

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, May 16, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

I'd like to take a moment at this time and introduce our young guests here this morning. We have 33 students of Grade 8 standing of the St. Andrew's School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kopansky and Mr. R. Jefferson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

We also have with us today 27 students of Grade 12 standing of the St. Mary's High School, North Dakota, the United States of America. These youngsters are under the direction of Dr. Turkula. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 90, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 93, An Act to Adjust Certain Benefits arising out of the Operation of the Group Life Insurance Plan for Public Servants.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the contents of the Bill recommends the proposed Bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the proposed Bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur) introduced Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne) introduced Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 102, An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. We have just been advised this morning of five new government bills just being introduced. Could the Minister indicate if there are further government bills to come?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate how many more government bills have not yet been introduced in the House?

MR. LYON: I'll try to get that figure for my honourable friend. I'm not sure of the number offhand, but I'll get it for him.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): A supplemental question to that of the Honourable Leader. Can the House Leader indicate when we might be receiving the balance of the Bills?

MR. LYON: Just as soon as possible. We're as anxious to get them in as my honourable friend is to see them and debate them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Is the government intending to bring in a Bill at this session dealing with the Expropriation Act?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. It deals with the question of the relationship of trade unions who have bargaining agreements with certain fisheries in Manitoba. Has my honourable friend had an opportunity of assessing the situation to see whether or not the points that I have raised in debate respecting the relationship between labour organizations and fisheries as to the expiration or non-continuation of the agreement?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, as late as this morning, we still have no indication from the labour unions or anybody in the Department of Labour of the points that were raised by the honourable member. If they wish the services of the Department in helping to find employment for people, the Department will give its usual services as it has done in other cases in the past through working with the Canada Manpower Centre.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Mr. Speaker, my question was directed as to what the Department was doing, not what the unions were doing. I have raised the question in the House I believe on that basis. There was an obligation upon the Minister to undertake some inquiries himself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister of Finance been able to determine whether the bridges which would be made necessary by the high level diversion and the cost of them, can be offset against the amount which he indicated, the capital cost of the high level diversion \$5million, exceeds the next best alternative?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think this is by all odds a better subject to pursue in committee. It's complex. The two interact, inter-relate. That is, the responsibilities of government for providing such things as roads and bridges and the creation of this Hydro utility in the north. I'm not at the moment prepared to, nor did I remember undertaking to make any enquiry on the subject.

MR. GREEN: I assure the Minister that he never made any undertaking, I just thought maybe, another question, that by now he may have had the information.

I'd like to ask a supplemental question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Could he advise the House whether the bridges involved that I referred to - or maybe the Minister of Transportation - would be necessary if there was no high level diversion? Would the bridges then be redundant and could they be rationalized?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, all bridges proposed would be required.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I believe my honourable friend undertook to forward some information this morning insofar as the composition of the Fresh Fish Marketing Board. I'm wondering if my honourable friend is in a position to do so.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I was delayed a few minutes in coming to the House this morning for that same reason; I understand it's going to be sent down to me in a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to see whether I can clarify the Minister of Transportation's reply. Would the bridges be required whether or not the high level diversion was proceeded with?

MR. McLEAN: That's the point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker. The Churchill River would have had to have been crossed, the Suwanee River, and there's another river, the name of which escapes me at the moment, assuming that we had established the route of the location of the road, bridges would be required.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question to the same Minister. Is it not a fact that the bridges would have to have a much longer span as a result of the high level diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we are making any progress on this question and whether or not it might very well be done in committee?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may in answer to that. Hopefully we are endeavouring to have some progress made, to use the normal phrase of government. I think it serves a useful purpose for my colleagues or anyone else in the House to seek information from the government. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend says "at the proper time." This is the proper time. May I . . .

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a Return to an Order of the House on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I wish to direct to the Honourable Minister for Health and Social Services, and whatever other departments he may be in charge of. The walk from Portage Avenue to the Grace Hospital is quite a long one and it's a steep one, it's uphill. I was told the other day of three elderly women who had made that walk up to the hospital, they were so exhausted when they got there they had to sit down and rest before they could venture the steps into the building. Is there any possibility or any prospect of having some means of transportation there to carry people from Portage Avenue up to the hospital? It's quite some distance in the summertime, in the wintertime it's a real hazard.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell the Member for Portage la Prairie that with respect -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I beg your pardon, I . . . thought the House floor was clear.

MR. PETURSSON: Sorry Mr. Speaker. If that was directed to me . . .

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, it's something I'll relate to the Board of the Grace Hospital and see if they can help.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell the Member for Portage la Prairie with respect to the Address for Papers, with respect to monies owing by San Antonio Gold Mines, that I have accepted responsibility for seeing that he does receive an answer. I said I'd make an enquiry. I am informed that I did not accept his Order on behalf of the government, another Minister did. I'm informed also the information is being compiled and will be brought forward as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the House Leader, and the reason I'm raising the question is because of the confusion that exists just a moment ago as to what the proper title of the Minister's office it may happen to be. My question would be, has legislation been introduced, or is it necessary to introduce legislation under the various acts to formalize the changes of titles and responsibilities of the various Ministers, and, of course, I do not mean by naming them in legislation, but naming the names of the respective departments?

MR. LYON: I believe the First Minister has introduced a Bill which will be a little tarred, at least, with the problem that my honourable friend raises. The name of it escapes me, I believe it deals with the office of Executive Council or some such similar name. It has been given first reading and it will deal in part at least with the problem that my honourable friend raises. Not all of the changes that are required need be made by statute, but the ones that will be required to be made I understand will be covered in this Bill. There may be other legislation but I think this Bill deals with most of it. I'm speaking off the top of my head subject to correction, but I'll double check that if I find I'm in error.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I direct another question on a different subject to my honourable friend, the House Leader. Can he inform the House when the Special Committee on Automobile Insurance may meet, or will meet?

MR. LYON: I'm advised that it will be meeting as soon as a convenient time can be found.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplemental question? Will that "convenient" time be before the session is prorogued?

MR. LYON: That depends to a large extent, Mr. Speaker, on how well my honourable friend and my honourable friends opposite are able to co-operate with us and how well we're able to co-operate with them in getting all the business going in a reasonable fashion now that we've reached this time of the year. I think we're all going to work together though toward the same end and we'll try to get things moving.

MR. PAULLEY: May I assure my honourable friend of the utmost co-operation as far as this side of the House and my group in a desire of having the Committee on Automobile Insurance meet. I pledge him my co-operation if he would but reciprocate.

MR. LYON: We'll do our best.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He's not listening at the moment. I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources: Does the government intend to take action to prevent flood waters of the Pembina overflow from emptying into Manitoba in the Halbstadt area? There's a break in the dike and it's a serious problem for the farmers in the area and it's causing damage every so often. The water should be contained in the Pembina channel. The Minister knows about this. Is there any action going to be taken on this?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation there. I think both he and I are also aware of the long term answer to the manner and way in which the problems on the Pembina can be resolved. We both have a similar interest. I'm referring to the eventual construction of the Pembillier dams in that area. I would hope that very shortly meaningful meetings will get underway with Ottawa officials to proceed with this course. Correspondence has passed between my office and the federal department responsible, setting up these meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Several days ago, I believe it was a week ago last Wednesday when we had the emergency debate on the farm crisis, he indicated to us that in conjunction with the Western Ministers of Agriculture, he was seeking an audience with the Federal Minister of Agriculture, hopefully for the 20th of May. My question is has this date now been confirmed?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, the date for that meeting had been confirmed, and I think I indicated, prior to that, and we did have - established a date to meet with Mr. Olson the day before on the 19th. That date and the 20th now have both been cancelled because of air transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. In view of the fact that we only have 30 minutes left in the estimates and there are many important and costly departments still to go, has the government considered an extension of that period of time for debate?

MR. LYON: . . . No.

MR. DOERN: Well Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the government consider extending the hours so we might spend some time examining the remaining departments?

MR. LYON: I think there is now a sufficient body of precedent built up in that regard to instruct my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): I would like to address another question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that now this meeting has been cancelled, I was wondering whether or not he will make representation to the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa that the draft report be presented now that has been compiled, or is in the process of being compiled by the Standing Committee on Agriculture of the House of Commons.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite get the question. I couldn't hear my honourable friend.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, my question was, has the Minister of Agriculture, of Manitoba, made representation to the Federal Minister of Agriculture to ask that the report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture be drafted immediately and presented to the House of Commons for immediate studies and action be taken accordingly?

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't asked for a draft report of the . . . I assume the honourable member is referring to the House of Commons Committee that sat in Winnipeg. I have made no request for that report, but I could do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Yesterday he announced a program whereby unemployed people over 16 could take courses this summer at Vocational Institutes without paying any fees. Could the Minister indicate approximately how much they expect the program will cost and how much of that share the provincial government will put up?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, at this point we have no idea what size of enrollment we will get. It's a very experimental course but we will be advertising it extensively to attempt to build the enrollment up as far as we can. The costs of operation at the Institutes are entirely borne by the Provincial Government, with the exception, of course, of the Manpower referrals which we get from Canada Manpower, but they would not fall under this program.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister indicate, even approximately, how much these courses amounted to in the past, for example, last year - the number of students taking these courses and how much money that would cost, if it were eliminated, if we had the same number of people this year.

MR. CRAIK: We haven't any estimates made on the actual cost. We don't know whether we're going to have to hire extra staff at this point or not.

MR. DOERN: Another supplementary Mr. Speaker. Is the money for this program now contained in the estimates of the Department of Youth and Education or are these new monies that will be used?

