

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 14, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 40 students of Grade 11 standing of Garden City School. These students are under the direction of Mr. John Senkiw. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

We have 14 students of Grade 9 standing of the Queen Elizabeth School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Goletski and Mrs. Gunson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

We also have 25 students of Grade 11 standing of the Springfield Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. James Smythe. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield, the Minister of Health and Social Development.

We also have 20 students of Grade 11 standing of Westgate Mennonite College. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jack Suderman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

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

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 Northern Affairs.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, on a brief matter of privilege, in the Winnipeg Free Press of March 12, 1973, I would like to correct a quotation made by myself, "At one point the Liberal platform appeared to call off the diversion of the Churchill River, Mr. McBryde said; then according to Mr. Asper it favours a low level flooding". Mr. Speaker, the corrective of that statement would be that "At one point the Liberal Platform in 1969 favoured a low level flooding; Mr. Asper says their present platform is consistent with that, obviously it's inconsistent".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): I would ask that the Minister, the member state clearly, the Minister state clearly, that it is incorrect for him to say, or for him to have been reported as saying, that Mr. Asper favours a low level diversion.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Attorney-General.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James) introduced Bill 20, an Act to amend the Queen's Bench Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne and the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (both absent). Oral questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Education. It relates to a difference of \$33,000 in the amount that the department has approved for a regional vocational high school at Brandon and the amount of the tender which the Brandon School Board has approved. My question to the Minister is this: has he had a request from the Brandon School Board for an urgent and immediate meeting to discuss this difference with a view to resolving it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had a request from Brandon -- I've had a letter from the Brandon School Board but not requesting an urgent and immediate meeting.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister prepared to meet with delegates from the Brandon School Board in the near future to discuss this matter?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I've never refused to meet with anyone.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to make a brief statement.  
--(Interjection)-- It's not a debatable point.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I find this rather irregular; if the honourable member had given me notice I could have said yes or no. I would have known. As it is I don't know.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, when members have matters which they wish to announce which do not affect the debate in the House and are not of a political controversy nature, they have been given permitted leave to do this regarding curling programs, etc.

A MEMBER: Oh fine, sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on the same point of order.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Just on the particular point of order, I think the general custom is that any member other than a member of the Cabinet who wishes to make that kind of a statement asks for permission to rise on a question of privilege, and that question of privilege is granted then for the Minister or for the member to make whatever statement he wants. But it's indeed with the leave of the House that he must do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member have leave? (Leave) The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

STATEMENT

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, it's with great pride that it being today that the group in my constituency of Wolseley is here that I rise to ask this House to join with me in recording and correcting an oversight on our part in not having earlier congratulated and expressed our appreciation to Sylvia Burka, a resident of my riding, a young lady who has just won the Women's Junior World's Skating, Speed Skating Championship, a girl who has served our community with distinction, brought honour to us, and who set a marvellous example for young people all throughout this country.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Will the Minister of Agriculture table the report of the committee which was set up to investigate the price and sale of fertilizer in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker, that is something that will be announced at a later date.

MR. HENDERSON: My supplementary question: will it be in time for the people to know before seeding as to what's going on? The farm people are very concerned about it.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position at this time to know how long it will take for the commissioners to get their findings. I am not sure that there is any reason why they wouldn't want to make those findings public, although I haven't had an opportunity to caucus the matter. So in that context I cannot give my honourable friend an affirmative answer at this point, but I will take that under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question, I believe, for the Attorney-General. In view of the story in the Thompson Citizen, where a Transair plane landed at the wrong airport in the wrong country, I wonder if the Attorney-General will investigate, or the government will investigate the qualifications of pilots who don't know the difference from one airport to another.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we are all interested in the accuracy of people who have very responsible positions like airline pilots, and I think this matter is under the purview of my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I'm sure he's taken note of the member's concern.

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

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could he inform the House as to whether or not the Hole River Island Lake winter road is passable?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Hole River Island Lake road was opened some time ago but due to the unseasonably warm weather the road is presently closed, and will probably be closed unless the weather turns cold again.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Another question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the truckers who are using the road, do they guarantee delivery when they bid for contracts?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, at the present moment there are no truckers using the road.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Minister didn't hear me. I said, when the truckers use the road and they obtain the contract by bid, do they guarantee delivery?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the contracts by the freighters with the people who want the goods freighted in is between the freighter and the person who wants the goods hauled in, and I have no idea what those contracts say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know from the Minister of Education approximately how many teachers, new teachers will be certified this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: As many as there may be enrolled in an institution under the direction of the Minister of Universities and Colleges Affairs who would pass the examination set by that university.

MR. GIRARD: Yes. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Education would like to clarify that in terms of even hundreds.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: If the honourable member would direct that question to the Minister within whose department the institution is, then perhaps -- I don't know how he would handle it; he may wish an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur) Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Sometime ago I directed a question, I asked him what the government's position was in regard to redistribution of the electoral boundaries, or at least a report of the recommendation of the commission. At that time the Minister informed us that he was corresponding with Ottawa and awaited a reply. I ask the Minister now if he has a reply to the correspondence with Ottawa, and is prepared to tell the House what position the government is in now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an occasion to check the file in that respect very recently, so I cannot vouch for it as to whether or not a reply has as yet been received. The last time I was familiarizing myself with the subject matter no reply had been received up to that point in time. I can only advise my honourable friend as I did previously, the nature of my representation was that adjustments ought to be made in the formula of representation so as to bring greater equality of representation on a per capita basis as between let us say the Maritime region which has certain guarantees and the prairie region, which doesn't have the same kind of guarantee, but that's as far as I can go at this time.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. Would the First Minister be prepared to table all correspondence between himself and the Federal Government in regard to the distribution of electoral boundaries?

MR. SCHREYER: I would have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker, subject of course to the clearance with the authorities on the other end.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister tell us what uses the Manitoba Centennial Corporation is making of the land it purchased on Main Street between Higgins and Henry Street formerly the Nugget Hotel?

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs)(St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take this question as notice.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, since the Honourable Minister agreed to take the question as notice, perhaps he can take a supplementary -- what price was paid for this land?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of University Affairs. Is the Province of Manitoba giving support to the Communist Party of Canada in providing a place at the University of Winnipeg for the holding of the Tenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Internationalists, which is a revolutionary youth and student movement?

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

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I don't have the document that the honourable member is holding in his hands. I don't know what it is and I don't really . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MILLER: . . . give it to me. However I would point out that the University of Winnipeg is an autonomous institution and if they've allowed an organization to make use of their facilities, this they can do; they make it available to every organization that requests that space. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I think Social Creditists would be allowed too.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary. Is there going to be a charge made to the group for using the university premises?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the university will treat this the same as it does any other group.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the Federal Government's announced policy of yesterday where they will not employ illegal immigrants, such as draft dodgers and army deserters, in the Federal Civil Service, will the Premier indicate whether his government will follow that directive and not employ any illegal immigrants including . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Policy question.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . including draft dodgers and army deserters?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the answer would be self-evident in the sense that it would be both improper and illegal to employ anyone who has illegal residential -- or does not have legal status here as a legal resident or citizen.

MR. BOROWSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Premier's statement will he then undertake to replace professors of that university, some of whom are illegal -- in Canada illegally, draft dodgers, and I believe there's at least one army deserter employed by the university?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that the assurance would be helpful but it is an easy assurance to give, and is given hereby, that no one who is in Canada in any illegal manner is employed by any employing agency or entity, whether it be public or private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose): . . . much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ADAM: My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, and it relates to the question asked by the Member for Pembina. I wonder if the Minister could undertake to ascertain if it is correct that Imperial Oil is holding substantial stocks of chemical fertilizers for a price rise?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that any private entrepreneur that wants to maximize his returns in his business will do as he must do to do just that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. It relates to the committee make-up listed in today's votes and proceedings. Can he indicate to the House why the Member for Crescentwood has not been included in the

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . government's list for the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Apparently because the members of the House yesterday voted to approve the list that was established by the committee.

A MEMBER: Didn't realize our loss.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be so but the question relates to it, whether it was approved yesterday or not, why the Member for Crescentwood in view of his many statements on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. The question is argumentative, clearly out of order. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. The Honourable Member for Rhineland state his point of order?

MR. FROESE: Yes. The House Leader just mentioned that the report had been accepted by being received. I don't think this is correct. Generally when we receive a report it doesn't necessarily mean that it's adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: . . . point of order, and I presume that there is a stage at which the report has to be concurred in which I overlooked. The Clerk is nodding to me. I presume that at that time the honourable member would be able to make such amendments to the report as he desires to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Member for Riel's question, if it's any comfort to him if he looks on some of the other committees he will notice that I am not on some of these committees that I was on last year. --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that he was in the business of providing farmers with grasshopper spray last year, is it the intention of his department to get into the business of selling wheat sprays to farmers in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is indeed a matter of policy. The Estimates will reflect the government's continued participation in the kind of program that we launched last year -- not because of our own choosing at that particular time. At this point in time there is no policy position in favour of going beyond that state. Now if it proves to be desirable in the public interest sometime in future years, perhaps we may want to undertake that second step. At this point in time there is no policy position of that kind.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide an answer to the Member for Arthur who wanted to know the other day whether or not the Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba is charging farmers a cent for their wheat seeds and cleanout of this grain being sold to feed mills? Well my answer to that obviously has to be no, Mr. Speaker. The Minister doesn't charge anyone anything.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader on the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I, looking at the Clerk, was of the opinion that the report from the Committee to set up Standing Committee must be concurred in. I haven't done research into it myself but he now tells me that the report need not be moved for concurrence, that the report was received, that that is the normal way after the original motion to set up the committee, that the committees are set up, therefore with regret there will be no opportunity, as I previously indicated, to deal further with that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I should like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In reply to a question from the Member for Arthur he said that he was not charging farmers a cent a bushel for handling feed grains. Would he, would he now advise the House whether or not the Feed Grains Commission is charging farmers for the privilege of selling grain through the commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris obviously doesn't know the --(Interjection)-- yes doesn't know the question that was put to me. It has to do with the cleanout in the residue of feed grains, if you like, not feed grains itself. And in that connection neither I nor the Feed Grains Commission place any charges on the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government given consideration to setting up a provincial wheat board such as is the case in Ontario instead of belonging to the Canadian Wheat Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not given consideration to that kind of idea.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. In view of the statements made inside and outside of the House regarding The Pas Complex, I wonder if he could indicate to the House what steps he is taking in regard to the charges regarding the whole CFI question at The Pas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, a number of questions have been asked in the House, and there have been statements outside of the House respecting the proceedings dealing with The Pas Complex, and I would like to table copies of the verbatim report submission of the Deputy Attorney-General made in court on March 6th -- which is now a matter of public record. And in that I would like the honourable members to note that Mr. Pilkey in addressing the court read a letter received from the Inquiry Commission composed of C. Rhodes Smith, former Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Leon Mitchell, Q. C. and Dr. Murray Donnelly, and the letter reads as follows: "You have asked us to submit our views as to whether or not criminal proceedings should, if the Crown deems it advisable, go forward at this time. Recognizing that the responsibility for making this decision is yours, and not being privy to the proceedings contemplated, we submit the following observations:

1. The terms of reference given us by Order in Council January 27, 1971, make it mandatory that we comment on the conduct of various parties as is evident in several sections, of which we quote:

2. "(a) To inquire into, ascertain, and report upon the facts and circumstances relating to the development of the Forestry and Industrial Complex near The Pas in Manitoba, involving primarily Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Limited, River Saw Mills Company, M. P. Industrial Mills Limited, James Bertram and Son (Canada) Limited, including but without limiting the generality of the foregoing.

5. The nature of the contractual obligations undertaken by all persons involved in the Complex, and whether those obligations have been fulfilled adequately in good faith and for fair value."

