tantalum by its major owner Chemalloy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has already given a reply and I'm sure that the Minister can take the question again as notice in an effort to double-check because at this point that is all that the Minister can do is double-check. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not aware that we in this House need accept as given,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) or as fact, what may appear in the pages of the Financial Post. I recall for example that the Financial Post on more than one occasion referred to a company in West Germany by the name of Handlische Papierfabrik and also referred to Mr. Michael Sindona both as having some definite substantive interest in Churchill Forest Industries. It turned out that in fact there was no such direct or indirect connection and it was just speculation in the Financial Post and in this case it would appear from the answers given by the Minister of Industry and Commerce that the information which my honourable friend is basing his question on, is also speculation.

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

MR. ASPER: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Industry. In view of the fact that his statement on Tantalum Mining last night tabled, refers to an agreement dated February 22, 1971, my question to the Minister is, has he read that agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member has read Citation 171 of Beauchesne. It's the one that I gave him a copy of, Section A and B. If he hasn't I would refer him to it, Oral Questions, The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of privilege of the House to ask you, Sir, to take under consideration of disallowing the destruction, similar destruction that took place of public property here last year when the House was prorogued. I think this type of thing is costing the taxpayer money to repair damages caused and it's stupid and it's also childish.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the comments the honourable member makes should be given due consideration. It is our Assembly that we do injure when we leave here and of course it's true it is taxpayers' money. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder, Sir, if the Minister would undertake before the House prorogues, obviously not necessarily today, as a matter of courtesy to provide the House with a brief statement with respect to the current situation at The Pas, the Churchill Forest Industries project at The Pas, with respect particularly to the number of employees now presently being employed, the current sales to date, the projected number of employees for the coming year and the projected sales to date. If the Minister would undertake to give us that statement some time in the next few days I think it would be appreciated.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to learn of the honourable members' interests in the developments at The Pas. I would remind him and all members that I tabled, I tabled only a few weeks ago a very lengthy document which gave considerable information, not only on employment but on sales, on costs, and so forth. However I will endeavour to see what we can get in the way of current information and if the honourable members are keenly interested we'll try to supply them with that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Can he advise the House whether there have been any infractions or complaints registered under the Liquor Control Act against the Lord Selkirk Cruise Ship for the sale or supply of liquor to minors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, no I haven't. I did have a concern evidenced to me by one of my honourable colleagues that there were discarded bottles floating in the river and I investigated that matter, although the investigation did not clearly indicate that they had come from the river boats that navigate our very historic and picturesque river. I have not received complaints in respect to the matter that the honourable member suggests. If he's giving me notice of his complaint, I will look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister inquire as to whether or not last weekend 15 members of a 4H group in age group 15 to 17 years of age were served with champagne during a dinner and following that were allowed privileges at the bar, and all were in the age group 15 to 17?

MR. MACKLING: I'll certainly take that question as notice and I would like to - if the honourable member has any further particulars or any source of information where this can be verified, that he would be kind enough to submit it to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Order, please. Order.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the government proceeding with the building of the 100 bed Seven Oaks Hospital in North Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health,

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there is not a definite proposal at this stage and whenever government policy is arrived at the citizens of this province will be informed.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, another question to the same Minister. Will the Members of the Legislature be receiving copies of a White Paper on health matters prior to its release to the media?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this document will be tabled in the House on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside,

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if it is not a matter of government policy to proceed with the construction of the Seven Oaks Hospital, would the Minister undertake to inform Councillor Joseph Zuken of that fact.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that this was not a government policy, I said that we had not received a definite proposal of the commission itself.

MR. ENNS: Then the representations made by that particular council on the open by-line show this morning ...

MR. SPEAKER: Question? Question?

MR. ENNS: My question, Sir - are merely speculation on his part awaiting government policy. No, Mr. Speaker, I want to clear. Has government made the policy decision to build the Seven Oaks Hospital in the north end of the City.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of University and Colleges,

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, on this matter the Seven Oaks Hospital is an incorporated board. They were requested by the Health Services Commission and given authority by the Health Services Commission to undertake studies. They have now taken on staff, a director who will help them formulate policy proposals for the hospital which will have to go to the Health Services Commission and then it will be brought to government, and not until that point in time. So Councillor Zuken is not wrong; they are acting in accordance with the statutes, and they're doing the proper thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside,

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary question to either the Minister of the University and Colleges or the Minister of Health. Is this similar to the situation where the department hired staff to promote the concept of community health clinics to try to develop the need, or has a decision been made?