MR. CRAIK: They're in the departmental estimates, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I have just received a phone call from a lady in Neepawa who is very disturbed over a phone call she had in regard to property on Hecla Island, I think, specifically at Gull Lake and - Gull Harbour rather, not Gull Lake. Gull Harbour - and it has to do with expropriation of all of the private property on three large islands and two small islands in the area and huge plans for a project following expropriation of all the private property. I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister could outline the program that's envisaged for that area.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. -- (Interjection) -- Order please. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, dealing with the question of Fish Marketing once again. I was privileged to catch a recording of my honourable friend's statement to the radio media in which the Honourable the Minister indicated that three of the four fish plants now in operation processing will be declared redundant due to the rationalization within the industry. Can I take it now that my honourable friend has at long last come to the conclusion that the statements that I have been making in this house are correct?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerec)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party have his ears examined.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the House Leader. Is the government planning to present new legislation relative to registration operation of trust companies.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, there will be some legislation affecting trust companies before the House this year -- (Interjection) -- Well it's being prepared at the present time and hopefully will be ready shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't get too far with my honourable friend the Minister . . . so, I will direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare, et al . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps to save my honourable friend some time. He perhaps didn't hear the Minister of Tourism who said he would take my honourable friend's penetrating question as notice.

MR. SHOEMAKER: But, Mr. Speaker, I'm confident that my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare will know more on this subject matter than the Minister of Tourism. -- (Interjection) -- It is indeed. And in consideration of the fact that a historic Icelandic village, as I understand it, is to be built at Hecla, I will ask my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Icelandic Affairs, whether he can inform the House on the proposed plan for that historic monument.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, that whole matter is before my colleagues at the present time. I can think of nothing greater than a typical Icelandic monument in the heart of America. Within the boundaries of my constituency at this time lies all of what was the original republic of New Iceland, the republic of Nya Island where we had the first Democratic government established in Manitoba, and I'm just delighted that all the members are joining me in commemorating those early pioneers in some way in the future, in some tangible way. But the details, my colleagues I know will be happy to share with them in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder with those remarks - Order please. I wonder with those remarks if the subject could be considered closed. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance in the absence of the First Minister. I wonder if he has noted that the Premier of B. C. is promoting the negative income tax; and my question is, at the forthcoming conference that the province will attend with the Federal Government whether this principle will be advocated by our province?

MR. EVANS: I have no idea what other provinces will do and I'm not prepared to say what we will do.

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

MR. ENNS: Well Mr. Speaker, just in reply to a question that has been asked several times by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. To date the members of the federal Fish Marketing Board are Mr. Dennis Harvey of the Federal Government who is chairman; Mr. J. D. Bergeron from the Department of Indian Affairs; Mr. R. M. Gordon from the federal Department of Fisheries and Mr. Dave Corney, the general manager who is also a member of the directorate. These are the only ones to date that have been designated officially and gazetted by Order-in-Council as directors. Others, including our own representative from Manitoba, Mr. Hayes, it is my understanding, are to be designated officially by Order-in-Council very shortly. They have been meeting together as a group of directors with industry, but my latest information as of this morning is that there are still four or five of the provincial representatives on the Board of Directors to be officially designated by Order-in-Council as directors of the Federal Fish Marketing Corporation.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I thank my honourable friend for the information. He refers to Order-in-Council. Would that be provincial Order-in-Council or federal? And if it is federal - not Manitoban, of course, provincial - does the Manitoba representative for instance have to receive the acceptance of the senior government before he can be appointed by Order-in-Council to the Board?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that this, as in all cases, this is a federal Fish Marketing Board, very much so under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. The Manitoba Government makes no appointments, has no power or authority to make any appointments; all appointments both to the Board of Directors and the Advisory Board are made by the Federal Government.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may Mr. Speaker. It was my understanding on this, this was a joint effort of the four of the provinces and the Dominion and companion legislation is required in order to put it into effect. If what my honourable friend says is correct, my question to him would be, why are we passing companion legislation in order to come within the federal legislation?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the reason, and I suggest it's not the time to discuss it, probably the time we get to Bill 50 on the Fisheries Act - but quite simply, and I'm sure his colleague beside him and others will inform him that it's more because of the intra-provincial marketing nature of this board that companion legislation is required for us to pass in this House. And there are other reasons; because of the heavy federal input into the fisheries industry generally, they have all traditionally have played a role in the fisheries inspection and fisheries grading - there's an overlapping here of responsibilities that we hope to resolve with

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . the passage of two acts. Essentially our Act is permissive, a companion role to dovetail, so to speak, with the federal Fish Marketing legislation.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may then, one further supplemental question insofar as the composition of the directors of the Board are concerned, would I be correct in assuming then that notwithstanding who the province of Manitoba desired as its representative, on the Board or Directorship, the Federal Government could in its wisdom or otherwise, and I guess it would be otherwise, appoint somebody else from without the province to represent Manitoba?

MR. ENNS: That is essentially correct, Mr. Speaker. However, I'm pleased to report that this is a co-operative effort initiated to a large extent by efforts of the provincial jurisdictions. I think the Province of Manitoba over the years has played a leadership role in the formation of the Fish Marketing Board and I can report that the degree of co-operation between the Federal Minister in this instance, the Federal Government and the provinces is of the highest order. They have accepted our recommendations for appointments to the Board of Directors and I think this is possibly the case with the other provincial jurisdictions or the territorial jurisdictions who have likewise recommended to the federal government a representative to serve on this Board. And the federal government, it must be recognized, has reserved for itself, the appointment of four, five, I believe, of the total ten man board that come completely from within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It is my understanding that they are appointing, it would appear from the list that I read, senior officials from the different departments involved, a representative from the Indian Affairs, a representative from the Fisheries Department, a representative from the Trade and Commerce Department - these are senior civil servants that the Federal Government is appointing as its five members of the Board, along with the chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education, or the Minister of Finance, I'm not quite sure who should deal with it. I'll direct it to the Honourable the Minister of Education though. In view of the fact that we have a surplus account of about a million and a half in the tax rebate fund, and also in view of the fact that we are penalizing the school districts in the multi-district divisions, is it the intention of the government and will the government increase the tax rebates to taxpayers in the multi-district divisions?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that question to be out of order at this particular time. The honourable gentleman is discussing spending of public funds -- (Interjection) -- The Minister is at liberty to answer but . . .

MR. CRAIK: No change in policy to announce at the present time Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader in clarification of a question on Monday of this week, when I asked him about Royal Assent on the Electoral Divisions Act, and there was a subsequent question by another member. I just want clarification. There is some speculation outside of this House about the possibility of an election. There's a passing interest obviously by members here. Could the Minister give assurance that should such an election be called or happen, that it will in fact be based on the new electoral boundaries?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I am ill equipped to discuss such matters as elections, but I can respond to my honourable friend with respect to the bill and assure him, as I thought was clearly assured to him the other day, that the bill will receive Royal Assent before this House rises, is adjourned, is dissolved, prorogues, or is blown up.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the only ones that might blow up are those on the opposite side of the House.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce 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.

MATTERS OF URGENCY AND GRIEVANCES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I have a matter of grievance that I want to discuss in the House this morning. This has to do with the ARDA-FRED program which is under the control of the various departments in the Government of Manitoba; and in particular, Mr. Speaker, I want to make reference to the program as it applies to the Libau, St. Peters, Riverton, Winnipeg Beach and Washow Bay areas insofar as the land acquisition program of the whole ARDA program is concerned.

I have here a letter, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to read into the record. This is a letter sent to me recently by the Member for Selkirk - that is the Member of Parliament for the constituency of Selkirk. I want to read it in its entirety, Mr. Speaker, so that the House will have the full knowledge of what is behind my grievance motion in the sense that this has been drawn to the attention of the Member of Parliament as well. And I quote, Mr. Speaker: "By now you have very likely heard allegations that land prices paid by the FRED administration in the Interlake, and particularly in the Riverton-Washow Bay area, is disproportionate as between adjoining parcels and as between similar land use capabilities. More specifically, it has been alleged to me by a number of persons that whereas FRED administration was offering and paying something like \$5.00 to \$10.00 an acre for most property, it had finally agreed to pay \$18,000 for 320 acres in the Washow Bay district owned by" - and I won't quote the name, Mr. Speaker. "There were no buildings involved and that puts the per acre price clearly in excess of \$56.00 an acre approximately. In an attempt to determine the facts I filed a question on the Parliamentary Order Paper and the reply was only in general terms, stating finally that the province did not disclose details of individual purchases. It seems to me that the public interest requires that the facts be ascertainable and available, otherwise rumour and allegation will understandably continue even if there is no basis in fact.

"I have this day made an effort to follow up by writing to both federal and provincial ARDA-FRED directors. I suspect, however, that the replies will be off the point. Accordingly, I think it would be important if you make some effort through the medium of an Order for Return on the Legislative Assembly Order Paper to obtain information relative to the low and high of the prices paid for land acquired in the Riverton-Washow Bay area, and elsewhere for that matter.

"I enclose herewith a copy of the reply referred to above, intermediate as it was. It seems that what is required is some systematic questioning and investigation of FRED and land acquisition policy by a legislative group. It appears to me that the following pattern is emerging: Land that is subject to flooding in varying degrees has been looked at for purposes of diking; decisions are made, dikes are erected. Land that now has dike protection as a result is selling in the Riverton-Washow Bay district, for example, for approximately \$55.00 to \$65.00 an acre to private purchasers. Land very near by, sometimes in the same section and which was not that distinguishable from the land just referred to before the construction of dikes but which is now outside the dike, is being bought by FRED at offers of from \$5.00 to \$10.00 an acre. I cannot understand the way in which any justification can be made to those who come forward with the complaint that their land, in some cases on the same section but arbitrarily excluded from dike protection, now is a captive sale at prices of one-fifth to one-seventh than that being received by those selling dike protected land. The point which comes out of all this is that the decision as to where the dikes should have gone, or are to go, cannot be an arbitrary one determined only by one or two officials; there should be some discussion at the local unit level. And a second point that arises, that can be drawn from this, is that the FRED authority is under some obligation to reconsider its per acre price offerings. I don't know if such obvious discrepancies can be found in the Libau-St. Peter area but in the Riverton-Washow Bay area it would seem that grave discrepancies exist. As a starter, I would refer you to northeast quarter 24-23-4 E. Within a few days after your receipt of this I will call you."