The letter goes on: "Much evidence has been accumulated but there are several vital witnesses to hear and proceeding with the criminal process at this time might well prejudice obtaining this evidence. To go forward without the benefit of the Commission's work would be to prejudice many important issues which you have asked us to report on. Our report will provide a comprehensive and factual foundation from which the question of misconduct, if any, can be assessed. And we think it would be premature to proceed in advance of it. The only possible justification for so doing would be the statute of limitations. We assure you that we shall weigh and carefully consider the verbal evidence of witnesses and the massive documentation on this complex -- on this complex subject, and give you a full report just as soon as humanly possible, and hopefully by the end of September, 1973. The timing of the release of the report will be of course a decision for the government."

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that honourable members will read . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do believe that the honourable gentleman is taking up the oral question period with a statement which should have been delivered at that time. I have allowed part of the statement to be made simply because a question was asked and I thought the answer was relevant. But I do think that we are going beyond our rules when we are taking a long time to make an explanations.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside wish to state his point of order?

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): On a point of order, we on this side have had no

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . objection to the Attorney-General reading into the record these important matters. The point of order that I rise on, Mr. Speaker, is your consideration that if we do accept it as a statement being made by the Attorney-General that the usual privileges apply to other parties in the House, in terms of responding to the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. By leave we can proceed to any direction this Assembly desires. I am only the custodian of your rules and I was indicating that the answer was a little lengthy, and I think that's fair. Oral Questions. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't concluded the answer to the question. I intend to be very brief.

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

MR. JORGENSEN: On the point of order that you yourself raised, which I think is a very proper one, and I think that perhaps the best way to proceed at this stage is for the Attorney-General to ask for leave to revert to motions so that he is going to be in a position to be able to make that statement and comply with the rules of the House, which would enable members on this side of the House to comment on that particular statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on that point of order too. There has been many questions asked in this House regarding this subject. A great deal of time was wasted; it's an important matter. I have asked the Attorney-General, and I hope you allow him the privilege of answering a very important question for all of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I met with members of the Commission of Enquiry, all three members of that Commission, discussed the procedural problems with them, and as a result of those discussions I have issued instructions to Special Counsel to proceed with the criminal prosecutions as he recommends.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Attorney-General with respect to the letter that he's just read on to the record. Could he tell us the names of the people who signed that letter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, at the time that Mr. Pilkey read that letter into the record at court, it was indicated that Mr. Smith, who was then in England, had had the letter read to him and agreed with its contents. It was therefore, since Mr. Smith was not physically able to be present to sign the letter, signed only by the remaining commissioners.

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

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education, and relative to the difference of \$33,000 in the amount he has approved for the Brandon Regional Vocational High School and the amount of the tender approved by the school board, is he prepared to meet with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question has been asked. Answer has been given. A variation of a question is not permitted. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: On a point of order, Sir. With great respect, may I be permitted to complete my question in order that you may rule it in order or out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm not going to debate with the honourable member but the amount that he has said indicates to me that it was already asked this afternoon. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can he report to the House what were his results with negotiations he held with the directors of the Unity Bank.

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

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I took this question as notice a few days ago and I will report to the House in due course.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. Perhaps at this stage the Minister can tell the House if he had any negotiations, or he didn't, with the directors of Unity Bank.

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

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. My

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. WATT cont'd.) . . . . question arises out of the answer that he gave me a few minutes ago regarding the sale of the cleanout on seed grains to the feed mills. I wonder if the Minister would confer with his Executive Assistant and find out if it is not a fact that the feed mills are deducting one cent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is argumentative in that context. The Honourable member rephrase it?

MR. WATT: I'll rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister have a second look at the question that I put to him, or posed to him, some time ago in regard to the sale of the cleanout to the feed mills. If one cent a bushel is not being charged through the feed mills or deducted from the farmers from whom they are purchasing cleanout in their seed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well I don't know, Mr. Speaker, why the member persists on a -- I have taken the question as notice and my department has supplied me with the answer just given. Now unless he's alleging that the department itself in its investigation is in error, I could undertake another check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he be willing to provide members of the House, or at least would he provide me with a copy of the manual Evaluating Farm Land for Assessment Purposes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): I'm sure that that can be done, that we can provide the honourable member with a manual.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: For clarification purposes, I asked whether he would be willing to provide me with a copy of the manual that is being used for evaluating and farm land for assessment purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I would take the question as notice. I thought I had already answered the honourable member. If such manual exists I'll provide him with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education and I wonder if he could advise the House how many of the 46 school divisions misinterpreted the regulations in the same way as did Rolling River in requesting the grants?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any.

MR. GIRARD: Yes. I'd like to submit another question to the Minister of Education, and ask him if all the students of Manitoba will be required to remain in school until the same date that will apply universally in all divisions, and I think that date would be indicated as the third week in June?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: There's no intent on the part of the Department of Education to allow any deviation on the regulations or the provisions of the School Attendance Act, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the provisions are quite clear.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, then I'd like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, then. Does the Minister suggest by that answer that the procedures followed in the past years was in fact a deviation from the regulations where the students were exempted on an earlier date.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member surely well knows that under the provisions of the School Attendance Act, there is permission granted to the principal, the superintendent, to allow for early dismissal and he's, I'm sure he's equally well aware of the fact that within the eleven and nine days at senior and elementary school respectively allotted for in-service, parents days and other business within the school, every school division is at liberty to allocate that time as it best sees fit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Attorney-General. I ask the Attorney-General if in his recent discussions with the members of the Churchill Forest Enquiry Commission, has he been able to ascertain or has the Commission indicated to him

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . whether or not any schedule for the hearing of the testimony of Arthur D. Little Incorporated has been established?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I met with the Commission to deal with procedural matters that were of importance to them and I didn't, I didn't question them about their course of activities in the next short time, and I didn't feel I had any right to do so.

MR. ENNS: One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I recognize it may not be the Attorney-General's capacity to answer the question, but I wonder as the Minister responsible for reporting to the House for the activities of the Commission, can he indicate whether or not the testimony from Arthur D. Little Incorporated is going to be brought forward before that Commission.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a matter for the Commission to decide. Certainly if I had my way, I'm certainly interested in what Arthur D. Little has to say. I'm sure they will too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Attorney-General. With respect to the charges that he has now announced are going to be proceeded with re the CFI operation, could he tell the House why charges weren't proceeded with before now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will obtain a copy of the document which I filed with -- tabled with the House and read it, he will understand the Crown's position as it was placed before the court when the question was raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I'll try and keep it so it isn't argumentative, Mr. Speaker. I wonder can the Honourable Minister indicate to the members of the House the number of free passes that will be issued for the hockey game tonight and the wrestling tomorrow night, and who's going to have the passes?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, -- and I refer my honourable friend to the statement that I made in this House last week when he was probably sleeping -- I don't know.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was asked in the House the other day what the salary of the President of Phoenix Data is. My understanding is that the President of Phoenix Data receives \$24,000 a year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer to my question, would he confirm that that salary for the President of Phoenix Data is approximately comparable to the salaries paid to the Presidents -- the chairmen of the board of our other two utilities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't concur with that, but I indicated to my honourable friend that when I gave him the amount of the salary he would be able to make his own comparisons.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if he's been able to ascertain the approximate projection of student depopulation in Manitoba for the coming year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other questions, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order. I believe that I was holding the floor yesterday when we adjourned and there was still some time left for me to address the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has 18 minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I probably will take them all in view of the fact that there is a backlog of questions that I have to answer.

Yesterday we closed off, Mr. Chairman, with the suggestion having been made by the Leader of the Liberal Party that somehow I was closing off all of the avenues of debate and I was responding, Mr. Chairman, that if this was an attempt on my part that I was being singularly unsuccessful that as a matter of fact that debate was something which I not only did not wish to close off but I wished to welcome, that each of the steps, Mr. Chairman, that I have taken have both informally and formally made it more feasible for debate to take place rather than less feasible. Any suggestion that Mr. Booy not serving on the Water Commission closes off his opportunity for debate is wrong, and to the contrary. As a matter of fact he has more of an opportunity to debate than if he was on the Water Commission. The same with regards to Mr. Newbury.

Mr. Chairman, I did make a statement in the House yesterday which I would like to correct because I found that my memory failed me in that respect on checking my own memorandum. I said that I called in all of the lawyers to advise the Water Commission, and I believe I said that I had not previously told them what my own advice was and I let them give offhand answers. I did send them, Mr. Chairman, my interdepartmental correspondence with the Commission to indicate what I had advised them, and asked them to come and advise the Commission on their own. I think that the members of the Cabinet therefore certainly knew what I had been advising them; I don't believe that that is the case with the Deputy Minister, the Deputy Attorney-General. However I'm really not certain of that, he may also have known. But rather than let a miss statement go, Mr. Chairman, I would like to at least correct that, that was the manner in which this was done.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's rather unusual that I am referred to as closing off all debate when the same person who makes the reference indicates that we have set up the Environmental Council, and I think it's worth noting, Mr. Chairman, what the Environmental Council is. Every single person who made a complaint about Manitoba's conduct in the area of the environment, every person who expressed a concern, every person who indicated that they would like to become involved in the environment, was made a member of the Environmental Council. That is how the list was made. We made that list of people; we told them to come in; they were not called in on the basis of being our friends, the reverse, Mr. Chairman. They were called in the basis that they wanted to have an input, and in most cases, Mr. Chairman, because they were complaining about various factors in pollution, and we said, we will let you have this, or we would like you to have this Environmental Council; it will be run entirely by you; you will have full access to the staff on every area of the environment on which we are working, and you will have the right to choose your own executive and to run your affairs as you see fit, and the Department will facilitate your staff needs. Mr. Chairman, that's a very odd way for a person who is trying to squelch people to deal with them.

Now the honourable member then indicates that the Environmental Council was not listened to. Well it's quite a different thing, Mr. Chairman, for providing an opportunity for people to have a say in the best way possible and abdicating the responsibility of government. I presume that my honourable friend would say that if he had such a council that he would no longer be the Minister, and that the council would make the decisions. Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that I am the person who is responsible to the people of Manitoba; I have to go back to them for the purpose of seeking an endorsement, or otherwise, and therefore I am the person . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated yesterday that he was going to table some letters. I wonder if he'd care to table them so we could see them.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in tabling the letter that my honourable friend is referring to and just so that it is not out of context, Mr. Speaker, I will table -- and this is a thing that I do regretfully, I do it regretfully because it is not a good idea to have interdepartmental correspondence go on the table, but in view of the misrepresentations that have been made as to the nature of the relationship I had with the Water Commission, I am going

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . to table the interdepartmental correspondence which I think puts into context what happened with the Water Commission. So it's not only one letter, it is a series of documents back and forth which I think, Mr. Chairman, confirms everything that I have said in public on this question, that what I have done privately is what I have done in public, and I will table the document and table copies of it for honourable members.

It is a wrong -- it is a wrong practice. In the last analysis I should not be bringing into public -- I should not be bringing, and honourable members should not be bringing into public internal controversies with staff because, Mr. Chairman, if that is going to be a matter of public debate, and the Honourable Member, the Leader of the -- the Member for Lakeside, who knows a little better than the Leader of the Liberal Party, is recognizing the problem that we are having here -- if staff people can bring their problems into the House through the Opposition so that the opposition is forwarding the position of staff through the Legislature and the Minister responds to that then, Mr. Speaker, the staff tries to find a way of getting their position through the Opposition rather than through the Minister. I am indicating, Mr. Speaker, that I think that this is not a good practice; it's not one that I would normally follow, but in view of the tremendous misinformation that has been related with regards to my dealings with the Water Commission, Mr. Speaker, at this point I can see no choice. And I want to indicate that the letter that I referred to -- (Interjection) -- and it is not a precedent, and I don't intend to continue it -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Liberal Party wants a copy. I had a -- here is an extra copy.