MR. MILLER: I will gladly inform the Member for Lakeside, who apparently doesn't understand what the issue is all about, the man hired by the Seven Oaks Hospital Board is an employee of the Seven Oaks Hospital Board and not an employee of the government.

MR. ENNS: My third and final supplementary question. The government then to date has not as a matter of policy accepted the proposition of building a hospital in north Winnipeg? -- (Interjection)-- That's right, has not as a matter of policy agreed to the building of a hospital in north Winnipeg. Is that right?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the government has not had a proposal put before it. Period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Does the Minister intend to continue the practice of admitting large numbers, I mean thousands of non-resident students while many of the Manitoba students are unable to attend, or not be accepted? Will there be a change in policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges,

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will advise me of these large number of thousands of students that are allowed in and Manitoba students not being placed, I would gladly like to hear details of this information.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true that only 125 students out of 500 were accepted in one faculty alone at the University of Manitoba?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there are many faculties and the vague reference to faculties in general doesn't help me in ascertaining whether or not the first statement made by the honourable member is correct.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Does the Minister consider or contemplate a change in policy in this area?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if I knew what the honourable member was talking about in the way of policy I might answer, although frankly I would not divulge any policy in advance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be in order to supplement the answer provided by the Minister of Colleges and Universities by telling my honourable friend, the Member for Assiniboia, that if he will reflect or research, or both, he will find that there have been from time to time certain faculties that have accepted fewer students than the total numbers that have applied, and this quite apart from considerations about foreign student enrolment. That's point number one.

Point number two, Mr. Speaker, is that this government without apology has a policy of scorn for xenophobia. The Government of Canada has as a matter of policy decided that it will assist the underdeveloped countries by providing educational assistance and physical facilities for the education of those coming to Canada on various foreign student training programs in order to help the underdeveloped parts of the world. So far as the government of Manitoba is concerned -- and for that matter I believe every province with the possible exception of one or two, that I'm not aware of -- has a policy of co-operating with our Federal Government with respect to this desirable international policy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Fort Garry expressed some concern in a question to me and asked me to look into what he I think termed is a dangerous situation of overcrowding at the campground at, I think it was Grand Beach. This question could properly have been directed to the Honourable the Minister responsible for Tourism and Recreation. I did make inquiry and I'm given to understand that on the long week-end there was a very large number of people who wished to use the camping facilities at Clear Lake; obviously far more than what the campgrounds proper could contend with and the RCMP Police in advice to the parks officials indicated that it would be less difficulty if people were permitted to camp in other than the appropriate places. In other words, they were camping in non-designated places because of the great hardship and inconvenience for many people in having to be told to return. It did create some congestion, some difficulty but it was better than having forced everyone to return without giving them an opportunity to camp at all. Obviously there is a need for more and more facilities and I understand that through the department facilities are being increased, and I think his budget reflects that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Attorney-General for his reply. I would have directed the question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Development but he was absent from the chamber at that time. Could I ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Development if there are regulations being applied in parks like the one at Grand Beach which limit the amount of space, or restricts the amount of crowding so that campfires are not maintained close to automobiles and gasoline supplies?

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Well, Mr. Speaker, yes there are regulations made by the park. I think that the Attorney-General explained the situation quite properly. It's a question of supply and demand. We haven't the facilities needed. In the weekend that my honourable friend was talking about, just in the Whiteshell there was over a 1,000 extra campers. We are doing everything we can, excellerating our work at -- mind you we won't be ready for this year -- but at Hecla Island and different areas, we are having a good look at that. In the meantime we're reducing but we're not reducing at what we hoped it will be - the final requirements will be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the Minister and government and the government insurance corporation, the auto insurance, are still adhering to the no-fault principle re claims that are submitted to Autopac?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Sélkirk): Mr. Speaker, I