Mr. Speaker, this is something that has been on my mind for some time and I want to acknowledge the fact that I have been . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend mind tabling that document that he's just read from.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I wouldn't mind, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to make the point that I do recognize the fact that I had drawn this matter or matters of similar nature . . .

MR. LYON: My honourable friend will table the document?



MR. USKIW: After I receive permission from the sender of this document.

MR. LYON: Oh no, no. My honourable friend has read from the document so it's now the property of the House.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

MR. JOHNSON: Who wrote that document?

MR. USKIW: The Member of Parliament for Selkirk.

A MEMBER: What is his name again?

MR. USKIW: Do you want to know his name? His name is Mr. Schreyer. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Government Services has had matters of this nature drawn to her attention very recently by myself and I understand that she is undertaking some effort to see whether situations such as these did occur and I can appreciate that fact. But at this stage, Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out that this is my last privilege to draw a matter of such importance by way of a grievance insofar as this Session of the Legislature is concerned, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I chose to use that privilege this morning.

I want to make reference to the case in point which I did discuss with the Honourable Minister, to date have not had satisfaction and I don't know whether I will have satisfaction. Hopefully I will. But I want to draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, that a quarter section of land was purchased in the Libau area, of which eight acres were bought at the price of \$50.00 an acre, ten acres at \$80.00 an acre, forty acres at \$12.50 an acre and 102 acres at \$10.00 per acre. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw that to your attention because I understood that the ARDA-FRED program was a rural development program and a rehabilitation program, and if you look at this kind of an arrangement I don't know just whether this is development and whether it's rehabilitation. When one receives \$10.00 an acre for his property by virtue of the fact that that property was flooded consistently for the last number of years one is not being rehabilitated, Mr. Speaker. That is very little consideration for an individual that has spent many years in the business of farming in that particular area; very little consideration in the light of the fact that if he wanted to relocate he would have to pay ten or fifteen times more than what he received if he was to purchase farm land that he could continue a farming operation on. And, Mr. Speaker, if you at all look at the word itself, "rehabilitation", I don't know how the department can rationalize that they are indeed doing something in the way of rehabilitation in this area. This particular parcel of land was assessed up to 1967 at \$1,900 for that quarter section - and I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that that is a reasonably high assessment. It's about 50 percent of the assessment in my own area which never gets flooded, Mr. Speaker - and on that basis if I related to my own area where land sells from anywhere between \$125.00 to \$150.00 an acre I can't understand on that basis how the government would offer a person \$10.00 an acre and then classify it as a rehabilitation program. It just doesn't make any sense, Mr. Speaker. I took a look at the assessment figures of the years from '55 to '67, and they are all highly assessed years. The year 1967 in which this contract was arranged and agreed to, that land was assessed at \$1,900.00. The year 1968, Mr. Speaker, the same land was assessed at \$1,350.00, roughly one-third drop in the assessment the year after this program was launched. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the land is only worth \$10.00 an acre surely the House must agree that this particular individual was over-assessed for many years back, and who is going to refund to this person the monies that were paid in taxation for all those years. In talking to various officials, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this case they tell me that they had to classify this land as marsh land; and again, if it is marsh land, Mr. Speaker, I want to know why the assessors when they assessed it for all these years didn't classify it as marsh land. So we can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker; it's either marsh land and the assessment figure should have been low, or it is agricultural land and the assessment figures are correct. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, the Land Acquisition Branch should have proceeded to make offers that were reasonable in light of those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak long enough on this matter, and I want to emphasize this point, that it does require a great deal of bearing out because this is only one example and I'm sure there may be hundreds of others, I don't know. From the letter which I just read I believe that there are other cases and this is not the kind of way in which I thought that the ARDA-FRED program was going to proceed to in fact deal effectively with the flooding problems of Lake Winnipeg, effectively in the sense that these people would be relocated or be offered prices from which they could have sufficient revenues from the sale of their property so that they

May 16, 1969

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . might relocate on a basis without having to mortgage themselves substantially and that they can continue on their farming operations.

The question of the arbitrary dike line that was established around the various flooding areas - and this is a very important question because one has to recognize that where the Government of Manitoba designates that a certain area is subject to flooding and beyond that can be protected by means of building a dike, one must recognize that by making that decision there are many other decisions that are made in the process; namely, that the land that is left on the wet side of the dike for all intents and purposes has diminished in value in a sense that one can't get a reasonable sale price for that land, in a sense that one can't perhaps borrow money from the various lending institutions on the basis that they are not secure on that land, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, this has an effect of almost bankrupting the people that are left with the properties on the wet side of the dikes. On the other hand, those that happen to have their property on the dry side of the dike, their values are increased because of that protection and here you have the disparity. I feel strongly about this point, Mr. Speaker. I think the government ought to take a second look at their policy with respect to land acquisition, make the necessary readjustments that are necessary so that these acquisitions are equitable, so that the people concerned get a decent return, so that they may relocate without undue hardship.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in 1965 this particular piece of property was insurable under the Manitoba Crop Insurance program, and again it brings to mind that if it was marsh land I don't know how the Manitoba Crop Insurance authority could have gone in there and offered those people crop insurance. I have a copy of the contract here, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wishes to see it; I'm prepared to table this contract for the benefit of the House. But again I point out that this land was considered farm land for the purposes of crop insurance which is the program of the Department of Agriculture of this government and again we see the contradiction of policy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in another area that has not been covered by this particular program but should have, the situation is not different there today than it was for the last number of years. I'm referring to the St. Peters area where the Land Acquisition Branch decided that they were not going to go into the program of acquiring the land from those people; in particular, Mr. Speaker, those few river lots that happen to be adjacent to the marsh land area, the St. Peters area. They offered these people moving grants, that is, the Red River Valley Board did some two or three years ago, and because of those offers whether they were accepted or not the ARDA program did not include those people in the land acquisition program. I think that this is unfair because there are a number of parcels of land there that should have been included in this program, that those people should have been given the option to sell because a good portion of their property is also inundated by, not only lake waters from time to time, Mr. Speaker, but the Red River during the breakup season, almost every spring. I know that the Minister may say that, well this is the Red River and we have no program for that. Mr. Speaker, this is a point I tried to make two or three years ago, that it makes little difference to me where the water comes from but in this particular connection this is where the river and the lake meet and it's very hard to ascertain whether it is the high water of the lake or the waters of the Red River or what have you that is causing the problem. It's a combination of both in many instances and I don't think the Department should have been sticky on this particular point. It would have meant purchasing another ten or fifteen parcels of land.

Now in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I hope the Minister will take a second look; I hope that we can give these people a reasonable price for their property. In this connection I recognize that they are not forced to sell their property, Mr. Speaker, but in light of the program that is supposed to rehabilitate these people, it cannot be rehabilitation, Mr. Speaker, unless these people receive a decent return, a decent price for the land which they are giving up so that they can relocate themselves and continue in their business. Thank you.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should say a few words on this motion because the honourable member has brought this one particular case in the area to my attention as he mentioned. But I think I'd like to express his last statement, my first statement, because I think we all know that in this case there was no compulsion whatsoever - and he did state this just now too, that there was no compulsion for anyone to sell - but it was a program whereby if the owner wished to sell to the government then they made him an offer for his land and it was strictly on a voluntary basis. I think we all have the greatest concern for any people who happen to be in any of these particular areas and we have to attempt to do whatever we possibly

(MRS. FORBES cont'd) . . . can do to alleviate some of their difficulties and see if they cannot be recompensed in some equitable way, and I must say that we have attempted, as far as we possibly can, to see that we were fair in here.

Now I think you all know that there was a great deal of research and a great deal of intensive investigation before any move was made here, because it was very hard to establish market values in this particular area, and I think the Honourable Member from Brokenhead would be the very first to agree with me on that. And so all the research reports before they started were submitted to the Land Value Appraisal Commission and to the General Committee of the FRED-ARDA program, and both the Commission and the Committee accepted a classification of the land in there. Naturally they had to come to some definite decision as to classification and so they classified it as better class of cultivated land, less productive cultivated land, reclaimed marsh and arable land, and the marsh inundated land, and with this in mind our people were asked to go in and make an appraisal and submit it.

The particular section or quarter section which the Honourable Member from Brokenhead brought to my attention caused me a great deal of concern too, because he mentioned that this individual couldn't rehabilitate himself with what was given to him here, or offered to him, but here again I must say there was no compulsion and he accepted it voluntarily. This wasn't his whole unit and this did concern me, but when I see what his whole unit has, I really believe that he does not have to, or did not really have to think of relocation, because, Mr. Speaker, in the quarter section that we are speaking about, he had about 25 acres that were on a building site and bush, there were 20 acres that were cultivated, there were 25 acres here which were pasture land and 20 acres that were cultivated grass land, and about 70 acres that was in marsh, and the former owner of this particular quarter section had built a dike on it in years gone by, which showed that it had been inundated on previous occasions. He referred to the assessment of this particular piece of property and I have the assessment value here, the assessment as of 1967 assessment, and I gave these figures to the honourable member too. For that quarter section it breaks down to the average assessment to be approximately \$8.50 per acre, and the settlement that this family got, on the basis of the land value, was \$2,720, and then of course there was an allowance for the buildings which came to \$3,975, and the owner has the right to remove these buildings from the property prior to December 31st of this year.