The Water Commission said to me, Mr. Chairman, in a memo of October the 22nd just to see whether there is -- they wanted to hold a certain type of meeting and I didn't. And this is why they were fired. This is what the honourable member is referring to. On October 22nd the Water Commission by its chairman wrote me: "I am prepared to recommend to the Commission that it provide you with a firm commitment not to make use of the legal powers of inquiry conferred in Sections 4(1) and 5 of the Act in conducting the public meetings on Lake Winnipeg regulation." Now, Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to keep people quiet and the Commission said that they were providing me with a firm commitment that they would not do the things which I said would take the matter out of governmental control and put it into the control of the Opposition and I deal with those things in these memos, I could have kept them quiet by saying, "I accept your commitment." But, Mr. Speaker, such a commitment -- and I mean no disrespect to the members of the Commission, because I don't think they fully understood what they were saying -- such a commitment could not be made by them; and what is furthermore, more important, could not be accepted by me as a Minister of the Crown.

In a letter to me, Mr. Speaker, dated on October 28th, 1971, which again is filed, the Commission said to me: "The Manitoba Water Commission will hold these hearings in the form of public meetings at which representatives of Manitoba Hydro and the departments involved will have the opportunity to outline the proposed regulation scheme to the public. The Commission will then offer any participant the opportunity to inform the Commission of aspects that may have been given insufficient attention and to suggest improvement. The Commission will also offer any party affected by the regulation the opportunity to inform the Commission of its special interests and to make a case for programs of compensation if these interests are thought to be adversely affected. At these meetings the Manitoba Water Commission does not intend to make use of its legal powers of inquiry under Section 4 of The Manitoba Water Commission Act; the Commission does not intend to allow parties to subpoena witnesses, or to allow the examination or cross-examination of witnesses. The Commission intends that all questions will be directed to the chairman who may disallow questions which in his opinion will not serve the purpose of information and clarification or which are properly phrased."

Mr. Speaker, the Commission said that it would do exactly what the government was asking it to do. But it said it wanted to do so in a form which wasn't in accordance with The Water Commission Act, and we said, "We cannot accept that. If you wish to hold hearings they must be hearings; the government and you agree as to what the nature of these inquiries should be and therefore if you are going to continue with this inquiry you are going to continue it along those lines." I don't think that the members of the Water Commission thought that there was anything untoward in the suggestion that they're making. But, Mr. Speaker, had I accepted that, then the honourable member would have had criticism of me. Then the honourable member would have said that the Minister had an arrangement with the Water Commission whereby they would be -- and this is what he would say, although I don't charge that the Water Commission

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . was making that type of suggestion because I'm trying to be fair to these members; I don't believe that they had anything bad in mind -- but if I had answered this correspondence, yes, would the Leader of the Liberal Party have said, "well now you did a nice thing and you have not aroused the ire of the Water Commission and you have not stifled debate, you have behaved admirably." Are you kidding, Mr. Chairman? The honourable member would have said that there was a collusive arrangement between the Water Commission and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to enter into a pretence to do one thing and to do another. Now is that not . . . ? Because, Mr. Chairman, if I had done that he would be right to make that type of suggestion.

And, Mr. Speaker, to now charge me with having stilled these people is the most contemptuous charge which this man could make because in spite of this fact they went ahead, Mr. Chairman. The Water Commission conducted its hearings. If I wanted to stifle them I could have said to Mr. Cass Booy at that time, "We no longer want you to continue these meetings." They conducted the meetings; they delivered a report in which they made their entire statement, which by the way was entirely in accordance with government policy so there is nothing in the report which would have inspired any suggestion that the Commission be dis-established, and I told Mr. Booy, and I told the media and I tell my honourable friend, that the reason that Mr. Booy was changed from the Commission is that the hearings were taking on the context of a review of hydro policy, and whether he meant it or not -- and I'm not making charges in this connection -- it was looking as if the Commission was reviewing the Hydro policy and whatever we told the Commission, and the honourable member will find it in these memoranda, we told them that we were not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: . . . we were not, Mr. Chairman, asking them as one of their functions to appear to be a veto power or a review power over the Hydro policy. That was not the purpose of the meetings, and when it appeared to take on that purpose I told Mr. Booy that in view of this fact, and whether or not you are to blame, I am changing the Chairman of the Water Commission, because I want the public to fully understand, and the understanding is coming through, that the Water Commission is not reviewing the hydro-electric policy of the Province of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says it is coming through. I tried to make this point for several years in the House when he wasn't here. We indicated what those meetings were; we had complaints about them by the Member for Riel; we had complaints about them by everybody who wanted to complain about them, but we always indicated what they were, and apparently what the Leader of the Liberal Party is saying, in spite of the fact that the government had a policy with regards to these meetings, that the Water Commission should be the final authority as to whether the government's policy is correct or not. And we said that that is not so. . . . the honourable member likes it or not I am responsible for the administration of the department. I suppose that can be changed by the democratic process and I accept the possibility that that could be changed but it is not Mr. Cass Booy who has to answer to the public, it is I, and therefore, I think, Mr. Chairman, that whether my honourable friend will admit it or not if he was in government he would either behave the same way I did, which I doubt, or he would behave improperly because the proper steps were taken.

And these people have been shut up? Cass Booy has not been shut up. Would it surprise the honourable member for him to know that Cass Booy remains a member of the Commission of Environment. Just knock these people out of the way, and I presume that on the Commission of Environment, that Mr. Booy is fulfilling his role without complaints, and is operating within the terms of reference of that committee, and is doing the job. There has been, Mr. Chairman, no attempt, no indeed, if an attempt was made then it would merely be a demonstration of lack of effectiveness. There has been no success in keeping anybody quiet concerning this program, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, there are ways to keep people quiet; there are ways to keep people quiet at the expense of the citizens of Manitoba. I suppose if I wanted to keep the Norway House band quiet, I would give them \$14,000 which is what Dave Courcne said when he came to see me, he says, "It's a small amount, why don't you give it to them?" And I replied, because I was stingy. Now was that going to keep Dave Courcne or the Norway House Band quiet? Is that an action which is designed to keep him quiet? I believe that it was wrong for the people of Manitoba to pay \$14,000 to keep somebody quiet, so they'll make a noise, and they'll make their position, and I will answer their position; and if the public thinks I am

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . wrong, they will be able to do something about it. But if I kept them quiet, such as the honourable member suggests, then they would not --(Interjection)-- pardon me? The honourable member says now that he didn't suggest I'm trying to keep people quiet. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is his answer that he now does not suggest that I'm trying to silence people, I guess I've made my point and I'll sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel a bit sorry that I have to change the topic of this very interesting kind of debate. However, I would also be certainly remiss if I did not during the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Resources bring up some questions at least with regard to my area, and more specifically that area which is affected by Columbia Forest Products in Sprague.

I know that that particular area has been in question for some time now, and I want to suggest for the record that the people of Manitoba ought not to think of that area as one that is not viable or one that is not aggressive, because in fact, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister might well know, that community and the area served by that community, which includes a number of communities, is certainly a very aggressive and very lively one. It might be of interest to know that they've succeeded in building a brand new skating rink; they have a new addition to their school; they have a new community hall, and so on, and that community, Mr. Chairman, whether we like it or not is certainly a very viable, aggressive, progressive community that ought to be treated as such.

With regards to Columbia Forest more specifically, I would like to indicate, as is well known by the Minister no doubt, that that is the main industry of the area; it ought to be treated as the main industry of the area. It's a little different when we speak of a metropolis such as Winnipeg losing one industry because that is not in proportion as significant when you relate it to the area itself. But we are I think, loathe to accept that when we deal with Columbia Forest Products we are not only dealing with an industry, we are dealing with a community.

I think one of the problems that we have faced in the past is that the community itself has been divorced and devoid of information and participation with regard to Columbia Forest Products, I was very happy, and I'm thankful to the Minister, that he allowed us to meet some few days ago at which I was able to voice this as strongly as I could, and I was happy to hear him entertain a suggestion that possible --(Interjection)--. Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the Minister might be keeping me quiet, and he probably knows that I am somewhat patient, but I wouldn't want him to think that I'm altogether that patient that I will be quiet all along. I'll be quiet as long as I see the money -- maybe I'm related to Dave Courcne.

However, I want to suggest to the Minister that it was not a facetious suggestion on my part that now that we have established the Columbia Forest Products belongs to the government, or belongs to the Crown Corporation, that it might well be feasible that a Board of Directors will be established, and I was happy to see the Minister entertain suggestion that a member from the locality might well be one of the members of the Board of Direction.

I don't know if it is fully appreciated but to the people of that area this is a very significant move for two reasons. First of all it will assist the people of the area to make an input into the direction which will be taken by that corporation, or by that company, and secondly, and probably most important, Mr. Chairman, it will enable the people of the area to have access to information on the direction, on the future, on the operation of that company, and to that community that is vital.

We have found great difficulty in the past in obtaining information that is concrete and significant and meaningful for the area. With regard to Columbia Forest we had difficulty, Mr. Chairman, having government tell us their assessment of what is likely to happen. We have difficulty in obtaining information of costs, information of where does the money go, information of why is it that our producers are paid as little as they are. We had difficulty finding information as to why we had difficulty showing profits. We have difficulty finding out for example, what is the government's assessment of the natural resource on which this company depends? These are some questions, Mr. Chairman, that I hope will be less difficult to obtain now that the responsibility of the Minister has been changed so that a different minister is in charge, and I'm confident that whether the news is good or not, that we are more likely to get it straight-forwardly now than we have in the past. At least it is my hope.

I would like to know for example, Mr. Chairman, in very unequivocal terms, the

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . details of the insurance policy. There was speculation that the insurance policy was for \$2 million and then we hear it was for \$1 million; what is the amount for which the portion that was burnt was insured for? I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if in that insurance policy there was a rebuilding clause? I would like to know if there was a rebuilding clause, will it be adhered to? I would like to know if it is not adhered to, what are the arrangements being made? And I think, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, that that kind of information should be not only made available, but should be given to the community that is dependent on that very industry.

There are a few other problems that arise in that immediate locality, for which this same Minister is responsible. He will no doubt recall that a few years ago, possibly last year, at least when he was then Minister of Mines and Resources, I brought to them a problem in the area of drainage, and the real problem is faced by those people who live in local government districts, and local government districts which have the property owned in large proportion by government. The LGD of Piney for example is some 85 percent of the area Crown land. Now what problem does that create in the area of drainage? The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that before the farmer is able to use his land and drain it properly, he has to drain the Crown land that surrounds him, and he has to do this on very little assessment. He has to do this on very little grant because the grant arrangement is 50-50 to a certain amount up to approval, an amount approved by government, and I suggest very humbly that that amount is not very significant, and they cannot raise more on their own because of the assessment problem.

I suggest that there is a problem of assessment while that is not directly related to the Minister's responsibilities it is rather significant that you'll find some farmers in the area who will sell their cultivated land back to the government -- and as you well know the government is very prepared to buy land in that area and they call it their reclamation policy I believe, or some policy by which they are glad to obtain ownership of the land -- and these farmers are then able to lease the land from the government. What happens in that kind of thing, Mr. Chairman, is that they can sell the land to the government and then lease it for less than they would pay in property taxes, and those people of course, are quick to figure out the advantages and use this kind of advantage. The end result is that the LGD has lost some assessment, and the further end result is that the finances that are required from the LGD on property taxes to provide funds for our schools and for the municipal operation, are simply not there. That is where we find mill rates that are excessively high, a hundred mills more or less, and I think that that is rather ridiculous. And I pointed this out, Mr. Chairman, during the debate, when we were about - when we did grant the City of Winnipeg 3 - 1/2 million dollars over a period of three years, and my objection at that time, as you will recall, was that we are asking those people as Manitobans to supplement people who are not paying as much in property taxes and I think that that is grossly unjust.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the attempts made by government to implement what they call a stay-option, when you look at the problems of the sparsely populated local government districts of low assessment, I cannot but refrain if I don't want to make some very serious accusations, because I feel that in a subtle way we are telling those very people your area is not viable, you might as well get out. We are telling them this on the basis of our property taxation; we are telling them this on the basis of our drainage; we are telling them this on the basis of providing employment; we are telling them this on the basis of developing roads; we are telling them this on the basis of developing tourism, and so on, and these people, not so naive may I submit, cannot but understand that they are subtly being told, look you don't quite rate, and I reject this kind of subtle suggestion, Mr. Chairman. I don't do this in any way to inflict upon the present government that that is simply their policy. I don't suggest that that was not the case in the past but we have lived with that kind of thing too long and it is time that we have changed. It's time we changed so that we recognize that that area is part of Manitoba, and that area is viable and that area should be developed.

