

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, September 11, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Hon. Mr. Mackling as Chairman. Your Committee has agreed that, for the remainder of this Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of ten (10) members.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 5 - An Act to amend The Pipe Line Act.

No. 6 - An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Line Act.

No. 7 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act.

No. 8 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

No. 11 - An Act to Adjust Certain Benefits arising out of the Operation of the Group Life Insurance Plan for Public Servants.

No. 15 - The Transit Grants Act.

No. 22 - The Financial Administration Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 4 - The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act.

No. 23 - The Provincial Auditor's Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that the Report be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, to 25 students of Grades 9, 10 and 11 standing, of the R. B. Russell Vocational School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Kneller, McGhie and Pasioka. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

We also have 25 students, Grade 11 standing, of the Kelvin High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Toews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

And 49 students of Grade 5 standing, of the William Russell School. These students are under the direction of Miss Proteau and Miss Gibbs. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): . . . . when the budget might be presented. Is it going to be this week?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'm aiming for some time next week. I will certainly give an indication in advance if my honourable friends are interested.

MR. WEIR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Might I ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs? I wonder if his department has any indication of the rate of tax collection returns in

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . rural municipalities as compared to other years, and I'm referring now to rural municipalities, areas where we have the agricultural situation that we have now.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the nature of the honourable member's question and I understand that the Department of Agriculture is presently taking a survey, so if we could take this question as notice I would hope within a short time that we'd be able to supply the member with the information.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Does he not think that this would be an excellent opportunity to call the Agricultural Committee together in order to hear the view of the rural municipalities, as well as the Retain Mercants' Association, the implement dealers and the gasoline companies, as to the problems that they face. I think this would be an opportunity for the Minister to get all of those opinions.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I indicated about two weeks ago to the members in the House that there were measures being taken to study the situation. I have three men working on statistical data establishing all the information that we may require with respect to arrears in debts, whether it be F. C. C. mortgages, Agricultural Credit Corporation mortgages, whether it be taxation and all other matters related thereto, and when we have this data compiled it is my intention to involve many people in a presentation to the Federal Government.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister if he would give us the names of the personnel on the committee that he has appointed to look into all aspects of this . . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, these are inter-departmental people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the ones already put forward. Can we expect some kind of a report while this House is still in Session?

MR. USKIW: I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that we may have an interim report some time next week and a final one before this Session is prorogued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): A supplementary question, Mr. Minister. Can we expect the Agricultural Committee to be called this Session?

MR. USKIW: It may involve the Agricultural Committee.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. It also follows along the lines of the honourable member the Leader of the Official Opposition. Is the Minister of Finance in a position to indicate to the House as to whether or not there's been any decrease, any appreciable decrease in the amount of monies collected pursuant to the Revenue Tax Act as it may apply to rural areas, taking into consideration the agricultural crisis?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, may I request of the Minister of Finance that, if possible, that this information be made available to the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: The question was: is the Minister in a position to evaluate or to report? and then the answer was "no". On the Order Paper today there is a request for an Order for Return. I imagine that is the kind of information that the member is requesting. If he will check the Order and consult with his neighbour on his left, he can ascertain whether or not it covers the questions he has in mind.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, if I may, yesterday the Honourable Member for River Heights asked if I could compare the rate paid by the -- or undertaken to be paid under the Telephone System issue that was recently made, with - and I quote - "the 40 million loan of the Ontario Government at that time in West Germany for 7 percent." At that time I replied that I was prepared to say without checking much further that I don't believe the statement "as it is put by the honourable member." Last night, the honourable member gave me the opportunity to read the newspaper report from which he had obtained his information, and certainly what was stated in the report was as was stated by the honourable member. He also suggested that I might have to rise this morning or this afternoon to apologize for having questioned it. My information received, as of this morning, on the Ontario Hydro issue was that it was issued at 7 percent, was issued at \$97.00 to yield 7.41 to the buyers. The cost of issuing it to Hydro reduced the net to Hydro to \$94.50, since the cost of processing a loan runs 2 1/2 to

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . 3 percent when done in Germany as compared with one percent when done in Canada, and the cost to Hydro was therefore 7 - 7/8 percent plus, of course, what was mentioned by the Premier yesterday, that in addition to that is the risk of an upward revaluation of the Deutsche mark, which would of course increase the cost substantially or to the extent that it was revalued upward.