I think we should go into this one in a little bit of depth, because our appraisal indicates that there were 18 acres of cultivated land, 10 acres of which are valued at \$80.00 per acre, the remaining eight at \$50.00 per acre, there were 40 acres of land subject to recurrent flooding, and that was at \$12.50 per acre, and the remaining 102 acres of marsh land at \$10.00 per acre. Now I think that we should note here too, Mr. Speaker, that these acreages that they used in this report were supplied by the owner himself; they were not ours. They were checked but they were supplied by the owner himself, and he also told us, too, that in the previous five years that he had lost what he considered to be 2 1/2 crops, so we can see that there was considerable years when he wasn't getting much out of the land that he'd had there.

Now, as I said, he has another half section of land here that makes up his total area, which he worked in the area, and the entire acreage amounts to some 318 acres, and at the time that he made this settlement the sworn value of that was \$9,000; but in the other half section that he has there's a good 100 acres there, or 110 acres, which our appraisers say that it would sell upward of \$100.00 an acre, and I believe the honourable member knows that he has sold that and he has now received a pretty fair price for the other part of his acreage. Now if you really listen to what the Honourable Member from Brokenhead says — and I took the inference in the first place that this man, with the amount of money that we had offered him, was really put out on the street and looking for another home and had to relocate somewhere. Now we know that this really isn't right. The individual that we were speaking about does not live on the property — he has buildings there but he does not live there, he lives in the village; and besides the acreage that he had left was a good acreage on which he could make a living and he has seen fit to sell this.

Now we did have him in, because I was very concerned about it, and I told the Member too that we would make the offer to him that if he is really not satisfied then there is no compulsion about it, although he has accepted the money. If he would care to give us the money back we'll give him back the land, but he didn't come forth with that, and I think that we've been as reasonable as we possibly could here. And again I must say that we have to be very

(MRS. FORBES cont'd) . . . concerned about the people. This is only one example and I am sure there are many others that could be brought to light along and in this particular area which is where there is often flooding and where these people must be concerned as to what their future is, and many of them expressed, when they accepted the offer, that they weren't entirely satisfied but I have the feeling that they went away with the idea that half a loaf is better than no bread at all. I'm sure I feel for people who have this in their mind, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to close with saying that we tried to keep them well informed; they tried to give what they considered to be a fair and reasonable offer for their property; we are willing to take a look at any piece of property where anybody really feels that they have not been treated fairly, and I certainly will do that if any are brought to my attention, and I did this one in detail for the Honourable Member from Brokenhead when he presented it to me, but again I must say that the deal is between the owner and the government and it's strictly on a voluntary basis, and there is no force or compulsion here for them to take any offer that is being made by us.

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MRS. FORBES: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: The Minister stated a moment ago that there were 18 acres cultivated, and I've read into the record, Mr. Speaker, that there were something like 100 acres - or I thought I did. If I didn't, I will tell the Minister now there were 100 acres insured in 1965 of that 160 under the Crop Insurance Program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead mentioned the fact, when he began to speak on this motion, that this would be his last opportunity this session to speak on a grievance on the motion to go into the Committee of Supply. I expect that is correct, but my only reason for speaking at this time, Mr. Speaker, is to once again remind the members of the House that the members of the House are not limited to discussing grievances on this motion. Any matter, as I understand the rule, Mr. Speaker, any matter that is within the public sphere and within the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Manitoba, is open for discussion at this time, there being certain restrictions, of course. Any matter that has been already decided during this session cannot be discussed, or a matter of which notice has been given, and perhaps it's because of that that frequently it is matters of grievance that are discussed, and it's a useful debate for that purpose.

But one reason that I wanted to speak on this motion, Mr. Speaker, was to point out that I am not speaking on a matter of grievance, so that I can speak on some other matter. I would be afraid if the members of the House continued to use the expression in opening their addresses on this motion, that "I rise to speak on a matter of grievance" that we would develop a precedent here, that sometimes you or some other speaker would hold that it was limited to grievances. My understanding is that it's not so and, Mr. Speaker, the conduct of the business is within the competence of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. Maybe I would not be too boring if I took a minute to just remind the honourable members once again of how this particular subject lends itself to discussion in the Chamber.

The fact that you can discuss a grievance or any other public matter within the competence of the Legislature, arises from the old rule that the public, the Commons, have a right, when the Crown is asking for money, to bring before the representatives of the Crown any matter, any grievance or any other public matter within the competence of the problem, and this was a principle that was established many many years ago. It's true that in the early days it was concerned mainly with grievances that the Commons brought before the sovereign, but in more recent times that has been expanded to where any public subject can be discussed and, as the honourable members know, this is not the time, Supply, when we are actually granting the money. This is the time when the Crown is laying before us what it esteems to be its needs, and this is what we debate in the Committee of Supply, whether the representative of the Crown has properly estimated what the Crown requirements are and whether they should have that much.

As the honourable members are well aware, Mr. Speaker, the private members do not have the opportunity to grant more or to raise the estimates that the Crown is asking for, but they do have the right to recommend reductions. And then, Mr. Speaker, a little later after concurrence, we will come to the matter of where we are actually granting the money, because that's the function of the Committee of Ways and Means. Having submitted the representatives of the Crown to the proper cross-questioning regarding what they intend to do with this money if they get it, and having checked up on them as to the requirements for the various purposes,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . that having all been decided, and I suppose it will be decided reasonably soon now - then the next matter that we come to is: how do we raise this money? And that is the Committee of Ways and Means, and I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to provoke any further debate or anything, but all I am suggesting is that that is another opportunity for members, if they wish to, to discuss any public matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, my contribution to debate at this time is to point out that I am not speaking on a grievance, I'm speaking on a public matter on which the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba has jurisdiction, and I'll not take any more of the time of the House to point that out, but I didn't want the precedent to develop here that this motion allowed for discussion only of matters of grievance. Mr. Speaker, I may have a lot of questions that I would still like to ask, as we're running practically out of the 80 hours, but at the particular moment I have no special grievance to announce and therefore my speech is finished.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Gladstone last night and the comments by the Honourable Member from Elmwood and the Honourable Member from Rhineland, and notwithstanding the fact that there is a resolution on regional development contained on the Resolution Paper, I think it would be more appropriate at this time to very briefly state the government's position in connection with regional development and to allow, in the time that's allotted, any questions that may in fact be asked by any of the other members.

The Government is committed to develop the various regions of the province and to strive for equality of opportunity for all people in the province. The Federal Government has as well shown an increasing commitment in developing the regions of Canada, and establishing a new Department of Regional Economic Expansion to whom we will look for extensive support in our efforts here in Manitoba.

The importance of effectively tackling regional disparities was unanimously agreed to at the recent Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa, and the TED report shows that there are differences in income and other indicators of the regional quality of life, and suggests that one of the most urgent challenges of the modern era is to bring about balanced regional development.

Governments have come to accept that they have a responsibility to strive for equality of opportunity for the people of their jurisdiction in employment opportunities, levels of income and quality of life. Each individual, no matter where he is born, should be given the opportunity to make a real choice as to where and how he wishes to live. This choice is best given by working towards stability and if possible growth of population and the availability of well-paying job opportunities within the region.

The TED Commission has established the goals for the development of the economy of Manitoba. The Commission has recommended - and I'm quoting now from the report - that "the Federal and Provincial Governments state more explicitly what their commitments for balanced regional development imply in terms of growth targets." And that's the end of a quotation from the TED report.

From the government's point of view, the following are desirable goals for the development of the regions:

1. Full employment.
2. Average incomes as close as possible to the provincial level and a reasonably balanced distribution of incomes within each region.
3. The full and best use of the resources of the regions.
4. Where economically feasible, population stability and growth.
5. Good commercial services.
6. An attractive environment.
7. A high standard of cultural and recreational amenities.

The TED report has recommended that the Regional Development Corporations play a significant role in preparing plans for regional growth. The Government agrees that

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . co-operative planning at all levels of government is essential. There are at present in Manitoba five regional corporations and it is hoped that two additional corporations will be formed by the end of the year so that all of the organized territories within the province will be included within one or another of the corporations. The role to date of these organizations has been both educational and developmental, and they can have an important role to play to help co-ordinate local interests with those of the senior governments. It will be necessary for both the federal and provincial governments to co-operate closely with the corporations in preparing any regional development measures. This is why the province has:

1. Increased its financial support to regional corporations, and this was increased last year.

2. Have this year offered to underwrite economic base studies of each region which was the first step in the TED recommendations. This will ensure the greatest possible understanding and grass roots participation, which was referred to by the Honourable Member from Gladstone.

3. Will establish a Regional Statistical Desk to provide additional data on regional areas. (Our information is rather primitive at this point.)

4. Call a major regional economic expansion conference later this year to examine new ways to expand regional growth in consultation with the federal and provincial governments, regional development associations, and other interested groups.

And of course we are going to continue to work with individual communities. The Regional Development Branch of the Department of Industry and Commerce was set up in 1959 to assist the communities and regions of Manitoba to develop their local economy. The branch is headed by a Director with a staff of four. They are generalists in the field of regional and economic development with a knowledge of local conditions as well as the services available throughout the government and various other agencies. It is their role to identify community and regional potential and to assist local people to get together and utilize the various facilities which can aid them in developing this potential.