I suppose that the Minister has just recently been made responsible for the developing Development Corporation, and I can recognize that he probably doesn't have all the details with regards to Columbia Forest, but on the long-term basis, Mr. Chairman, he might as well have his mind made up that Columbia Forest Products will not disintegrate, will not discontinue, but will rather have to be treated in a way that will increase both employment, production and revenue.

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GIRARD cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rhineland is very prone to suggest that we have written off something. I suppose that that comes to the Honourable Member for Rhineland with some degree of sadness. I suggest, however, and to repeat the Premier's words, I suggest that the reason why we are not necessarily unhappy that that particular industry has become part of the Crown, in terms of ownership -- in fact, Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that we would have saved money had we accepted the suggestion I made here last year that the government owned it anyway, they didn't have to go through litigation costs and, by the way, we'd like to know what amount we spent in that regard. How much money did we spend defending a defenceless position? --(Interjection)-- However, I believe that when the Crown owns an industry of that kind, they own it not to make a profit, because I believe if the Crown owns simply to make a profit, that is not justified, but they own it furthermore to provide a service to the area and they ought to keep it operating, not at an extreme loss, but they ought to keep it operating at least at break-even point because they are providing a service to the area, and if you want to acknowledge that public ownership, if you want to acknowledge that public ownership has value, then I say it has value in that it is providing a service that will not be provided otherwise.

Now, Mr. Chairman, again speaking of the same area, I'll voice another disappointment that I will probably be speaking of again, and I suggested this in the House before, that particular area of Manitoba is certainly one of the most potential tourism areas, but as I look through the estimates I find that tourism has been shackled, has been given no money. We prefer to give it to other departments rather than look at tourism. --(Interjection)-- Then I would like to suggest here and now, and I will again, that we look at that area of Manitoba as what it really is, a viable, a promising, a beautiful area that should be respected by both the Mines people and Tourism.

. . . continued on next page.

## MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take my yearly excursion on the Mines and Natural Resources and of course, I would like to express my concerns on the Mines and Natural Resources as it affects my constituency and also people who live off the fisheries in my area.

I'm not going to talk too much about the Hydro development because that's been covered I think very adequately by both sides of this House, and I think actually if I was to speak on it I would have to support the Hydro development for northern Manitoba. I think we must have Hydro if we want to attract industry to our province, we must provide cheap hydro for industry and for the people of this province. And of course I think that, I feel that anyone who opposes the low level diversion of South Indian Lake is doing a disservice to this province and to the people of this province.

But I want to speak, Mr. Chairman, about the fisheries on Lake Dauphin and Lake Winnipegosis as well as Lake Manitoba because my constituency borders on these three lakes and also we surround, my constituency surrounds the Ebb and Flow Lake. Now the problem of fisheries has been brought up by the Member for Roblin on Lake Winnipegosis and I thank the honourable member for his concern about Lake Winnipegosis, because there's no doubt, Sir, that Lake Winnipegosis is now in serious deterioration of the fisheries on that lake. In fact we have seen the fisheries there diminish from a three million pound catch for pickerel down to a hundred thousand pounds. There has been approximately 225,000 pound reduction between 1970 and 71. But a few years back, Sir, the catch on Lake Winnipegosis was approximately 300 pounds annually. This is a disastrous reduction in catch. And prior to 1969 there was little or no management or research being done on our inland fisheries and the result is now evident and this also has reduced income for many people who supplemented their income around Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Dauphin and many fishermen who derive their living from fisheries entirely.

I think that Lake Dauphin and Lake Winnipegosis are two lakes where we could really try and have management and research because these lakes are completely deteriorated in my estimation and there are some fishermen now even on Lake Winnipegosis who are prepared to see the lake closed. I have been receiving some representation that perhaps the fishing has deteriorated to such an extent that it may as well be closed. This perhaps may be something will have to be decided upon by management and the fishermen and I think it should be discussed.

One thing that I find that we should look into is that we know how much the commercial catch is annually, we're able to have figures on this, but it appears that we don't know what's happening as far as sport fishing is concerned. There don't seem to be too stringent regulations regarding the catch. There are daily limits but I don't know how closely they are checked. And also the size, the size of the fish being taken. Since we don't check the daily catch how do we check the size. It appears to me that there are no regulations as far as size are concerned. I think that if we have a creel census on these lakes, especially on Lake Dauphin, Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba, I think we'll be surprised at the amount of fish that's coming out of these lakes other than commercial fishing. Now last year, I like to spend at least one day a year fishing and I happened to be in an area where there was about 13 or 14 boats fishing and everybody was catching fish like mad but I found that all the fish that were being caught or the majority of the fish being caught were all under size, in fact I doubt very much whether any of these fish being caught that day had ever had a chance to spawn. They were all under size. I fished all day and I had a hard time to get my limit because I was only keeping fish that were adult fish and I threw perhaps 25, 30 fish back during the day because they were all under size. I think this is something that we have to investigate immediately if we want to rehabilitate these lakes and keep them in high production stage.

Another thing, that we are doing some research I understand on the migration of fish from one lake to the other. However, this is just in the preliminary stages, it's only been done the last couple of years, they're now tagging fish on the Waterhen River to find out whether they are migrating into other lakes. But I would suspect that the smaller fish are taken down the river with the fast run of water. There's no doubt that many of the smaller fish are taken from one lake to the other.

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ADAM cont'd) . . . . .

These are some of my concerns. I see by the report that there has been an increase in the seeding of fry into the different lakes but we have been doing this for years. We've had hatcheries on Lake Winnipegosis in the past. There was a hatchery at Salt Point, I believe, and it was a whitefish hatchery and we have been seeding these lakes for years but where are the fish? They're just not there. So we have to try and do a little more research and management to find out just what's happening. As I say, I think that we should ask the Minister to see if it would not be possible to have a creel census for this coming year on the lakes that I mentioned.

I would like to move into --there's been some concern about the population of our water-fowl and the reasons for the decline in the duck population. Of course man has always been the biggest predator. --(Interjection)-- I see the Member for Lakeside, because he lives along the lake there must be some ducks up there. I say that man has been the biggest predator. --(Interjection)-- Well my colleague's interjection here says Conservative members have been the biggest predators. Now I don't know if that is correct or not. That is not my opinion that's his opinion. I say man is the biggest predator of everything that exists. We have not learned to live with our fellow creatures. I submit that the skunks are --(Interjection)-- over the past year -- and I'm not talking about Conservatives I'm talking about skunks.

A MEMBER: Keep your comments, talk about skunks.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, I notice that the fellows on the other side are getting a little bit hilarious here. Mr. Chairman, over the past few years the value of furs have declined in price and particularly skunks, and as a result we find all over Manitoba that there are a large number of skunks that are not being taken, they're not being trapped to any great extent to my knowledge. I know they're all over my place -- and I don't include myself.

A MEMBER: What's attracting the skunks to this province all of a sudden?

MR. ADAM: But it so happens that my farms are adjacent to a very very nice duck marsh and I notice I can go out there any time and see duck nest eggs all eaten up and broken up and I think that it's either skunks or racoon or crows.

A MEMBER: Or socialists.

MR. ADAM: Another reason that I think our duck population is diminishing, and this may come as a surprise, but I think that many of our ducks die of lead poisoning because many ducks are shot at and they do not die they fly away with a lot of lead pellets in them and I think they later die of lead poisoning. I would ask the Minister if he would consider banning the use of lead shells the next hunting season and that only stainless steel shot shells should be allowed to be used.

The Member for Rock Lake mentioned the problem of blackbirds. That certainly is an irksome and a costly nuisance particularly in my area. As I mentioned, I live along a lovely marsh and the blackbirds like to nest there at night, in the day time they like to eat my oats. It's getting so bad that we've had to just about all but discontinue seeding oats. It is a problem but I also agree with the Minister that we should not use the funds that were discussed the other day for compensation. There must be some other method of handling this problem. Perhaps we can get our culinary experts to devise some kind of a dish or something. They must be awfully good eating because they can eat oats like mad. They like to eat the oats in the milk stage. They're milk fed blackbirds in other words.

I'm a little concerned about the deer population also. I think that there's been a very big increase in the bag this year; 2000 I believe increase over last year. This looks to me like a lot of deer. I don't hunt any more myself, I discontinued hunting deer several years ago . . .

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. ADAM: . . . and I think that we should only hunt the deer when they've over-populated and they can't feed themselves any more. So that's the way I feel about it. I know there's been a lot of talk about predator control and they speak of wolves. Well it happens that I'm a little friend of the wolves; however, I think that because we've allowed, we've had stupid governments --(Interjection) -- unwise governments.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. We haven't had stupid governments, just got smart wolves.

## MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: We've had unwise governments who allowed man to go out, the biggest predator, and shoot all the deer and as a result the natural food of the wolves are no longer existent so they have to go for sheep. Man is greedy, he wants sheep, he wants deer, he wants everything. That's man's nature and I say that if government want to allow man to take everything he should - if he wants to take the food that belongs to the wolves well then he should compensate the farmer.

A MEMBER: Compensate the wolf.

MR. ADAM: Which is what I say. They have to eat too. And if we take their natural food well then naturally they're going to go after our domesticated animals. So you can't have it both ways, can't have it both ways. I'm sure the Member for Lakeside agrees with me on that.

I had some other things I wanted to say, perhaps I may have time later in the Estimates. Oh there's one thing that I wanted to mention when I was talking about Lake Dauphin; I think that Lake Dauphin at one time used to be a heavy producer -- and I want the Minister to take particular note of this-- Lake Dauphin used to be a heavy producer of Grade A tulibeas that used to weigh around two pounds. That was a very sought after fish at one time for smoking purposes and also for export, they were A whites. Lake Dauphin also was a quite a heavy producer of Goldeye. I know this because I used to fish there when I was 18 years old. And that is no longer existent. Those species are practically non-existent in those lakes any longer.

I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that's about all I have to say. I may have a chance to speak a little later on. Thank you very much.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I really have to apologize to my honourable friend but the old system of Estimates was that a Minister had unlimited time. We now are confined to a half hour like every other member. As a result I have a backlog of people to answer questions on who I have not answered and that's one of the accommodations that apparently will have to be made in order so that we can deal with these. --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Well I think that the Honourable Minister of Colleges and Universities will have the same problem and I am having a problem. I'm not pretending to be superior to the others. The fact is that we used to be able to get up and answer for two hours. --(Interjection)-- Pardon me? Well we're in the last half hour now. Private Members starts at 4:30. So we're in the last half hour now.

I'd like to deal if I can first with the last questions I had and try and get back as far as I can. I continue to appreciate the remarks that are made with regard to wildlife, particularly by rural members and the Member for Assiniboia who continue I admit to educate me on many questions and things that I cannot answer offhand.

I will deal with the honourable member's remarks concerning the fishery. I think that this is one of those dilemmas that we will never be able to solve on the basis of the apparent conflict between an attempt to get as much as one can out of the fisheries today and at the same time a desire to conserve. We are now involved with a program on Lake Winnipeg which is designed to provide an income for fishermen and at the same time provide for the future of the fishery. And although it may be ideal in its conception, I can assure my honourable friend that nobody agrees with what we are doing; at least they will not say they agree. The fisherman who is given a 4,000 pound quota says he would like a 6,000 pound quota and says that the government is either stupid or ignorant or their biologists don't know anything, unless they will give the quota that the fishermen request. The person who does not get a licence because if you give an unlimited number of licence you make everybody poor rather than making everybody earn a living will not be satisfied with that system. So when the honourable member says close Lake Winnipegosis and see if we can bring back the fishery, I know that there would be some people who would go along with him. --(Interjection)--

MR. ADAM: I just wanted to correct the Minister. I did not say that we should close Lake Winnipegosis. I said some of the fishermen are now talking about it.