May I say in that respect, Mr. Speaker, that at all times that an issue is proposed by this government - and I'm speaking now not this government in any different sense from the previous government - all markets are considered before the decision is made, and the factors that were weighed in this case on the Duetsche mark issue, were that processing time apparently takes two to three months because of a line-up that takes place, which would mean that the issue in our case would have been priced after the German election which takes place towards the end of this month, and it is felt - and this I was advised when I was east on the question of the issue - that this was not a good time to take a risk on the results of the election as it might affect the revaluation of the Deutsche mark. The European market at the time that we went out was also considered somewhat risky because of the fluctuation that was taking place in the French franc, and honourable members may recall that. So that, because the Canadian market indicated to us that it was able to support a Telephone issue of the size that we gave, as of course was proven when we put out the issue, it was considered advisable to proceed as we did, and we feel that we did the correct thing and one for which we can take some pride. May I say that this does not rule out the possibility that in the future we will be going to the European markets if it is deemed advisable so to do at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister of Finance for his information. I wonder if he's in a position now, and he may not be but if he's not whether he would inform the House and attain the information, as to when Ontario Hydro did begin the processing of this loan.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it's of any value to continue with an investigation of how Ontario Hydro was negotiating its loan. I might try to get the information for the honourable member. I don't think it's of any particular value to the House. The honourable member was welcome to visit me in my office and I can arrange for an interview between him and someone else who may be more knowledgeable than I am to discuss general market conditions, but I'm not even sure that we have a right to inquire from Ontario Hydro as to the procedures that they used in connection with their loan.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure which Minister I should address my question to. It's with regard to pollution. Has the Manitoba Government conducted negotiations with Ottawa with regard to the new legislation and stricter regulations on pollution?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the honourable member that several Ministers of the Manitoba Government, including the First Minister, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the Minister of Agriculture and myself, met with the Honourable Otto Lang, the Minister in charge of pollution for the Federal Government, discussing the Water Act. We heard his proposals with regard to what is intended by the Federal Government across the country. At that time we indicated several reservations that were held by us. I can say that the meetings that were held in this regard were deemed to be very pleasant by both parties.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, in the light of these discussions, is there any plan or any project by the Manitoba Government to change the legislation in Manitoba regarding pollution?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think it was agreed by both the Honourable Mr. Lang and ourselves that the Manitoba legislation in connection with pollution does fall on the things that are necessary to control pollution in the Province of Manitoba depending on the strength of its administration, but the legislation is all that is necessary. What the Honourable Mr. Lang referred to us in terms of federal legislation was things that could affect inter-provincial waters and the possibility of national standards, and it's on this last issue that the Federal Government seems to have not formed any firm policy.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the light of the concern expressed last year in The Pas area about pollution in the river there from the new pulp and paper mills and the developments there, has there been any review of this by the present government?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I can advise the honourable member that I have met with our Clean Environment Commission as well as the relevant civil servants who are involved in the administration of the Pollution Act, and not only in The Pas but in other areas as well, we are now taking steps with each of the industries or municipalities that are involved in any polluttional material either to earth, air or water, discussing steps for the stage by stage elimination of the polluttional danger.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose posed. Does the Federal Government provide any assistance under this program, and also has our government set up any priorities as to what rivers or so on would be tackled first?