Now during the last year this branch organized a wide variety of conferences, meetings and workshops to stimulate interest and action for regional growth. These include:

1. A conference attended by 80 of the Directors of the regional corporations to discuss matters of mutual concern, including: agriculture and food products; water resources; tourist development; industrial development; location cost comparisons; regional development incentives; community planning; Federal programs for regional development, and other related topics.

2. Quarterly meetings of the managers of the regional corporations have been held to secure the latest information on economic development opportunities. This was provided by the staff of the Department and other business experts.

3. The Agri-Industry Development Conference was held with the agricultural community of the West-Man regional corporation.

4. Seven regional development workshops have been held in the following places: West-Man workshop was held in Souris; Pembina Valley in Morris; Central Plains was held in Portage la Prairie; East-Man was held in Lac du Bonnet; Parkland was held in Dauphin; Northland was held in Thompson; and the Interlake was held in Eriksdale.

These workshops include both government and private development specialists who provide information and hold discussions on such topics as: The improvement of community centres; Finance for development; Tourism and Recreation; Industrial and Commercial Development; Agriculture; Management Training; Housing; Business management; Regional economic trends, Resource development; and other related topics.

Presentations at these conferences were made by people from the private sector who travelled to the various regions. These included representatives from a number of private business firms; from the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation, the Manitoba Institute of Management, the Industrial Development Bank, the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg, from a variety of architectural and business consulting firms, from the Community Planning Association of Canada, as well as experts from a variety of Government departments.

5. Fifty-Four community reports were researched, revised and publicized, and a new community improvement program was put underway.

Now while there is still much to accomplish, our efforts so far have achieved fairly significant results. We have substantial new plants appearing in Gimli and The Pas, in Minnedosa, in Brandon and in Selkirk, and in many other Manitoba centres. We have 22 of 66 new industries

( MR. SPIVAK cont'd. ) . . . . in the past year that started operation in rural Manitoba, and again I point out that of the \$61 million in the Manitoba Development Fund loans, more than \$45 million were for facilities located in rural Manitoba.

But it is clear from the TED report that as good as this progress has been, we must work still harder in cooperation, not only between the levels of government, but also with the private sector to strive for an accelerated pace of growth throughout our whole province.

These are times of change; of movement of population from farm to town and from town to city. People can travel farther, faster and more easily. We cannot expect every community in Manitoba to grow; and not every region to grow in the same way or at the same rate. Industries will tend to be attracted to larger cities within each region and to discourage this trend may not be in the best interest of each region. So regions must strive for balanced growth, with industrial centres, trade centres, agricultural centres, resource centres, tourist centres and residential centres, each playing their part and each person fulfilling a role best suited to his skills. It is an immense planning and development job.

It should be clearly recognized that this is a program that will not achieve the desired results overnight, or even next week, or even next year, or even in the next five years. It is a long term program that will require a continuous enthusiastic and constructive endeavour in both the public and private sector, and in particular, on the part of the people of Manitoba's regions with whom we must and will work towards a more prosperous future in the 1970's.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, time is at a premium and I would like to go into a number of questions concerning the need for capital in our province and the present situation, which undoubtedly has to be radically changed. I know, from discussions with people over the past few years being concerned about the problems of Manitoba and the question of our economic development, which is absolutely crucial to our future, one of the frequent comments that I have heard in speaking to people I regard as somewhat knowledgeable, is how our major resident corporations are too conservative in the sense of investing outside of the province and tending to give loans rather than equity capital or venture capital, and the Minister cautioned us many times not to mention the names of firms and I do so with some hesitation, but I nevertheless would like to illustrate at least one name that I have heard mentioned so frequently, the name of the Great West Life Company, which I guess is now a part of the Investors Group. But here's a major insurance company with headquarters in our own province and I am told - and I must say that this is only second-hand - but I am told that their investments tend to be largely in Eastern Canada and that people in our own province find it very difficult indeed to get any funds from them, and if that's an indication of the cooperation of the larger members of the business community, then I think we have to work very hard to encourage them to look in their own back yard and help develop their own back yard, because these are the people with the funds, and it strikes me as being most peculiar and regrettable that they are not investing in their own province or they don't have the faith in the businessmen of their own community.

I would like to ask the Minister in passing, in reference to one section of the TED Commission, whether or not his government has made a detailed assessment of the Carter Commission, because this is a major document and undoubtedly will have quite an impact on the future of our province as well as our nation, and I would assume that if intelligent planning were the order of the day, then there would be a number of top civil servants and members of Cabinet who would be, in a prolonged manner, studying the Carter Commission, because we all know that it's a very large document - I think some 2500 pages - and would take any intelligent man several months just to go through it once, so I would hope that the government is doing a sort of a continuing assessment of the Carter Commission because I have the impression that within the next five years many Carter proposals will be implemented.

The Honourable Member for Hamiota and others have mentioned the need to attempt to make Winnipeg a more attractive financial centre by building up the Winnipeg Stock Exchange, and this is something that I would wholeheartedly support, because when one looks at the amount of money that is available in this province, and how it is not being invested in our province but it's being either kept in bank accounts or invested elsewhere, this is a very serious problem indeed. I think it's a problem that is not unique to Manitoba but is found everywhere in our country. For example, if we -- in fact, I remember this point being taught by a professor of mine about ten years ago, as a sort of a peculiar attitude of Canadians who tend to invest in bonds or leave their money lying around in bank accounts rather than investing in Canadian

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . corporations. This is the whole idea, the *raison d'etre* of the Canadian Development Corporation, and there is a suggestion as well in the TED Commission report that we have a Manitoba Investment Corporation, and I think this is a very good idea. It's sort of the baby brother of the Canadian Development Corporation, but the idea would be to have the private sector, individual citizens make investments, buy shares in this Manitoba Investment Corporation which would then invest in Manitoba corporations. In other words, there would be a pool of capital that we would tap from our own citizens and use to expand our province, in particular in Northern Manitoba in the mining field, but in manufacturing and other areas.

When you look at the amount of money that is available in Manitoba and the amount of investment that is made in Manitoba, the figures are quite startling. For example, if we take first the question of the amount or value of transactions in the three western stock exchanges, this is an indication of how much money is being invested in these provinces in shares that are of companies located primarily in those three provinces. In Vancouver they do some \$337 million in trading. In Calgary, on their stock exchange they do \$29 million in trading, and in Winnipeg we do \$2 million. Well, I mean, a \$2 million turnover on a stock exchange is a joke. I don't know what the New York Stock Exchange does in volume and I don't know what the Toronto Stock Exchange does, but I'm quite confident it's in the billions and we are only doing a fraction, less than 10 percent of Calgary and we are doing only roughly one percent of what is being done in Vancouver.

Now at the same time there is money in the province. People do have money in their bank deposits. The people in Vancouver and the people in Winnipeg have the same amount put away, stored in their mattresses so to speak, \$35 billion dollars apiece, and Calgary has about \$18 billion in bank accounts. Well, I mean, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious that the people of Manitoba are simply being too conservative in their investment policy and TED points out, in a paragraph, that you can deduce three things from a comparison of bank deposits to transactions on stock markets. First they say that Vancouver is attracting inflows of risk capital in considerable quantity. Well, that's obvious. They're more than ten times ahead in Vancouver. They have a provincial bank, a Social Credit Bank, and that has made the difference. — (Interjection) — Well that's the thesis of my honourable friend. They are doing a fantastic volume compared to Calgary and compared to Winnipeg.

My second point is that Winnipeg is obviously not attracting risk capital in any significant amount, either from the province from outside Manitoba or from outside Canada; and third, that Manitoba savings are either being diverted into securities other than equities to an above average extent. In other words, people are investing in conservative things or, more probably, flowing out of Manitoba to equity opportunities elsewhere. So there is something that we really have to work on.

Mr. Chairman, one thing I wanted to deal with very briefly is the kind of image that is sometimes portrayed by my honourable friend in his department or the Department of Tourism and Recreation, and I think this idea of beating '70 and so on is a good one basically, but I sometimes wonder about whether we are not in fact deceiving people who intend to take up residence in Manitoba. Advertisements emphasizing beaches and bikinis and good weather and things like that seems to me to be — when I look out the window today for example — seems to me to be somewhat misleading. Maybe we should take another approach. Maybe instead of suggesting to people that this is sunny Manitoba, sort of the Florida of the North — we have a city called Miami don't we? in the province — maybe we should take a different approach and emphasize that we are hardy Northerners.

A MEMBER: Ya, but let's not abolish the bikini.

MR. DOERN: Let's not abolish the bikini.

MR. GREEN: If the bikini is not misleading.

MR. LYON: . . . say for the record, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend would make it clear that he is not opposed to Manitoba girls wearing bikinis.

MR. DOERN: Not at all.

MR. GREEN: He's not suggesting they're misleading.

MR. DOERN: My colleague from Kildonan says that they frequently have to be fur lined though in view of the cold weather. Mr. Chairman, I think there are other things that could be emphasized, and we do emphasize these things and we should continue to emphasize them, things like our virtually clean air in comparison to other cities in North America. I think we have something like the lowest amount of pollution in the air compared to other major centres.



(MR. DOERN cont'd.) Things like our — presumably our low crime rate and our low cost of living, that's one of the more positive things here; low wages unfortunately sometimes go hand in hand; our central location, our cultural facilities and so on. I think the emphasis has to be on a good place to live in and the emphasis might be on the four seasons, and perhaps it should be on the idea that you know only the toughest will survive in this province — (Interjection) — A man for all seasons, right. But the problem is that when we go to the idea of sands and beaches and sun then people who come here can only be disillusioned and can only say that they were misled. — (Interjection) — Not if they hit the right day?