MR. GREEN: I apologize to the honourable member and I also congratulate him for his prudence, because the fact is that although the idea may be sound in terms of closing the lake for the purpose of conserving it back, the fact is that the people who traditionally make an

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . income, any income, on that lake would not cotton to a suggestion readily that it be closed, even though the idea is sound, and therefore you may find people in the area as the honourable member has said who talk about closing down the lake, but the government has to try -- and I hope that this is in accordance with the honourable member's wishes and I think it is -- that the government must try to maintain the income of the people in the area and at the same time do something about the fact that the lake is not producing as much as we would hope it would produce. And again I apologize to the honourable member. He did not say that he would close the lake but he said that some people are making that type of suggestion.

For the honourable member's benefit I can confirm some of the things that he has said. With regard to Lake Winnipegosis, pickerel production has reached an all time low. The winter pickerel harvest for '71 - '72 was only 5,000 pounds, while the 1972 open water season produced only 54,000 pounds of pickerel. In the early 1960's the annual pickerel harvest was often measured in millions of pounds. In an effort to improve Lake Winnipegosis fishery a number of changes have been proposed or implemented, and these are suggested things: One, that restrictions have been placed on a number of commercial fisher licences issued and the length of the commercial fishing season and the over-all lake quota which is again one of the things that I say we have a problem with.

There will be an increased gill net mesh size of four to four and a half inches. The mesh size changeover will be phased in through progressive zoning over a five-year period. It's not something that's intended to be done abruptly. This will allow fishing to continue and net replacement to occur as old nets are worn out. The study of fish catching efficiency of various cord sizes will be continued to assure that mesh size changes will have the desired effect.

Three, a delayed sport fishing season on known pickerel spawning rivers associated with Lake Winnipegosis will be implemented. Now this isn't intended to cut the season out completely but at least it will be delayed so that I presume the commercial fishermen will have the better chance

Number four, the development of pickerel rearing areas to raise fish in small lakes and impoundments around Lake Winnipegosis to a size large enough to enhance their chance of survival to marketable size is being continued. The feasibility of opening a white fishery on Lake Winnipegosis was investigated but it was found that the special commercial whitefish season was not warranted -- a special commercial whitefish season was not warranted at this time due to low fish stock. So I can tell the honourable member that the Department has a concern with the areas that he raised. I thank him for raising them and I hope that his raising them will urge us on in this respect.

With regard to Lake Manitoba which he also mentioned, pickerel and sauger harvest during '71 - '72 season of 483,000 pounds represented a considerable decline from the harvest of one to three million pounds for those species during the 1960's. Most of the fishermen obtain their best harvest from early run fish during the first part of the season and were unable to catch as many fish as '71 - '72 due to a late freeze-up; however much of the decline was due to reduced pickerel stocks. Attempts will be made in 1973 to increase pickerel stocks through rearing experiments similar to those which have been attempted on Lake Winnipegosis. So the facts that I quoted with regard to Lake Winnipegosis and the attempts that were made on that lake will also apply to Lake Manitoba.

With regard to predators, the honourable member has indicated part of the conflict as between those who are in favour of protecting the wolf and the coyote, and the sheepherders who feel that the Department should be taking a more enthusiastic position in these connections and I believe I dealt with that problem earlier in my remarks. Again, we are in the dilemma of having to strike a balance between two contending groups. I thank the honourable member for his suggestions with regard to the banning of the use of lead shells. I'm really not in a position to make a comment on that at the present time and I will do so when the Department is able to look into it.

In regard to Lake Dauphin I believe the honourable member is aware that the Water Commission is now holding investigations with regard to Lake Dauphin and Lake Manitoba; I believe is holding hearings under the normal powers afforded to the Commission presided

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . over by Dr. Hugh Saunderson of the University of Manitoba and four other persons, none of whom have any temerity or none of whom are terrified of the Minister of Mines. They're holding normal hearings under their act, Mr. Chairman, which is an entirely different situation than was discussed with regard to Lake Winnipeg and the honourable knows it but I'm not going to re-open that debate.

The Honourable Member for Emerson said a good deal about the Columbia Forest Products and its importance to the community of Sprague. He also indicated, Mr. Chairman, that the Crown has the responsibility in areas of Manitoba in order to give effective implementation to the stay option. I want the honourable member to remember his remarks because there will be numerous opportunities when it is demonstrated that the government is going to great efforts to insure that economic policy coincides to some extent with social policy. And I want to warn honourable members that when those efforts are demonstrated it will not always be possible to present a balance sheet which reflects -- or a profit and loss sheet which reflects a commercial enterprise which has been in existence for many years and which has had the opportunity of choosing its risk and the manner in which it will operate without social consideration. And when such a balance sheet and profit and loss sheet is presented I hope that the honourable member will not join those colleagues of his who I know will jump in and say, look what happens when the government is involved in reflecting a social policy through economic enterprise.

I want to warn honourable members that the wishes expressed by the Honourable Member for Emerson that the government take an active interest in developing economic programs which reflect social needs and the needs of all Manitobans and that it not be a criteria of these programs that they necessarily show black figures at least in the immediate implementation of the program, that he will be on our side of our position and that he will not join those who would condemn the government because this type of risk, which is very difficult -- you know the government is never the one that is left with the good programs, the ones that are sure things, the ones that are easy to operate, the ones that either private financiers are willing to put their money in or banking institutions are ready to put their money in, the government is always the last man on the totem pole when it comes to economic development and they have to take the worst risks and one should expect the worst results. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says that we are going to change all that. Let me say to him that we are going to try to change all that, that the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that in the . . .

A MEMBER: You're going to take the best risks.

MR. GREEN: . . . Well, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't be unhappy with having some good risks, I wouldn't be unhappy with doing that at all --(Interjection)-- yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that some of the things that we are doing in the field of mining should show some results for the people.

But the honourable member made a comment he would like to know details of the insurance, he would like to know details of the rebuilding clause. I can tell the honourable member that this matter is being handled by the solicitors for the Development Fund and it is not the government's intention to have the insurance claim handled as some sort of populous activity in the Village of Sprague, that it will be handled by the officers of the Crown in order to see to it that we can get as much out of our insurance policy as possible. I can tell the honourable member that I don't think any insurance policy -- and I stand to be corrected -- requires rebuilding. There may be an argument, there may be an argument about how much money you get if you don't rebuild but I don't think any policy requires rebuilding. I stand to be corrected if that is not the case. The honourable member wish to ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to provide me with the details of the insurance policy. I would like to know what the details are, if there is a difference between the monies available if you rebuild and if you don't. Would it be possible for me to have that information?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that what I can do is a compromise, is attempt -- and this I give not as an undertaking -- is an attempt to give my honourable friend a copy of the policy of insurance that was held. And I will see whether that is not in conflict with the government's processing of its insurance claim. If so I will give it to him, I don't

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . see why it shouldn't be. The Honourable for -- well the leader of the Liberal Party would also like a copy and of course if one copy is -- Well the honourable member asks a question.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister in having stepped into that subject could tell us if the maximum amount under the policy is collected, whether or not there would even still be a loss if there was no rebuilding?

MR. GREEN: If the maximum amount under the policy is collected would -- let's say we have full recovery, full recovery of the face value of the policy -- and then we have, we still have the sawmill there -- is he asking me whether the value of the sawmill together with the full recovery value of the insurance would equal the amount of the indebtedness to the Crown, to Manitoba Development Corporation? Mr. Chairman, I believe that to answer that question is to compromise the Crown's position in negotiating on the insurance policy. I believe my honourable friend knows that.

Let me say to you this, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that Columbia Forest Products was in the position of being advanced money as an attempt to keep the plant running and that not a great deal of attention -- and I don't want to compromise our position on the insurance claim, that the prime motivation for advancing was to keep the company in operation. As to the value of the operation let us wait until that is decided because I think that to do otherwise would be to, you know, it may be kind of good government tactics for me to lash out at the former government for how much money they put into that plant, etc., but I do believe that it would not be conducive to a proper consideration of our insurance claim, therefore I choose not to do it.

The honourable member's statement that we invested money in a lawsuit which was hopeless, I want the honourable member to know that the member sitting next to him last week -- the Member for Sturgeon Creek -- and his Leader have both been saying that there is a clause in The Manitoba Development Corporation Act which supersedes any contract which says that whenever the Crown wants to it can out off funds, it needn't advance money and can demand everything that has been advanced. They are making that interpretation of that clause. Now if such legal lights as the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Sturgeon Creek are saying that we did not have to advance money, and of course Mr. Justice Nitikman is saying that we broke the contract by not advancing the money, then obviously there is a conflict between those legal lights and the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench.

Now to be fair to the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition's position and the Member for Sturgeon Creek's position the Crown took the position -- not because of that clause but it took the position that it did not have to advance money indefinitely and whatever the Great Northern Capital came in and asked for they had to be given. I would hesitate to make criticism of the Minister of Industry and Commerce to the effect of suggesting that he would have the Fund enter into such a contract, or that the Fund would enter into such a contract under his jurisdiction. But Mr. Justice Nitikman says that that's what happened. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is as clear-cut as the honourable member says. Certainly our legal advice was to the effect which induced us to proceed with this case; that there was no grounds for saying that the case was completely hopeless. I'm not saying that there were grounds for saying that it was a winnable case -- that it was going to be won. All I can tell my honourable friends, and I practiced in the courts quite a bit, I think I might even say more than any other member in this House, that I was active before the courts. The ones that I thought, Mr. Speaker, were the surest cases I lost, the ones that I thought were the weakest cases I won. And of course there were nuances in between. But if you can go to a court where the fountain of all wisdom sits, the Supreme Court of Canada, and five judges will say one thing and four judges will say the other thing, I think that my honourable friend walks in where angels fear to tread when he says that the case was hopeless and it should not have been proceeded with.

In other words, what the honourable member is saying is that the previous administration entered into a contract which said that when it says that they will provide operating capital that what it means is not that it will give it the amount of capital that is necessary to

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . put it into operation but that every time Rod McIsaacs came in with his hand out it was to be filled by the Manitoba Development Corporation. That is the effect of the decision; that is the kind of contract that the Honourable Member for Emerson is now saying that the previous administration entered into with Columbia Forest Products. Well it may be a good political -- in the partisan sense a nice debating point for me to say yes that is the case, but the case is still sub judice to the extent that we are now considering whether or not we should appeal, and other than indicate the differences of opinion that can occur with regard to a legal case, I am going to leave it to my honourable friends that it is not the case of the Crown going into a hopeless situation, it is a case of the Crown defending its right to ask for \$500,000 which it felt it was entitled to under a contract, and I don't think that the honourable member should be so anxious to hope that we not get the \$500,000 --(Interjection)-- He hopes we do. All right then, if we are to do it we have to have lawyers to pursue it for us, we have to go to court, because Mr. McIsaac will not just give us \$500,000 because we will say please give it to us. We have to give him \$500,000 when he says please but it is not the other way around. We have to prove our case in court. I'm sorry that I even referred to Mr. McIsaac personally. It is Great Northern Capital which is the defendant in the case and I assume that it is a group of people and in law you are not supposed to pierce the corporate veil. The honourable member says Art Morrow, there are others, and I really, Mr. Chairman, am not making a criticism of those people at all. I have always said that it is the duty of the people who are acting in the interests of their company to make the best possible deal that they can for their company. If I was the lawyer for Great Northern Capital I would try to, in dealing with the Manitoba Development Fund get the best possible deal for my client; and if I am acting for the Government of Manitoba, I am to try to get the best possible deal that I can for my client, the public of Manitoba; and the best possible deal that we can get is to try to recover what appears to be a penalty clause on the contract and that's what we are trying to do. Whether we will be successful or not -- we have lost one round. If it's any comfort to my honourable friend, I want to tell him that when I was a lawyer, when I was a lawyer I lost a case in Magistrate's Court, it went up to the County Court, I lost in County Court, it went up to the Court of Appeal and when it got to the Court of Appeal there were four judges sitting and they were unanimous that we were wrong. I thought to myself as I went home that day if all six judges say that we are wrong, then I must be wrong. I woke up the next morning and I said, no I'm right, and we went to the Supreme Court of Canada --(Interjection)-- that's right. We went to the Supreme Court of Canada and the five judges of the Supreme Court of Canada said all of the judges who previously heard this case were wrong and they unanimously found our way. The honourable member says that I should have stayed in practice. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am practising here the same as I was practising there.