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) can only suppose that the honourable member must have had a claim himself that has caused the introduction of this question and he's anxious to receive some sort of commitment prior to his making his submission to the drive-in claim centre, from the Minister responsible for Autopac. There is a booklet released that I would very gladly recommend to the honourable member which fully explains, and in considerable detail, all the provisions of coverage. There have been no alterations insofar as coverages are concerned from the date of the issuance of the booklet which I will make available to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, for clarification re the statement of the Honourable Minister. If a commercial feed truck with faulty electrical wiring backs up to a farmer's barn to unload the feed and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. ORDER, I don't know why I have to say it five times. The question is hypothetical. It's out of order. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . my question is for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he tell the House by what procedure the medical history of a person who gave evidence concerning the dispensing and prescribing of drugs at Mount Carmel Clinic was made available to representatives of the Clinic without the knowledge of her doctor or the patient?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I took a similar question as notice from the Leader of the Liberal Party a few days ago and an answer to his question and yours is forthcoming.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister know that details of that medical history were given out in a press conference at Mount Carmel Clinic last Thursday evening?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that my knowing made that much of a difference as long as I could get the information, and I did say to the House a few days ago that I was doing everything in my power to get a report on the questions that were posed in this House and this should be related to the House very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the question I have to ask has had much concern in the United States over the past number of months and now seems to be reaching concern in Canada, relates to a hormone called dispesterol that is being used in feeding cattle, I wonder if the Minister of Health has had any correspondence with the Minister of Health in Ottawa in regard to this matter, and if so can he indicate what his position is on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: No, I haven't personally, Mr. Speaker. I'll take the question as notice and see what information I can gather.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of this article where it is stated that farmers may be prosecuted . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question? Question please?

MR. EINARSON: Question, Mr. Speaker, pardon me to the Attorney-General. In view of this article which states that farmers may be prosecuted for feeding this, or the drug being found in meats, has the Attorney-General had any correspondence in this regard with Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I have recently become aware only through the news media of some residue having been found in animal liver and certainly it's a matter of concern and I can assume that the Federal Department of Consumer Affairs will be likewise concerned. And if my department has not initiated an inquiry I will see that such an inquiry is initiated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has there been any appointment made in regards to a leasing agent for the Town of Leaf Rapids?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On the assumption that the figures that he tabled last night are proved in the end to be correct, that 15 percent of Tantalum was in fact purchased for \$2 million . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question is becoming argumentative, will be out of order if the honourable member doesn't place it soon.

MR. ASPER: Based on the figures the Minister has put to the House as to the fact that 15 percent of Tantalum was bought for \$2 million, will he describe or can he provide the House with information that would indicate what occurred in the company in the year or year and a half to make the stock worth 300 percent more than it was a year, a year and a half ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think inadvertently, if I may, I think inadvertently the Leader of the Liberal Party used a wrong figure there, he said, "\$2 million for 15 percent". --(Interjection)-- \$2 million for 60 percent. I said I thought it was an inadvertent error because he did say 15 percent. However, assuming then that it was 60 percent that the member meant to say, what has happened in the interval? Well what has happened in the interval, Mr. Speaker, is that Chemalloy has entered into a contractual legal obligation to invest \$2 million into Tantalum, so that what was in effect - if I may use an algebraic equation for purposes of clarity - if 60 percent of X was worth \$2 million in 1971 then what is involved now is not X but X plus 2 million, \$2 million. Therefore there has been that change. And to that extent the property is worth that much more, it's been enhanced by \$2 million.

Furthermore of course there is the general fact that there is no longer litigation surrounding approximately \$5 million of indebtedness. At the time when the purchase was made there was substantial litigation surrounding the property and therefore it was bound to effect its value. So there are those two factors that make the difference.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister could give us the nature of the amount of liabilities of Tantalum over and above its inventory and its cash at the time of the purchase?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll look into the matter and see if I can obtain the information that the honourable member requests if I heard him correctly, but nevertheless it will be recorded in . . . I'm not sure whether I heard the entire question, Mr. Speaker, but obviously the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition is asking for some more detailed information. I will endeavour to obtain that information. I didn't hear him fully but I will read his question I'm sure in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Supplementary question to the First Minister. In view of the answer of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I wonder how he can expect to put the proposition that he did before us as to the equation without knowing what the liabilities over and above the actual cash assets and inventory are?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the information that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is asking for I believe in substantial part has been made available yesterday and today. I've indicated that there have been two substantial changes that effect the value of Tantalum property that have taken place over the course of the past year and a half, and I don't know that anything more need be said at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder how the First Minister expects to equate value without knowing the nature of the loss that Tantalum has?