MR. GREEN: They have one chance in 365.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there is only one or two other points I wanted to deal with. One is in regard to the Manitoba Development Fund. In looking at the annual report the people on the Board of Directors and their terms of office, some of the men who have served on the MDF Board have been on there for some time and I wonder whether the Minister has considered a bigger turnover or sort of a limitation on the terms. I can count at least three men who have been on since 1959 and others who probably will serve ten years or beyond. The question really is: If you're going to change the program of the MDF and make it more dynamic shouldn't we be looking for possibly some new, fresh blood on the Board, maybe some younger dynamic members of the business community and so on. Earl Dawson, if you'll pardon the expression, would be ideal — according to him.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to end on a positive note, assuming I haven't been doing that all along. I wanted to give my honourable friend an idea that I've carried around for a year or two and I think this is something I'd like to see him look into. This is an area that I suggest is going to be important in the world in the very near future; this is the development of the uses of paper products. For example, we have in our province the beginnings of a northern development in terms of pulp and paper. I'd like to draw to his attention the following illustration. Two years ago I was in New York and at the Modern Museum, one of their museums — Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art or something — they had a paper exhibit and I just went to it to sort of look around, they have interesting exhibits, and at first I just regarded it as a novelty but as I began to walk along and look at the furniture and the slippers and so on and so on I was struck at the potential in that particular area. The thing that really first caught my attention was a shirt woven out of paper, machine-made, that looked exactly like an ordinary shirt. This was done by some feat; or they had samples of clothing and so on that were knitted out of paper, actually hand-knitted by women, by top New York designers. The problem really is this, that these things can be done. I recall seeing advertisements in New York papers where they were making the first underwear out of paper. I think this is a thing of the future, that this is going to happen in the very near future that people will be using these products. We've heard of paper dresses and all sorts of other things that they're experimenting with. The problem is that the designers know how to make the stuff and they're experimenting, but the technology has not yet been developed; that the ideas are there, that we all know, or at least some people in the field know we are moving in this direction, that experiments have been made, but it's simply a question of technological breakthrough.

So I say to the Minister, given our talent at the University of Manitoba and our talent in the province and our northern forest resources, wouldn't it be a good idea to attempt to contact some large corporation in this field and see whether we can interest them into setting up some sort of experimental centre in Manitoba to develop a new line of paper products. I notice, for instance — I have a clipping somewhere, that there's a big race going on now in the United States between Kimberly-Clark and other big corporations; they're going into the market of industrial aprons and so on; they're competing with the traditional cloth or linen or whatever fabrics that they are.

So I would like to suggest to the Minister that he — and I say this in all seriousness — that he look into this particular area, that he perhaps study the question. I can give him some names if he wants to contact some people in New York who are designers, who have all the talent in the world to do the design or work on it. It's simply a question of money. It's a question of somebody putting up the money to achieve the technological breakthrough and I would like to see this type of a project occur in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Before the Honourable Minister replies I just have three quick questions. I had hoped that we would have enough time to get into Manitoba Development

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.) . . . . Fund today because I had a number of questions pertaining to that particular area. The one I wish the Minister would explain to the House is the — if one goes upstairs and looks through The Titles and the Companies Act upstairs on the third floor, I looked up a particular company and I noticed that MDF had no amount of money registered as a lien but they had unlimited credit. -- (Interjection) -- Well I can explain it again. The book simply says this particular company has unlimited credit backed by MD F, and I wondered if the Minister could give me an explanation on this. Possibly those that are sitting in the heavens there will have the answer. And if it's unlimited credit, what is meant by this? Is it a million dollars or two million dollars and how is it based? I know the Minister doesn't want me to mention names in the House and I won't mention this particular name, but it definitely states unlimited credit beside it, and I would assume that the total assets might be \$300,000 to \$400,000, yet with unlimited credit backed by the MD F this could mean in excess of a million, two million dollars if they so desired it. So I would like the answer to that particular question.

And the other one, I asked the Minister the first time I was on my feet. He mentioned that MD F were going to enlarge their scope more so, so that small businesses would be assisted. What is meant by this - "Small businesses will be greatly assisted through MD F?" I notice the Member for Neepawa-Gladstone last night talked about the number of people from his town, three companies I believe it was, that were turned down flatly because MD F -- one of the reasons they considered was that they were not large enough. Now does this mean that those smaller businesses whether they be in the City of Winnipeg, up north or in the rural area will be able to receive some assistance? I think a yes or no on this would be sufficient as far as I'm concerned.

The third thing I wanted to ask the Honourable Minister about was, would he consider in any way shape or form having the Chairman and General Manager of MD F appear annually before the Public Accounts Committee? Not to look for dirt as the Minister always infers when we mention these facts, but to give us a clearer understanding of what is going on in MD F. I think this would be an excellent way of taking all the innuendo that goes on or that is suggested by the Minister; I think it would be an excellent suggestion of satisfying those who have questions to ask, that if the General Manager would appear before the Public Accounts Committee we could ask the questions that we want to ask; we could mention names, they wouldn't be appearing in the press and we wouldn't be criticized by the Minister for trying to cause problems for the people that have borrowed money from the Fund or are in difficulties with the Fund. I think this would be an excellent way of satisfying all the members who have questions such as the one I mentioned in my first statement.

Finally, I just wanted to mention to the Minister that when my Leader mentioned that he was in favour of TED and he hadn't had time to read it all; I did read all of TED. We received the book a few days before Good Friday. I spent Good Friday, Saturday and part of Sunday reading it. I came back, told my Leader that it's a good document but, I'll bet you a dollar to a doughnut that the Minister won't be happy with it because it criticizes the Department of Industry and Commerce.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll have to ask the honourable member -- Our eighty hours have been completed and I will now proceed through the various resolutions that have not been passed. (Resolutions Nos. 57 to 64 were read and passed.)

Department I - Legislation. No. 3 - Other Assembly Expenditures - \$224,807.00 - Resolution ...

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, QC (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, before you go on with that. Item No. 2 I realize that this is payable out of Consolidated Revenue but nevertheless we have to vote it here -- (Interjection)-- we don't have to vote it but we can discuss it here. I'd like to get some particulars as to that amount of \$4,610 under Retirement Allowances Including Refunds of Contributions (Statutory). Could you tell me whether that amount is paid to one individual or whether it's paid to more than one individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm told the motions after 80 hours are not debatable.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'm not debating, I'm only asking a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I don't think there can be any questions answered either under the rules.

(Resolutions Nos. 1 to 5 were read and passed.

Department No. 4 - Attorney-General. Resolutions Nos. 16 to 23 were read and passed.

Department No. 5 - Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Resolutions Nos. 24 to 29 were read and passed.

Department No. 6 - Finance. Resolutions Nos. 30 to 36 were read and passed.

Department No. 7 - Government Services. Resolutions Nos. 37 to 48 were read and passed.)

Schedule A, Capital Supply, No. 1, The Manitoba Telephone System, \$17 million. No. 2 The Manitoba ....

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, we're allowed to debate these ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No debate, Sir, no debate.

MR. FROESE: Well this -- (Interjection) -- - pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I just pass these ones?

MR. FROESE: I don't think this falls under ...

MR. EVANS: These resolutions come into the Committee of Ways and Means, and there will be an opportunity to discuss the Capital Estimates at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Manitoba Telephone System, \$17 million -- passed. No. 2, The Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, \$200 million -- passed. No. 3, The Manitoba Water Supply Board, \$800,000 -- passed. No. 4, The Manitoba School Capital and Financing Authority, \$25 million -- passed. No. 5, The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, \$6 million -- passed. No. 6, The Manitoba Development Fund, \$25 million -- passed. No. 7, The University of Manitoba, \$2 million - passed. No. 8, The Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation, \$3 million - passed. No. 9, General Purposes, \$7 million -- passed.

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

I want to thank all the members for their co-operation during their estimates; it made my job a lot easier. -- (Interjection) -- I agree.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I now ask you to call the resolution which appears in my name on Page 4 of the Order Paper, commonly known as the speed-up motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that for the remainder of the session the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:30 to 5:30 p.m., and in the evening from 8:00 p.m., and each sitting to be a separate sitting, and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and the Rules with respect to 10:00 o'clock p.m. adjournment be suspended, and that the Order of Business for each day shall be the same as on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: ... one of those occasions where perhaps words are totally unnecessary, which is an injunction I hope will be followed on all sides of the House as we come to the basis matter.

But by way of very brief explanation, I should perhaps say that this is the usual motion that is brought in approximately at this stage of every session. This year it is a bit later than it was last year, last year I see that we brought the motion in when we had completed only 55 hours of the business of Supply and at that time we agreed to certain amendments proposed by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, which amendments were waived at the conclusion of Supply. So now we have waited this year to bring it in until Supply has been concluded. We hope that it will meet with the general approval of the members of the House. It is nothing new. I hope that form doesn't require that they make the same speech every year, but if they do we will have to listen quite attentively to what they have to say and hopefully perhaps not agree to all of the submissions that they make.

I should say seriously, however, Sir, that in terms of the business of the House this gives us a short opportunity to discuss that matter. It would not be the government's intention any more than it has been our intention or our practice in previous years to unduly hurry matters through the House. I know the Leader of the Opposition has made reference to the fact that there are a number of Bills for second reading on the Paper and he is concerned lest these Bills be introduced in the morning, passed in Committee in the afternoon and given third reading in the evening. I think he will agree with me that this is not the course that is followed unless it is a routine type of Bill that the House has had ample time to consider previously.