But I do appreciate the honourable member's remarks with regard to public ownership, the identification with economic goals and social goals. I would hope that the two are always consistent and that you always come out in the black. I am going to tell the honourable member that that is not going to be so, that there are going to be people who will criticize the Government of Manitoba because it tried something that didn't go, and I hope that when that happens that we will have the support of the honourable member who will say, even though it didn't work out, just as in Sprague where there is a potential problem in recovering the amount of money that was invested to that company, it has value and we are prepared to stick with it.

Because, Mr. Chairman, the alternative is taking place anyway. It's taking place in a rather different way. We had a corporation that went bankrupt here very recently in which my information is the Manitoba Development Corporation had no money involved and there was no Federal money involved. There was no loans involved. It was a \$92,000 gift and therefore nobody could say that anybody lost money, because \$92,000 did not represent the loan, and of course if it's not a loan you didn't lose it, because it didn't require repayment. So if we took the amounts that we are, let us say advancing in equity and advancing in loans and said, well in order to show that we are not losing anything we will make them gifts, then I suppose it would make the Liberals happy, it might make the Conservatives happy but it won't make me happy, because I know that the same money has been spent. Therefore Mr. Speaker, we see no problem in suggesting that there are certain economic goals that the province has, that they have a benefit in terms of helping us realize social aims, that we also think that there is a reasonable chance of doing something useful in this

## MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . connection and coming out ahead, and where that is the case, we on behalf of the people of the Province of Manitoba are not going to shirk from taking that chance because if it doesn't work out we are going to be criticized by members of the Opposition.

We have to have the strength to know that we are going to take that chance, that it might not work out 100 percent, that in spite of the fact that the Opposition will hold it up as an example of some type of bad management on behalf of the Crown, that we ourselves will know that what the Member for Emerson says is right. That the Crown should be doing it, that the risks are worth taking, that it need not show black figures, that what you have to do is look to see whether in the long run you are making a reasonable effort on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

And as I said, Mr. Speaker, when I took the job over from the fund, many private enterprise industries don't work. They try, they invest money -- and I differ from what members on that side say when they say it's not the people's money. There is no source of wealth that any person in this room has including the Leader of the Liberal Party that does not come from a combination of the resources that nature has provided to this province and the efforts that people have exerted on those resources. And how the money then comes and gets distributed so that the Honourable Member for Wolseley and myself have a great deal whereas other people have very little, is not nearly as a result of equity as people would suggest. Much of it is accidental, much of it has to do with the rules under which society operates, but the wealth belongs to everybody. How it got distributed is not merely an accident, it comes as a result of deliberate years of policy; that one person works very little and makes a great deal, other people work very hard and make very little, but the wealth belongs to everybody. And therefore the private enterprise that goes broke and loses money, loses the people's money the same way as government. And if private enterprise, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 4:30 . . .

MR. GREEN: Can I just finish my sentence, Mr. Chairman, That if private enterprise can sometimes fail I want to advise honourable members that public enterprise is no exception and it can sometimes fail too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, Committee rise and report. Call in the speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

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 Flin Flon that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

. . . continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Wednesday, Private Members' Hour. The first item is Orders for Return. Address for Papers, referred for debate. We have one Address for Papers transferred for debate. The Honourable Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker it's not my intention to deal at any great length with this rather straightforward request that for some unknown reason to me the government, and in particular the Minister of Agriculture, has chosen to transfer for debate, or not to accept post haste. Let me, for the purpose of the record read into the record the actual Address that I'm asking for: THAT an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence and contractual agreements among the Manitoba Government, the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board, and Burns Foods Limited, relating to the sale of pork to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Province of Manitoba through either the aegis of the private company involved, namely the one I mentioned Burns Foods Limited, and I must assume, with the co-operation and with the help of the Crown agency, namely the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board, and one would certainly believe, Mr. Speaker, that at the time the sale was announced with the help and the dedication of our worthy Minister of Agriculture. The sale is a significant sale. I believe it's a sale that spans the next several years, three years calling for a total movement of some 3000,000 hogs from the farms of Manitoba to the far-off consumer places in Japan. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a very very natural question to ask, tell us about the deal. Mr. Speaker, really what I'm asking the Minister of Agriculture to do is to give him an opportunity to allow us to compliment him further, indeed receive the bouquets of the House for having made that deal, because we must assume that it was in the best interests of the primary producers here in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, I at least have been and, up to now that is, and am prepared pending the Minister's reply to accept by and large, you know, the policy that they so often remind us of, of the openness of this government, and the willingness of this government to tell the public in this form what they are doing in our interests, in this case the hog producers of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I don't know the precise technical details of how the sale was arranged and I would hope that the Minister would not play cute games with us with respect to dodging behind any technical aspects that I may not have covered adequately in my humble address.

Mr. Speaker, the simple question that the Manitoba Hog Producers are asking, and have every legitimate right to ask, and I'm happy to be their spokesman in this instance, is simply to know for what price, what the actual contractual arrangements are that the Manitoba Hog Producer has committed himself to the sale of this rather large amount of pork to Japan. I go further, Mr. Speaker, I think that the consumers generally in the Province of Manitoba have an interest vis-a-vis, and particularly in view of you know the prices, the relatively high prices of pork that the Manitoba consumer has to pay, has to pay at this particular time, is interested in the question of this amount of pork moving out of the province at this particular time.

So, Mr. Chairman, as I said at the outset, it's not my intention to elaborate on what I take to be a pretty straightforward request. Mr. Chairman, the question of revealing to us the complete and full details of this sale, is important; it's quite all right if the Minister and this government assumes to take on the responsibility and the role of the chief negotiator in providing and moving into the marketing field in this way, then of course they have to accept the responsibility of telling the persons most directly concerned, namely the hog producers of Manitoba, what the deal is that they have to have consummated on their behalf.

Mr. Chairman, quite frankly it's rather astounding that Manitoba farmers, Manitoba farmers are shipping or have agreed to ship 300,000 porkers-- that's an awful lot of pork -- 300,000 hogs to Japan, and haven't been told at what price; haven't been told whether or not it's a good deal -- more important, Mr. Speaker, if in fact the deal is not a good deal, then at least the taxpayers of Manitoba have a right to know to what extent they may be called upon to subsidize the price on this contract. I would hate to think, Mr. Speaker, that we faced perhaps a situation where here in Manitoba a Manitoban can buy his pork hock at 89 cents a pound but he could travel to Japan and buy the Manitoba product in Japan for 69 cents a pound.

Now Mr. Speaker, all I'm trying to point out to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that I would genuinely suggest to him that it is entirely in his interests to be very open and very straight forward to the people of Manitoba, and in particular of course to the producers,

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . the hog producers who have on numerous occasions through me and through other members requested that they be made aware of the contractual arrangements entered into either by the Burns Foods Limited, either by the Hog Marketing Commission, or the government. We know that there is an involvement of all three parties concerned. This information should be public knowledge and the hog producers of Manitoba demand it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened quite attentively to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Lakeside when he starts talking about openness and revealing dealings made by the Manitoba Hog Commission on behalf of the hog producers of Manitoba and the company in Japan. What is he really trying to do, Mr. Speaker, what is he really trying to do? He is really trying to tell the producers of Manitoba that he wants the packing houses, the competitive packing houses of Manitoba to know what kind of a deal the farmers are getting so that they can really put the squeeze on the price and on the farmers as they were doing two years ago. --(Interjection) -- Is that what you're trying to do?

Does he recall that two years ago the price of hogs was \$20.00 a hundred, or \$19 - it went as low as \$19?

A MEMBER: \$18.00.

MR. URUSKI: Even \$18.00. This is the kind of a system that he is advocating to happen again, Mr. Speaker; that is exactly what he is intending to do. He is smiling but he is intending to compromise the position of the hog producers in an orderly marketing system in the province of Manitoba. I will even go further, Mr. Speaker, I would even venture to say that the Member from Lakeside in his remarks indirectly, is really trying to scuttle the Hog Producers Marketing Board.

A MEMBER: Defend the undefendable.

A MEMBER: It will scuttle itself, don't worry.

MR. URUSKI: This is the intent of the Conservative Party to speak about -- you know, on the one hand they have gone around the countryside and have spoken about free markets and the province should be seeking markets. Now when the Hog Marketing Commission on behalf of its producers has found a market and has been able to benefit and maximize the returns to the hog producers, he wants to scuttle it by revealing to the competitors or the open buyers of the system what the farmers of Manitoba are really bargaining for. Because what is really happening, Mr. Speaker? What is happening? A percentage of the market of Manitoba or the production of Manitoba, it's been taken off the market by the sale of this product to Japan. Therefore the boys on Marion Street have to compete much more keenly for what is remaining on the market. And let him not tell me that that is the case or a portion of the market situation that has occurred to the benefit of the producers of Manitoba.

In his remarks, you know, implicit in his remarks that the producers of Manitoba are going to be taking a shellacking. --(Interjection) -- Well that's what you're saying. That's what you're saying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Member for Lakeside kindly refrain. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has had his turn. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Member for Lakeside should do a study when he's referring to the price of meat in other countries and what the price of meat is in Japan vis-a-vis the price of meat in Canada and I think he will probably completely refrain -- not refrain, he'll probably take back those remarks that he mentions about the price of meat in Japan.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party has been continually preaching that they would abolish any type of orderly marketing system. They prefer the open market system. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, that market system has existed in Canada for about 100 years and how many farmers are left in the situation? Every year the farmers are getting more and more efficient; they're talking about open supply and demand and more and more of them are going bankrupt and leaving the farms. Is that the system that the Progressive Conservative Party is preaching, and I think it is. If it isn't they'd better get up and deny it. Additionally,

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

MR. URUSKI cont'd). . . . the Progressive Conservative Party across the way in the first two sessions of this Legislature was demanding and wondering why the province was not seeking markets, was not developing market research, that this would be the answer. But, you know, --(Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. URUSKI: They have continually demanded that there be more market expansion and when the hog marketing producers, Hog Marketing Commission goes out and signs a deal on behalf of the producers of Manitoba to be able to return the maximum amount on the sale of those hogs, they are crying foul play.

You know, as I stated before, maybe I'll repeat it again for the Honourable Member from Swan River, that when you start revealing what your contract obligations are in a sale of this nature, I can tell you what the price that Canada Packers or Burns or any other producer would be paying on the market. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? And of course, you know, they may not want to deal again. You know, there may be other markets or other countries that may want to negotiate with a sure supplier because the Hog Marketing Commission on behalf of all its producers can certainly guarantee production because they are the producers; they can enter into agreement with any firm because they are speaking on behalf of the producers and they can commit production, whereas if you go to Canada Packers or Burns, none of them can commit production because they are not in the production area of it. But I think it would be members, would be like the Conservative Party to say that the controls on production should go into the hands of Canada Packers or Burns and they should control the production rather than the producers. They would be the ones to say that Canada Packers or whatever other firm in the processing industry should tell the producers what to produce and how they will control the markets. And Ogilvie's and any other corporation that may want to control the market system.