MR. GREEN: I may answer the honourable member by telling him that the Federal Government proposal is characterized by its lack of financial assistance. With regard to priorities in Manitoba, there are several priorities that are being looked at by the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I'm aware that other questions on the subject have been asked before, but in view of the present state of uncertainty in the construction and development industries, can the Minister tell the House when a statement will be forthcoming about the government's intention on the projected downtown Winnipeg tax freeze?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I expect that a bill will be introduced very shortly which will indicate to the Honourable members the position of the government in this respect.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister: when he says a bill will be introduced very shortly, may I ask him does he mean that such a bill will be introduced during this Session?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question, I guess to the Minister of Health and Social Services - it's also on pollution. Will there be a report made to this House on the findings on pollution? Will there be a report made to this House?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I assume that during the estimates of the department the honourable member would have all the usual rights of asking questions regarding pollution. With regard to legislative reports, I believe that the Clean Environment Commission is required to table an annual report in the Legislature, but I wouldn't expect that report to give the honourable member all the answers to the questions that he would have in mind, and I would say that the normal reporting would be done by the Minister during the tabling of the current estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister tell the House whether he is currently holding discussions with municipal officials and other qualified personnel, on the pros and cons of total amalgamation in the Metro area?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're considering all aspects of this question. I don't know of any discussions dealing with pros and cons of this with any municipal body at the present time.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister define the nature of the discussions? Do they involve municipal officials from the municipalities within the metropolitan area?

MR. PAWLEY: What discussions is the honourable member referring to in respect to this?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the discussions I'm referring to, Mr. Speaker, are any that would have to do with the benefits or the disadvantages, the advantages or the disadvantages to be derived from some form of amalgamation approaching even total amalgamation in the Metro area, and what I'm asking, Sir, is whether these are abstract considerations on the Minister's part, or is he and his department actually meeting with municipal officials and weighing the pros and cons?

MR. PAWLEY: No, not at this time, Mr. Speaker. I thought I had indicated that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House Leader could advise whether the Professions Committee will be meeting during this session of the Legislature.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): The Committee on . . . .

MR. CRAIK: The professions.

MR. PAULLEY: I've been awaiting my honourable friends opposite to give me the names of the members of that committee so that I could place this matter on the Order Paper for the consideration of this House. I'm happy to say that at long last I have the names of their representatives to this committee; it will be on Votes and Proceedings in a day or so, and that will indicate to my honourable friend the establishment, first of all, of the committee.

MR. CRAIK: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture regarding a question, or a suggestion put by the Member from Arthur, on Page 413, September issue, regarding signs on farms for wheat for sale as low as 25 cents. Has your department, or has his department, Mr. Speaker, done any investigation in this regard?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I may point out that it isn't the intent of the department to go about the province travelling around to see whether people have signs along the roads or highways, but I want to tell my honourable friend that the matter is under careful consideration at the moment.

MR. MCGREGOR: . . . then a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the national news last night; it just stated the prairies where wheat was being sold at 40 cents a bushel. Is it the intent of the Minister to allow this practice to go on unlimited? Because it certainly would affect the over-all sale, the over-all gross product of the agricultural industry.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered the question adequately, but I will repeat what I said, and that is that the matter is under consideration.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, about the . . . . the Minister has just made. In view of the fact that, prior to his taking over the Department of Agriculture, that he was going around the province looking at signs, is he now -- is it his intention to do anything about the price of coarse grains so far as sales to mills are concerned?

MR. USKIW: When I have considered the matter further, I will make a report to the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the Honourable Member for Churchill before his question becomes ancient history.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): We've finished our caucus, Mr. Speaker. In respect to the recent announcement on the sale of oil, and before we give away Churchill to the Northwest Territories, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has considered the sale of claims for oil around the area of Churchill?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, no, I have not considered it.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture on the

. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think it's possible for a supplemental question now. He may raise a new question if he so desires.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you. I'll ask another question. On the same day that he made the statement about the fine, the Honourable Minister was asked by my colleague the Member for Arthur regarding his statement that was made after the conference in New Brunswick, and I read in Hansard here that he said he was preparing a submission. When can we expect the submission?

MR. USKIW: I don't know that I ought to repeat myself many times, Mr. Speaker, but when we prepare a submission for the consideration of our Government at Ottawa, it will be a lengthy one and very comprehensive.