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and refers to the operation of the Shellmouth Dam and I'd like to ask the Minister if he can indicate what volume of water is presently being discharged from the Shellmouth Dam to ensure the safety and the preservation of the environment in the Assiniboine River?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman asked a specific statistical question, I guess you'd call it, asking about the c.f.s and I will endeavour to obtain that information, current information. I'd like to remind him however that members of the staff of the

(MR. EVANS cont'd) Water Resources Branch of my department have gone to considerable length to discuss the whole matter of the operation of the Shellmouth Dam and to attempt to explain as fully as possible the way it can be utilized to the maximum benefit of all the people in the immediate vicinity; and I trust that the honourable member will have confidence that we are using our engineering staff to operate that particular facility for the benefit of the people in that area.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the volume presently being discharged from the Shellmouth Reservoir sufficient to meet the needs of communities downstream as negotiated in the original agreement with the Federal Government of Canada?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question to the Minister. Does the control of the Shellmouth Reservoir lie solely with the Province of Manitoba operating through the PFRA branch of the Federal Government?

MR. PAULLEY: How can it be solely if it's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't know how the Minister is expected to answer a question of that kind. Let's pause to reflect on the question. Does the Province of Manitoba maintain sole control over the operation of the Shellmouth Dam operating through PFRA which is a federal Crown agency. I mean, Mr. Speaker, the question has an internal self-contradiction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. There is no other way that the Provincial Government can operate other than through PFRA with regard to the Shellmouth Dam.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he provide copies of the agreements that were tabled this afternoon in connection with Tantalum Mines and Manitoba Development Corporation to all parties and groups in this House.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as has been intimated by some of my colleagues, really all recognized parties I believe have obtained a copy, but nevertheless the Clerk I believe has a copy and perhaps he can accommodate the honourable member somehow or other. The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, the information is public now and the honourable member can take the required and normal course to obtain that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question. Does he not think that the Legislative Assembly Act provides that equal treatment to all members and that all members should have access to information that is given and the information given to the other parties is not available to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . just outside of the Assembly a group of two or three hundred people who are anxious to be heard in respect of Bill 81, and I'm wondering whether or not it might suit the convenience of the House to let the people be heard. Now I'm not attempting to curtail any further questions this afternoon but I would like to indicate to the honourable members of the House what I feel is a reasonable proposition that the House, and I intend to move the adjournment of the House in a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the House would now adjourn and that the Committee of Industrial Relations would continue allowing the people of Manitoba, and elsewhere, to be heard in respect to Bill 81, this afternoon until 5:30. The House would then meet again this evening at its normal time 8:00 o'clock. The Industrial Relations Committee would continue its deliberations tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock. The House would meet tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 for the purpose of the resolutions that are before, and bills before the House. Then tomorrow evening at 8:00 o'clock there would not be a session of the House but if necessary a continuation of the hearings before the Industrial Relations Committee.

Now I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that I can only foresee up until tomorrow evening the procedures. We have given assurance insofar as Bill 81 that all who desire will be heard. It may be that the Industrial Relations Committee will continue its deliberations on Friday morning. However, I will, Mr. Speaker, as House Leader notify the members of the Assembly what

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the order of business will be for Friday, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris before I put the motion.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Before the motion I say that we're always happy when the House Leader entertains reasonable propositions and we're perfectly agreeable to the course of action that he has outlined. But I wonder if he would mind advising members of the House now whether the House is going to sit on Friday evening and Saturday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, of course after a motion to adjourn is put there's no real debate but I accept and I intend to be courteous to my honourable friend the Member for Morris that at the present time as I indicated a moment or two ago that the proceedings for Friday I'm not able to precisely say what they will be. There is the probability of meetings of the Assembly on Friday and on Saturday but at the present time I cannot clearly indicate to the House.

A MEMBER: The motion to adjourn, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. I haven't accepted the motion yet. I haven't placed it before the House because there were members that wanted to speak. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the tradition of this House is such that the question period is an unlimited one, subject to reason. However in the light of the fact that there are many dozens waiting to be heard on the Labour Bill --(Interjection)-- I said that in the light of the fact that there are dozens of people who wish to be heard on the Labour Bill we are prepared to accept your motion to adjourn subject --(Interjection)-- subject, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the Minister, the House Leader, take notice that as well as the Labour Bill that is important, a very important statement was tabled in the House last night which requires examination on the Tantalum Mining proposition and we would ask that the Minister, the House Leader, take into account that in the evening session we be permitted full opportunity for questioning on this.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the House adjourned until 8 tonight.