You know, it's very fortunate now, as I see, that the producers, the hog producers of Manitoba, have the upper hand. They are in control of the market system and market demands in the Province of Manitoba. They can go out on behalf of the producers and commit production, and increase production if there are markets and negotiations which will benefit the producers of Manitoba. Now they can bargain for themselves. It is this same party that is saying that the Labour movement is against the farmers and they are the same party across the way, Mr. Speaker, that would deny the farmers of Manitoba the right of bargaining and negotiating a better price for their product. --(Interjection) -- I would certainly, I would certainly reject -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. URUSKI: I would say that if the Turkey Marketing Board would get off its fine fanny they would probably be doing the same because they have the opportunity of orderly marketing systems and they would, they would if they, in my mind if they had any brains, be able to negotiate and with the assistance of the Marketing Branch probably do the same thing as the Manitoba Hog Producers Marketing Board. They should, in my mind; they have the authority, the producers are behind them, to commit supplies because they are the spokesmen of the producers. But instead they have let the markets go or the market situation to be manipulated by the the packing houses, and I would say we totally reject this resolution.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to enter this debate. I saw the question on the Order Paper but I assumed, Mr. Speaker, that it would be looked at by all members of this House and it would go through automatically. And instead, we've been treated to a lecture on the viability or the advisability of a Marketing Board, Now Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the issue raised by the address is very simple. We're not in the middle of negotiation. I saw no conspiracy on the part of the Honourable Member from Lakeside. The --(Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, there are times when confidentiality is essential in order to protect the position of parties. When the Honourable Minister of Mines a few moments ago explained to us that he felt his position in settling the insurance claim when the issue of confidentiality came up, we readily acceded to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: The honourable member being a man in the law profession, would he not agree with me that if two parties enter into an agreement that it's a standard procedure, an

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . obligation of both parties, not to divulge the terms of that agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, that's the point I was going to make. That exists, that exists only when both parties to that agreement are private, but when one of those parties is a government or is a government instrumentality, or is financed by the public, the standard routine in the House of Commons and in Canada generally has always been, as I understood it, full disclosure of all public commitment. But that wasn't the point I was making. The point I wanted to make was this, that the issue isn't confidentiality, the issue is disclosure. And we've been trying to debate disclosure and I am one, Mr. Speaker, who commends the Minister of Agriculture and compliments the Hog Marketing Board for having made this major breakthrough. And we hope, we hope to see many many more similar breakthroughs. And if we could be, if there was some evidence that the revelation of the kind of deals we're making would destroy our ability to make repetitive deals, then I would certainly be one to stand with the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for St. George and say, "no". And I fail to understand how the disclosure of a completed deal can impair the possibility of making other deals.

Now, this is the dilemma that government faces when it becomes part of the economy. And it becomes the economy, and it can no longer make disclosure to the public about what it's doing on behalf of the public because if this argument stands that he can't disclose this deal, then no deal should be disclosed; then we should now get to the point where we will no longer disclose tenders.

A MEMBER: That's the way it is in Russia these days.

MR. ASPER: The suggestion that the Honourable Member from Lakeside, who I don't normally find myself in agreement with, is a tool of, a conspirator with Canada Packers or Burns or whoever else in the meat packing industry, is really rather offensive, Mr. Speaker. This is not a debate on marketing boards and the government's farm policy, not a debate between the good guys and the bad guys of agra-biz but we have tenders and they're made public and every company in Canada that goes public doesn't find its competitive position destroyed as it does in prospectuses and notes to balance sheets that are made public quarterly as to all of its major financial dealings. And how in the world can it be suggested that the disclosure of the price that we just sold something for would jeopardize us in some way? Rather, I think it would earn plaudits from what I know of the deal, because if the Minister or the Member from St. George is suggesting that Canada Packers doesn't know, then you have heard the height of naivete because --(Interjections) -- because I want to know, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Mines described himself as having some experience in the courts, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I've had some experience in the commercial and corporate world, and I can suggest to this House that if Canada Packers is the enemy of the member who recently spoke from St. George, that it's they he doesn't want to have this information for - Mr. Speaker, I promise you if there's a piece of paper that has the number on it some place in this world, the likelihood is that Canada Packers has access to that paper. And if they have, Mr. Speaker, I think it's quite reasonable that the Member for Lakeside's request be granted that we have access. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of the Member for St. George where he spent considerable time, as he said, protecting the interest of the hog producer and saying what a wonderful job they were doing, and at the same time he turned around then and criticized the turkey producers of the province. Mr. Speaker, I happen to know that he is a turkey producer and it reminded me of the story that was told a while ago about the socialist who was asked what he would do if he had a million dollars. And he was told he would give half of it to his neighbour. And he said, "Well, what if you had two houses?" Well he's give one to his neighbour. They said, "What would you do if you had two pair of pants?" and he said, "I have two pair of pants."

So, Mr. Speaker, the thing is that here we have the Member for St. George who to my knowledge, and I may be wrong, he may be a hog producer, but I do know that he is a turkey producer. And he is very concerned about the safety of the marketing procedure that they

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd). . . . have set forward for the hog producers of Manitoba and somewhat critical of the marketing procedure for the turkey producers. And one of the arguments that he put forward was the fact that the actions of the present government and the Hog Marketing Board was to maximize the returns to the farmer, and this I think is very admirable.

Mr. Speaker, in the last four years that we have been in this House we have listened to many of the programs that this government has put forward and in every case, Mr. Speaker, where in their opinion they believe they have had an improving effect on society, they have stood on every rooftop and hollered loud and long what they have done and what the actual benefit is to the people. They have said, "Look how much we have saved you in education tax. Look how much we have saved you in medical premiums." But here they are not telling the hog producer how much they have increased the price of pork for us, so it leads one by the sin of omission, Mr. Speaker, to suspect that maybe the hog producer is not going to get as much as he should have. The very fact that they have omitted telling us when on any other occasion where it proves beneficial to them to disclose, they have disclosed loud and long what a wonderful thing they have done for the people of Manitoba. But they are strangely silent on this particular issue and somewhat reluctant to tell the hog producers of Manitoba just what agreement they did in fact sign.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is essential in this condition that these facts should be given to the hog producers of Manitoba so that they themselves, and indeed they are asking for this information, would be able to judge whether or not this government and the Hog Marketing Board have indeed acted in their capacity to provide the maximum return to the hog producers of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this will be the third session that I've been sitting in this House but I have to admit, Sir, that this is the ultimate - this Address for Papers is the ultimate in stupidity. Unbelievable, unbelievable. It's another typical Tory demonstration of trying to sabotage orderly marketing in this province. It's the same old gimmick that they've always come up with, Mr. Speaker. I see the honourable member that introduced this wants to leave his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ADAM: . . . Mr. Speaker, to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ADAM: As my colleague just mentioned, it's another attempt on their part to scuttle a marketing board in this province. Because, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. I recognize that I have maybe added to some -- the lightness on my part in accepting the charges that are being made. I want to make it very clear for the public record that I reject totally his implications, his outright charges that I or by my -- by putting forward this Address for Papers have any intent of doing any harm or scuttling any marketing boards. That is a deliberate distortion, Mr. Speaker, and I will not allow the public record to stand in that way. I am asking for simple straightforward information. What is the price of hogs that were sent to Japan?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The matter of privilege the Honourable member stated does not exist. Each member is entitled to his own opinion in this House. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope I don't have further interruptions by the Member for Lakeside. Mr. Speaker, they have always viewed -- I have heard them speaking in this House and they've always viewed the Marketing Board as an infringement on the sacred rights of the producer, of the processor, to decide the prices that the producer the primary producer will receive for his production and for his labour. They feel that the processors in this province have a divine right somehow to decide what the producer should be paid for his wages and labour. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's incredible, incredible, to bring in an Address for Papers of this type asking the Hog Marketing Board to divulge to their competitors, to divulge to the competitors in Saskatchewan, in United States and any exporting nation.

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

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. ADAM: What the member is asking is for a tender -- for a person who tenders on a highway contract to phone his competitor and tell him what he's bidding so the other fellow can underbid. How stupid can you get? So he wants the Hog Marketing Board to announce it publicly so that other exporting nations know just how much to undercut. That is his ingenuity; that is how he would run this province. --(Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ADAM: And the Honourable Liberal Leader is no better. He is no better. He is no better. His chair is empty. I have never seen anything as ridiculous as this, Mr. Speaker, I can't get over it. I'm not an experienced politician but with the limited business ability I have I know enough not to advertise my prices to anybody else. It's got to be just about the last thing in stupidity. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just would like to comment very briefly on the request that is made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I attended the Palliser Wheat Growers Conference earlier this year where we had a certain Mr. Presford speak. Mr. Presford comes from Europe; he lived in Canada then went to the States, then he came back to Canada and worked for the Canadian Wheat Board for a good number of years, and he's had all the experience with marketing boards and he presented a paper to this conference. What I'm going to read to you right now is just excerpts taken from his speech and I think they apply even though they concern themselves with the Canadian Wheat Board, which is also a marketing agency. And this is what he had to say. Mr. Presford said: "There are three main dangers in the present Wheat Board setup. First," he said, "the present system breeds distrust and resentment on the part of farmers. The Board is on the one hand a sales agency, on the other it's a regulatory agency. It has a justifiable right to withhold delicate sales information but it also invokes this right where it is manifestly out of place and where the farmer should be informed and be part of the decision-making process," he says. This is very correct because once a deal has been made the farmer should be informed.

Now the second point he makes: "The second problem with a Board," Presford said, "stems from its split personality, half trader and half administrator. The problem is that the Canadian Wheat Board begins to administer sales rather than undertaking aggressive selling in an entrepreneurial trade-like fashion. And thirdly, the third problem," he said, "is the make-up of the Board's present advisory committee." And I'm not sure whether there is an advisory committee to the present Board that we are talking of. He goes on: "It's heavily weighted toward the grain handling companies." he said, "Those who earn from storage cannot be as interested in rapid turnover of the stored commodity as those whose livelihood depends on sales and sales alone," he said. Presford suggested all these problems could be solved if the Board had to answer to a group of actual representatives of prairie grain growers. And I think this is where the problem comes in. This Board does not have to answer to the . . . producers, and I think any such board that is set up should be responsible and answerable not only to the government or to this House, but also to the producers so that they would have the right to get the information that they want. And apparently this is the request that is coming forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While it seems that there's been considerable change in the picture in the last year and a half from what we went through, heard from the Minister of Agriculture the fact that supply management was the answer to the maiden's prayer a year ago, then all of a sudden we find that he's forced into having to make sales because the buyers are standing at the door and this deal has been made. I can certainly see no reason why that the information should be withheld from the producers. We're selling roughly a million hogs a year; there's a one and a quarter percent levy on them. There's more than a million dollars to be accounted for and I would expect possibly if some of this is going in to subsidize a lower price, so what? I don't think that the producers are going to complain as much about it. But they certainly are wanting to know what's going on. I don't think that there is any business -- if we're going to establish confidence in these marketing boards and we're not going to disclose anything, I -- certainly if a deal is in the process of negotiation I certainly think it should be kept under wraps but once a deal like this has been

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd). . . . made -- I suppose it would be the first major sale out of the country -- and I certainly think that the complete deal should be disposed and, as I said before, if we're going to have confidence in these marketing boards, this is the way it's going to have to be done. If we're going to make deals and then find possibly ten years from now, or five years from now, that the pork was sold for 32 cents or something along this line where it's hitting 50 cents on the market, why I think that it's not going to go over too big.