It would be the intention of the government to be quite reasonable on matters of adjournment, subject, of course, always to having to call a halt if we thought that that right was being abused in any way in order to frustrate what we conceive to be the general will of the House. But this is the time of year when we introduce the motion, when we seek that co-operative attitude on behalf of the Opposition parties - which I must say have been forthcoming in all the sessions of my experience - and I hope that we will see our way clear to support this motion and to if possible give approval to the motion today so that we can devote the remaining days or weeks that are ahead of us to getting on with the business that is before us. I only wish to make that assurance about carrying on with Bills in the fashion that has been the practice in previous years.

I believe there's little else I can say at this time except to perhaps indicate that there was a suggestion I'm told made in the Committee on Public Utilities on yesterday morning, that it might be desirable for instance, if that Committee with all of the witnesses that are to appear before it were to consider sitting all day Tuesday. If we have the speed-up motion in force at that time it would be possible, of course, to do that. It would be possible by consent to do it in any case. These are matters that give us a bit more flexibility to deal with at this time; I hope always with consultation with the members opposite in order that we can facilitate the proper business of the House. But with these assurances, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion that I've just presented will receive the usual careful consideration from the members of the Opposition and hopefully might receive passage before we adjourn at 12:30.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the Minister of Industry and Commerce yesterday that addressed the Leader of the New Democratic Party and said that something happened yesterday that rubbed off on the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, that he was pious, and I seem to detect the same approach in the Attorney-General who seems very pious today. Of course he has more reason for doing this because he spent a week or two in Rome ... -- (Interjection) -- ... and more rubbed off, and I -- (Interjection) -- - yes?

MR. LYON: I just wanted to bless you.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm very pleased to hear that. This is welcome news and that only proves to me that he's pious because he's been damning me for the last ten years - very pleased to hear that. I thought that I should lead off in this because I am the next thing close going to Rome; I was paired with my honourable friend for two weeks, so I guess I'm somewhat holy also and pious. And with these -- (Interjection) -- That's right. And with these opening words, I think that all the members of the House will see that, there's at least three of us that are pious, one in each Party, and no discredit to the Social Credit because I'm sure that they are too,

MR. DESJARDINS (cont'd) . . . . and I think that we've established now that we will certainly have co-operation.

But the thing, Mr. Speaker, is that maybe we'll have to define co-operation and maybe co-operation will not be defined the same way in all camps. I think that co-operation in this instance, and this is my definition anyway, is to co-operate, to work together, the members of this House, but in a way that the province and the people of Manitoba will profit by this co-operation. And this is the most important thing. I feel that there has been a bit of a lack of co-operation or indication - I want to be very careful and fair, Mr. Speaker - may be an indication of lack of co-operation.

I think that my Leader, for instance yesterday, suggested something that was very good, a good idea. He felt that we should meet in committee, this Public Utility Committee, every morning, and then we would go back in the House and have a chance to deal with the Bill, second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and that to me makes a lot of sense and it makes a lot of sense I think to all the members of the Opposition, and I was very surprised to see that not one member of the government thought that this should be what we should do. And the Chairman of the Committee said: No, we will sit all day; we will be in Committee all day, morning, afternoon, evening, and in the middle of the night if need be. Mind you, he had a smile when he added that, but he said it nevertheless, and I thought this a bit odd, that the Committee would decide when we will sit. In other words, he was saying: Well, we'll not go in the House. And to me it didn't really smell co-operation, because co-operation is something that you've discussed before. -- (Interjection) -- You see, my honourable friend said it stunk, but I don't use these kind of words and I wouldn't say that, Mr. Speaker.

So I think that it was kind of odd that the Chairman of this Committee, the Chairman who was only elected on that day, would say: Well, we will sit in Committee all day - all day, and that the House had nothing to do with it - because we're not all members of this Committee - that the House had nothing to do in saying, Well, we won't sit, we won't sit in the House on Monday afternoon or Monday evening and we will go to committee. The House certainly wasn't asked any opinion on this; it was decided by a chairman of a Committee of the House, and I thought that was rather odd and I don't think that this is quite proper. I see where I'll have a reply by the Minister because there's a little caucus on the other side, and this is very good, this is the co-operation that I was talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said a few things that didn't go quite right with me although I am in the spirit of co-operation today. He said that we'll have to listen, we'll probably have to listen to the same speeches every year. Well, this is bad, this is bad if you have to listen to the same speeches every year. It's bad on two counts: either the members are too lazy to prepare speeches and are just repeating, repeating themselves or they like to hear themselves talk - and I hasten to say that I never spoke on this motion last year, Mr. Speaker; or the government is not listening to the speeches, because speech -- I was going to say speech after speech, but it's the same I guess, speech after speech or year after year, we've been advocating that the government should not wait until the very end of the session before they brought in these Bills, and the government will not learn, Mr. Speaker, the government will not learn. I remember this famous pension Bill, the pension that was geared pretty well for the front bench. You remember, Mr. Speaker, that came in the last day, the last day; the Chief Justice was replacing the Lieutenant-Governor and he was waiting that night; that was the end of the session. I even collected my five bucks to have a party for all the people. This was all done. Mind you, I never saw that party and we ended up in a big -- well in fact I think the government owes me five bucks but I won't talk about that. So, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- you lost the pension . . .

MR. LYON: You lost more than five bucks.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I wasn't a Minister then, you were. You know the Minister tempts me but I won't -- there'll be other occasions and we'll talk about that. But you see every year, Sir, the government comes back and waits till the last minute for these Bills. Now I'm not exaggerating. Well, I would like you to answer, but I guess I'll . . .

MR. SPEAKER: At this stage, I have no opinion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh. Well, I'm very -- no, I was going to say I'm pleased to hear that but that's not right, that doesn't sound right. I'm pleased to know, Sir, that you are impartial as always. But Sir, I would like to say that again this year, and maybe more than ever, the Honourable Minister in his pious way said: You know, this motion is coming quite a bit

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . later this year. He's right. But the Bills, the Bills aren't here yet, Mr. Speaker. We're working on the Expropriation Bill, I believe - this wasn't too clear this morning. My honourable friend - I've been calling him Rick so much, what's his - the Minister of Sports anyway and Tourism, Tourism had to contact and talk to his deskmate before he could tell us that there was some legislation coming, but there's some legislation that is being prepared now he said - prepared now - prepared, and we want this motion. This doesn't seem right, and if you had an opinion, Sir, you would agree with me I'm sure on this.

Now on Page 3 of the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, we have a long list of Bills, Bills that are coming in for second reading. They're only coming in, Sir, no second reading yet. You have on Bill No. 19, The Transit Grants Act. You know when that was introduced? The 18th of April, but we haven't discussed this yet, and all of a sudden, boom boom boom we are going to go at it three or four times, a -- that's not reasonable, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you will agree with me. No. 54, An Act to amend The Pipe Line Act, and that is sponsored by my honourable friend as well as the Act to amend The Real Property Act. That came in on April 18th also. There's three of them on April 18th, and we have never had a word on second reading. This is the important thing. Look at all -- well we wasted a lot of time I'm sure because these things weren't forthcoming. Then the next one, An Act to amend The Securities Act, was April 21st. And you go down the list - No. 50, the Fisheries Act; No. 59, an Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act; No. 60, An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Tax Act; 64, An Act to amend The Department of Welfare Act; 71, An Act to amend The Legislative Library Act; 73, An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Line Act - there must be two of those; An Act to amend The Department of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs Act. All those have been introduced for the first time on April 24th, but we haven't heard anything at all. I mean that is not co-operation. Are we going to all of a sudden railroad this through, and this will be co-operation, this will be for the good of the people of Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: You leave my railroad out of it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I can't use the word railroad now. If I could work in his wife's hairnet in there I would. Then the next few, Mr. Speaker, were on April 25th, and I won't name them all, I'd be taking too much time and this is the last thing that I want to do. And then there's the one on 28, No. 72, that's a good one, The Bee Act. Well that's on 28, but the bees will be tired if we don't do something very soon. And Sir, this is a very -- (Interjection) -- Did you say that was for the birds? We will get back on the Department of Education if you are not careful. And then there's the Ombudsman Act. Well this is very important; this is a very important one. Are we going to wait until the last day to shove this one through? That wouldn't be co-operation, Sir, as you know. -- (Interjection) --

Is that a promise? Oh, well I thought it was concurrence next. Oh, today we are going into the second reading of this? Sir, look at the time. I know you have no opinion but you know what the time is - quarter after twelve, Sir, and today . . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will permit an interruption, if he's prepared to give consent to sit this afternoon on government business, we'll go to second readings right this afternoon.

MR. DESJARDINS: Tonight?

MR. LYON: We'll even sit tonight.

MR. DESJARDINS: Look at the time, Sir, look at the time, and he says we'll be on the Ombudsman today. Now this afternoon is Private Members; we don't sit this evening, so that means in 15 minutes he's ready - and I'll have to use that word - to railroad all this through. Well, Sir, I'm not going to go for that, that's asking a little too much. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. LYON: We made you an offer.

MR. DESJARDINS: What did he say?

A MEMBER: He made a proposition.

MR. DESJARDINS: He made me an offer, but I'm sorry I would like to get out of here today, but I'm thinking of the people of Manitoba and I haven't the right to accept those kind of offers.

Now, Sir there's two more bills on the 30th of April, An Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Recreation, and that's a very important bill. I have a major speech on that I know. Then there's an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act on the 30th, and there are four others in May, Sir - May 2nd for 88 and 85, and then May 8th for No. 80 and 81. We had a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . chance to discuss these things before, we should have discussed these things before, but it was never brought up. And Sir, that is not all. You remember that two very very important bills were read for the first time yesterday - the School Bills. In fact I am told that the government maybe would like to fight an election on those, so let's take it easy and study those things before the Department, the Minister of Education decides to go to the people on this, because this is a very important bill and we want to know all the angles of those two especially.

Now my Leader, in a spirit of co-operation that is so common to this Party that I have the honour to belong to, said yesterday, when will we have this Bill? Do you know why, Sir? Because he thought we'd have it for the weekend so we could study it this weekend. Well, in the same spirit of co-operation they said "soon." When soon? Well they're printing it now. I tried to get a little more information and I said what page are they printing now? They wouldn't answer that, Sir, so we don't know when we will get these bills. There's two very important bills. And today, Sir, today, more bills - more bills - (Interjection) -- well sure the Expropriation Act and so on, this is coming. So is that normal? These are the laws, and our first responsibility here, we're lawmakers, and the laws of this province, the laws of the land come in in bill form first and we have to study this to make the proper laws.

Now we waste more time doing everything but the business of this House, and these are all laws -- if we finish this, next year it will be law, it will be too late to change. Oh, we can change it again, but I mean this is very important, important laws, and we are asked to shove this in a few days at the last minute. Well what are we asked to do? Why didn't my honourable friend the Minister say yes, we'll have committee in the morning, then we'll have second readings. Why? Why didn't the government, when my Leader suggested a week or so ago why don't we have some of these second readings so we could speed this up a bit, why didn't the government say all right, in the spirit of co-operation we go along; you have a good idea, a terrific idea and we will go along with this.

Now we have today the bills that were introduced - an Act to Amend The Liquor Control Act, that's a very important one; an Act to adjust Certain Benefits . . operation of Group Life Insurance; an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act; an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act; an Act to amend The Municipal Act, and you know how long this one will be. This is also a very very important Act and there's only the first reading now. So you are -- (Interjection) -- Well yes, I mentioned the two education Acts, the Sinking Fund Trustees, the School Board, and many others, Sir.

Well I suggest that there is no need for this motion right now, that this motion is premature. If we have to stay another month or two it will be tough for us, there might be a few more broken chairs like the one that we saw last night, that's possible, but at least we will try to make the proper laws for the people of Manitoba. That, Sir, I suggest is real co-operation between all the parties. This is the real form of co-operation that we think is good for the people of Manitoba, where we'll have a chance to discuss these things and bring these laws at the right time. And it wouldn't cost that much because we're all on a fixed salary. I think this is all right.

But, Sir, this is too important, and I think that if there was a way, if the Minister made me a promise -- I would like to see the Minister and the government make a promise to the people of Manitoba, and that is to say we've got a year before the next session - I'm talking about the year that there is no election of course, Mr. Speaker - but we have all this time and now we will work, we'll take the major -- we must know what we are going to do because we have a Throne Speech, and I thought that you were supposed to know because you usually say in your Throne Speech I'm going to do this and I'm going to do that and this is what this government proposes to do. So I think that we should get most of the important bills right from the start of the Session, Sir, right from the start of the Session. The Minister now tells me I'll make you an offer. If you agree with this, well no Private Members this afternoon. Will that be right, Sir? Will that be right? We had all kinds -- there's third reading of all private bills. We need time for that eh? -- (Interjection) -- Well that's private members.-- (Interjection) -- You mean you weren't even making a deal? You pretended you were making a deal.

MR. LYON: Oh no, no, no, Mr. Speaker. I'm so expansive I agreed that we'd do all bills this afternoon, private members' and government members' bills, and my honourable friend has just finished saying, has he not, that we're here to legislate. Well certainly he must

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . . agree, or does he not, that the bills should take priority over resolutions which have no effect.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, definitely, definitely, but this is not a question of one instead of the other. Oh no, this is this and that coming together. I mean the bills -- no, higher there. My honourable friend is trying to learn a few things and I'm just teaching him how.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the business of the House -- Order please. I wonder if the business of the House is not getting on to a roller coaster. Could we sort of keep with the matter before the House?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Sir, if you ask my friend to refrain from all these . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well of course my remarks are reflected to everyone in the House, no one in particular.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well that's the way it should be, I don't think that you should choose anybody. That's fine, but we all know here who the offenders are, Mr. Speaker. But you see this is right, we want to look at all these bills, we want to look at the private bills, but my honourable friend says we are going to do all this this afternoon. This is sheer -- I was up to Ombudsman, and he says we'll discuss this today. Now he tells me, and I was under the impression, Sir, that he wanted to discuss only those, but he says, oh no no, those too. Well my goodness the afternoon only has so many hours - and I've got to use that word railroad again, I can't do anything else - I'll talk about the CPR. I beg your pardon? --(Interjection)-- well next time I'm going to learn a few Icelandic words and I'll just throw them in and that will make my speech complete.

Now, Sir, I think that I have tried to demonstrate, to my satisfaction anyway, that the word co-operation means working together but for a certain cause, not railroad anything, Sir, and you seem to agree with me. This is right, and I think, as I said, it's not co-operation to keep the people here and say the morning, the afternoon, because we have to have certain bills -- can you see for instance these bills and the one on Education, can you see, Sir, that we're presented these bills and then we're told, well all right, the first reading now, in the afternoon, and it will be finished in one day. In all justice, the Minister said that this is not what he wants, but he said this before and I remember what happened on this pension thing - boy was that coming morning, noon and night, Sir.

So we just want to be in a position where we could digest a bit of the advice of what has been said by other members before we make up our mind on very important pieces of legislation on the laws that will govern the people of Manitoba, and this is too serious, Sir, to be rushed into this at all. If the government, as I said before, would come in with major legislation at the start, and I don't know of any major legislation - do you remember any very important bills that they brought early in the session that we had to discuss? -- (Interjection) -- Well medicare, but medicare because the government -- you see, I'm glad the Minister said that. The government had to meet a deadline, there was a date, so they rushed into Medicare. Was there lack of co-operation from this side, Mr. Speaker? I'm sure you have an opinion on that, because you know that we have co-operated on this. And that shows when the government wants to do something, it was important because they had promised the Medicare on a certain date. --(Interjection)-- Well that's it, that's right. That's right. My honourable friend has enough material for another long speech there I'm sure, because this is true.

So, Mr. Speaker, wanting to co-operate and not to take too much time of the House, I only have five minutes left in my speech, just a few -- no, Sir, I think that it's only proper that we hear from other members and I think that my point of view is clear. I don't want the government to believe that we don't want to co-operate; we want to co-operate. We want to co-operate of course, but we have a certain definition of co-operation, and co-operation is not that we are going to be rubber stamps, that we are going to go at the last minute, bang bang bang, and we don't want that - it's only the rabbit that does that - so, Sir, I rest my case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too wish to speak on this resolution, particularly because to date I have been in this house for three sessions and no one has convinced me of the necessity of this speed-up. If we would husband our time properly and allocate the agenda regularly so that we would all understand what is going on, instead of the government trying to play footsie every so often with us, we could probably do this House's work more expeditiously. But when we ask questions of the government as to when is this coming in, that is coming in, we get the answer "soon." When we ask of the government that they tell us how they are going



(MR. FOX cont'd) . . . . . to allocate some of this work, they say it's their business, But I'm afraid that's not so. It's also ours. We too are trying to serve Manitoba and we are trying to do it just as sincerely as the government, and the speed-up certainly isn't one of the ways of doing it. People want to hear what is going on, they want to make representation, and if we work at the business of the House in one day of having three sessions, things go through there before anybody can even get notification out to the public. This is not fair to them.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this; I have tried to conduct and to make my speeches as brief as possible and to co-operate with you. I note that we on this side have co-operated with the government even on Private Members' days and have allowed some of the bills to go through which should really have been done on government business. Nevertheless, and vice versa, that's true, we've also given up our time, but when the speed-up comes along there is no more consideration of private members' resolutions at all. They are left to the tail-end and this really isn't fair either, because I do think the government needs educating and the only way they can get educated is by resolutions that we bring forward now and then. It makes them aware of the ideas and eventually, gradually, they get around to implementing some of them. For instance, we have something this year - the Ombudsman is one of those things and so on. I could name a few others, but nevertheless this is what it takes to bring the government to the awareness of some of the issues. The other thing that I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, is that if it is so necessary to adjourn the House at this time, why didn't we start sooner. We were available, I'm sure so were all the other members. It was at the government's discretion when we started. Fine, if it's at their discretion to start late then they have to go along with ending late. If this is not what they want, well then if we must adjourn now, let's postpone the work that we still have so we can do it in an orderly fashion and do it later on. I'm not averse to sitting at another time this year. As the member for St. Boniface has pointed out, we get an indemnity for the whole year; we have to serve our constituents and Manitoba for the whole year. I see no reason why we shouldn't do this work in a proper orderly fashion.

The other thing that irritates me, as we pass laws in respect to hours of work and in respect to conditions and wages, and here we in this House can't even do that and regulate it properly for ourselves. We jump around from one thing to another and pile up the bills to the tail-end of the session and then we want to ram them through - one, two, three; one, two, three - and we don't even have the sense to say that we will stop at a reasonable hour, 10 o'clock, 11 o'clock, we leave it open and because the government has the majority, I don't dare trust them because we may be sitting here till two, three, four o'clock in the morning, as we've done on occasion, and it's just a matter of attrition and not a matter of consideration to the work that we have to do, and I say that this really isn't giving -- (Interjection) -- Would you like to say something?

MR. LYON: No time and a half for overtime, sorry.

MR. FOX: I don't ask for time and a half.

MR. LYON: No collective bargaining either.

MR. FOX: I put my time in and I carry on with my constituents. They know what I am getting paid. I have nothing to hide from them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am sure the honourable gentleman has a few more remarks to make on the subject. It is now 12:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.