There's only one thing that I would like to add at the end of this. I certainly will go against the grain of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose but I would certainly like to see this Hog Marketing Commission carried on, proved out successfully and I would certainly appeal to the Minister to keep government's hands out of the livestock industry. We're not requesting anything. We'll look after our own business and we'd be only too interested to stand back and see how this particular deal is going to turn out. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended speaking on this particular resolution until I listened to some of the speeches opposite, particularly in the last few minutes and particularly the speech that just came from the Member for Ste. Rose. Mr. Speaker, you know I've seen . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. WATT: I've seen, Mr. Speaker, and listened to and heard more bilge vomited into the gutters of the zoos by the pachyderm louse in zoos than came from the Member from Ste. Rose in the last few minutes, and when he talked about marketing boards, he doesn't really know what he's talking about when he accuses this side as being against marketing boards, nor does the Member for Ste. George. He doesn't know -- he doesn't know where his turkey marketing board came from in the first place, and he doesn't know who provided the legislation and the regulations to provide for the establishment of that marketing board. --(Interjection) -- He knows.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WATT: I've just told you. Probably he'd better go back and take a look over the record for a few years and he will know. But, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry that the Leader of the Liberal Party is not in his seat because he made a statement -- he made a statement that really astonished me when he said that he wanted to congratulate the Minister on a major breakthrough, and he's referring to the deal that the Minister has made with the nation of Japan. He congratulated him on a major breakthrough. What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is who the hell broke through what? Did the Minister of Agriculture break through the barriers and get into the markets of Japan, and is the price to Japan a price that is consistent with the cost of production of hogs in Canada? And is it a long term deal the hog producers in this province will be able to raise hogs and ship to Japan at a profit or a loss? Or is the breakthrough from the other side? This is what we were asking, what we wanted to know. Did the Japanese break through into the cheapest probably market in the world? This is what we want to know. All we want to know is the facts as to who got the long end of the stick in this deal. I suspect because the Minister is refusing to give a reply and give us answers through to this resolution that probably the Japanese are the ones who broke through into the market for hogs in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye) : Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was hoping that perhaps the Minister would speak first and probably disclose all the facts that we're so concerned about and save some of this further discussion. However, I am also one of those that want to congratulate the government for selling this pork to Japan regardless if Japan came to them or what the score may be on that. But some of the other stuff that was presented to us this afternoon relating to certain facts, I think when the Member for Ste. Rose mentioned that this was an Order for Return or an Address of Papers for Return that this was the height of stupidity, I think he should stick not to turkeys -- I don't think he's a turkey raiser -- but I think he should check the records because we've had some awful stupid ones not only the last three years but over the last ten years with some of them coming from some of your friends over there as well as some of our own and others.

However, I don't think that is what the question's all about. I believe he could be an

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd). . . . authority on stupidity - this I don't know but I don't think that of him. --(Interjection) -- Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member also brought out the example what would happen if bidders of different description, I think he's probably talking of road contracts and the lie, whatever it may be, well certainly we all know that in most cases these are definitely disclosed, the prices are disclosed afterwards. The only reason that I would suggest, if perhaps there is a second or a third stage in this type of a deal that you may have made, then for goodness' sake tell us on this side and perhaps we'll stop asking questions. But till the hog producer knows this, and until we know this, I think we should have a full right that you disclose the facts to us because I have a feeling that the Honourable Member for St. George would not be satisfied if he was selling his turkeys and his board would not reply or give him the answer as to what they were selling their turkeys to, leave it be Asia or China or whatever it may be, or I should say Siberia or Japan --(Interjection) -- No, I can't buy that because I think he would want to know unless there are reasons.

I see nothing wrong with this Address of Papers in here unless the government comes out and tells us certain things that perhaps will spoil the deal. But I'm going to be hard convinced to believe that when hog prices have practically gone up 20 cents a pound over the last year, what is going to be the difference three years from now? Certainly the prices will change and certainly that will have very little effect on what kind of a deal you are making. Now if you're holding back certain information -- were you outbidding other provinces that perhaps you don't want to let them know? I'm not that particular to know that part. I think the deal is good for the producers and what little I have heard this is a good thing for the producers, so for goodness' sake let's disclose the fact if it's possible, and if it isn't give us reasons why it isn't possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I know, I know that some members opposite want me to get up to make my point so that they can come back at a later date, but notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I also know that we will have plenty of time in the Estimates that will be introduced fairly soon, that is the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, to further debate that question. So I will rise and respond to some of the nonsensical arguments that have already been put on this particular question. The Member for Lakeside likes to indulge in innuendoes quite often and this is certainly not a surprise to me, Mr. Speaker. He does on occasion. . .

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

MR. USKIW: . . . like to leave an impression that government is indeed difficult to get information from. And I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the particular import of his request, the Order for Return which asked that the government give copies of correspondence as between or among the Manitoba Government, the Hog Commission and Burns Foods.

Well, if the honourable member was alert at all when the various press statements were given and the various reports came through the media he would know that we are not in any agreement, formal agreement with Burns, for example. He would know that the purchasing company, the Ito Company of Japan has negotiated its own agreement for the purpose of processing the pork that they purchase from the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission. So that it's really not a contract between the province and the province is in no way involved in the terms of that agreement.

Now, as between the government and the Hog Producers Marketing Board likewise the honourable members should know that we do not attempt to interfere in their negotiations but that we attempt rather to assist them in their negotiations. We lend to them the good offices of the Department and the Government in its Trade and Commerce area. We provide for them assistance to the Manitoba Marketing Branch, who by the way has spent a considerable amount of time and peoples' money in Japan and other parts of the world in trying to bring about a conclusive arrangement wherein Manitoba industry at the producer and the processing level can benefit and wherein people may be employed in this province. They have a credible history even though it's only a short one, Mr. Speaker, only a year and a half or two years since the Marketing Branch was set up, and only a year since the Hog Producers Marketing Board was reorganized and where they were given additional powers to allow them to enter into these long-term agreements.

Now, the members opposite want to disregard the fact that the agreement entered into

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . is a formula greement. It is not a single price agreement, because no board can enter into a fixed price agreement for a three year period. Common sense would dictate that that cannot be done. So that is is a formula agreement that takes into account past and present and future price patterns that may be with us. And that therefore if one was to quote today's price on that agreement it would be redundant tomorrow, because it's a moving price formula. It doesn't stay the same for any given period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: And at the end of three years, Mr. Speaker, when this agreement terminates I would have no problem in giving my honourable friend the information, but as long as we are in competition for that particular market -- and I say in competition because the very same people have been negotiating with the Province of Saskatchewan and with the Province of Alberta for the last number of months and the provincial people in thos two provinces, and the producer organizations, are also very keen on entering into some arrangement in the export of Pork to Japan. Obviously friends opposite should know, or members opposite should know, that it was not in the public interest, the people of Manitoba the pork producers in particular, to give away that kind of information which in fact would jeopardize their bargaining position for additional agreements.

Now, I have been advised that only yesterday there have been further communications with people from Japan wanting to double or triple the volume of pork supplies pursuant to this first agreement, or based on the fact that they are very pleased to have two things, two things -- yes they are prepared to enter into two new agreements today if we could supply the product, based on the fact that they know that because of the marketing board being reorganized and having the control of product that they can rely, not only on an agreement on price for the next number of years but also an agreement on volume. Something that is not possible anywhere else in North America .

Now, obviously, obviously there are some constraints on the producer board entering into such a rapid expansion into that marketing area of the world, but I can say here and now that it suggests to us that we have now an opportunity to gear up the production of pork in this province that would consume very much more the feed grains that are available and that we are now exporting out of this country.

Now friends opposite should know that there is a tremendous advantage in feeding your feed grains here in the province and shipping out meat products in terms of the economy of Manitoba as opposed to shipping out raw product in the form of feed grains or whatever. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not about to yield to the nonsense from the other side who only serve, Mr. Speaker, the masters, who in my opinion, who in my opinion, have had their knuckles rapped and who have lost something in the bargaining process of producer products in the market place and they want to regain it.

My friends opposite and the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Speaker, as well as the Leader of the Opposition - not of the Opposition, of the Liberal Party - should be ashamed of themselves in proposing, in proposing that the Manitoba Hog Producers compromise their negotiating position on the contracts that are now being negotiated not only with Japan, new contracts, but other people. And I want to relate to you an interesting story, Mr. Speaker, because on Friday last I had an interesting visitor from California, who was very much interested in the purchasing of Manitoba pork, and the volume of sales to this California group, Mr. Speaker, is larger than the first sale that was made to Japan last year - California. Not because they don't produce pork in the United States but because of our efforts in promoting Manitoba product, they have been impressed with the quality of our product and are prepared to charge a premium for Manitoba pork in Los Angeles. And this is something that we have yet to finalize.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to members opposite that they not knock a good thing because in giving the producers of hogs in Manitoba an opportunity to enter into long-term arrangements, through legislative framework, through the assistance of the Manitoba Marketing Branch, under the direction of my department, we are able to move widely and freely in world markets, so that we will be able to, Mr. Speaker, not depend so much on the export of grains in the future, but we will convert grain production into meat production and meat production into processing, which indeed will result, Mr. Speaker, in job opportunities for people of Manitoba.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. USKIW cont'd). . . . --(Interjection)-- No, No, he wants a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I just have a question. . . Would the Minister tell us if the gentleman from California that he mentioned a moment ago in his speech knew the price that Manitoba was selling hogs to Japan?

MR. USKIW: I should say not, Mr. Speaker. Once a contract is entered into -- (Interjection) -- one of the terms of any agreement, one of the terms of any such agreement as between the buyer and the seller is that neither side divulges the terms of that agreement. The Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party seems to suggest that that information is readily available. If it is, Mr. Speaker, I would be very much surprised. And if it was available we wouldn't need the resolution of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside to bring it out into the surface. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Lakeside is doing a disservice to the Province of Manitoba and in particular, in particular to the pork producers of this province.

Now I do have to appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite logically would like to know all of the details. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't even recall all of the pertinent points of that agreement; nor do I care, Mr. Speaker, to know precisely what did take place. What is important, Mr. Speaker, is that the -- what is important, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: . . . is that the producers, the producers of pork in Manitoba on a daily basis know the returns that they are getting on their sales. They are intelligent people and they know whether they appreciate the values that they are receiving for their production. The Member for La Verendrye --(Interjection) --

A MEMBER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister concluded his remarks.

MR. USKIW: I certainly did not.

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

A MEMBER: The Minister concluded his remarks sat down . . .

A MEMBER: No phoney rule . . . Warner.

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

The honourable gentleman yielded the floor in order for a question to be asked. That's what I recognized. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Gladstone -- is it Gladstone? He suggested that it would be a sad day when we find out that somehow the hog producers sold their hogs at 32 cents when the current market is 50 cents. Well I agree with him it would be a sad day if that's the kind of agreement that was entered into. But let not members opposite, Mr. Speaker, cast aspersions without having the facts. . .

MR. WATT: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Arthur state his point of order.

MR. WATT: Point of order is that my question was answered in the first two sentences that the Minister spoke and from then on he has been making a speech. He is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. He's entitled to debate. He's got 20 minutes and his time isn't up yet. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture. It's not a point or order.

MR. USKIW: I suggest to the Member for Gladstone that he not cast aspersions on the members of the Hog Commission and the operations of that commission without having any facts to back them up. I suggest to the Member for Rhineland and the Member for La Verendrye that while it is desirable to have more information available to satisfy all inquiries, I think, I would hope that they would appreciate the importance of confidentiality in this case, and only in the interest of the producers of Manitoba and in the interests of the people as a whole in trying to develop new and more aggressive marketing opportunities. I think this is something that we should all work towards.

The problem of producers not having the information is something that will not even be properly solved when there is an elected board, Mr. Speaker. Because I am sure in the wisdom of that board -- and we are proceeding towards an elected board, we have already two or three members elected -- I'm sure in their wisdom they will not want to divulge the important

## PRIVATE MEMBERS ' HOUR

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . facts related to any agreements that they enter into in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of 5:30 having arrived the honourable member will have the opportunity to continue next time. The House . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just so there is no misunderstanding, the honourable member who is speaking has indicated that he is not finished his speech and therefore there is time left on the order paper for him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I indicated that, the gentleman has seven minutes left. The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.