#### STATEMENT

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

MR. EVANS: The honourable members know the Government of Manitoba has sponsored a Hunters' Safety Training program during the past five years. Each year the states and provinces of North America who have such programs submit reports on them to the International

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . Association of Game and Fish Conservation Commissioners. After considering such factors as the number of people trained for hunting licences issued, the contents of the course and the materials used, the geographical area covered, the incentives for voluntary instructors and advertising and press coverage associated with the program, the Commissioners select one state or province to receive the National Rifle Association's award for outstanding achievement in the field of hunter safety training. During the past four years, Manitoba has received honourable mention three times. This year I am pleased to announce that, out of 30 states and provinces entered, Manitoba was selected for the top award. I'm sure all the members of the House will join me in congratulating the staff of the department and all the volunteers who have been associated with this program, not only this year, but the previous years as well.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD - (continued)

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. I believe a hearing has already been held by the Interstate Commerce Commission in connection with the Great Northern Railway Company's planned discontinuance of its present service from Winnipeg to St. Paul and Minneapolis. I believe, as well, that a further hearing has been suggested and an investigation will be undertaken. I wonder whether it's the intention of the province to make representations in connection with this matter before the Interstate Commerce Commission investigator.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier and Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that question will be taken as notice.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister. Has he anything to report to the House on his search for an Ombudsman?

MR. SCHREYER: Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. A news report yesterday indicated that Ottawa intends to clear out of all forms of entertainment at Riding Mountain National Park, including Wasagaming's famous 18-hole golf course. Has this come to the attention of the Minister and has he been in any consultation with Ottawa?

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, yes, I was well aware of the situation according to the press reports. Naturally we're concerned but, as the honourable member knows, this is a national park federal policy, but we're not just sitting on the job; we're making representations right now. As a matter of fact, we're drafting a letter to Ottawa protesting whatever they plan to do there.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the government consider asking the Federal Government to remove at least those portions of the park from federal control and return them to provincial control, if in fact it is their intention to cease some of the activities up there that are important to us from a tourism standpoint?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I can't give the answer to this at the present time. I'll take that as notice and will investigate and see what we can do.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of policy, which . . . any policy determination that's made will be announced. In the meantime, perhaps the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose could give us the benefit of his views in that respect?

MR. MOLGAT: I'd be delighted to give my views, Mr. Speaker. I have very definite views on the subject. Do you want them now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the First Minister. Some time ago I asked him whether the Department of Industry and Commerce had finalized negotiations for the building of an air tunnel at the airport for North West Airlines, or finished negotiations with North West Airlines for the building of such an air tunnel, and I wonder if he has any information in connection with this?

MR. SCHREYER: I hope to be able to have a definite answer for that, definitive answer, Monday.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, before we go into the Orders for the Day, present the following motion, moved by myself, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, that by leave the following bills now referred to Standing Committees as

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . shown, be withdrawn and referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments: Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Regulations Act, which was referred to Statutory Regulations and Orders; Bill No. 10, The Fisheries Act, which was referred to Public Utilities and Natural Resources; Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act which was referred to Public Utilities and Natural Resources; Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, which was referred to Industrial Relations; Bill No. 16, An Act respecting The Keystone Centre, which was referred to Agriculture; Bill No. 17, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act which was referred to Agriculture; Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, which was referred to Municipal Affairs Committee; Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Municipal Act, which was referred to Municipal Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question, first of all, and then I might want to have something to say as a result of the question. Can we expect the Committee on Public Utilities to meet at this Session of the Legislature in any event?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . I can give to my honourable friend, that the Committee on Natural Resources will not be called for the purpose of hearing bills.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Riel, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. WEIR: Ayes and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there's really no need for a vote. There's been some misunderstanding. Either we can dispense with the vote or have a standing vote so as not to take the time of the House. It's not our wish to object to an adjournment. With leave of the House it obviously requires unanimous consent that no vote be taken. It was a misunderstanding. But, unless members object . . . .

A MEMBER: On a point of order, is the First Minister saying that there was no objection from that side of the House?

MR. SCHREYER: There was a misunderstanding as to what was just taking place. If a vote is called it will probably be 57 to nothing, or 56 to one.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order - and I think we're probably all out of order in this connection; I don't think anyone of us should be speaking up - I think the vote must be held for the record.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to give leave to have the vote on it withdrawn.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, you'd called the question and in your opinion you heard certain noises, and I'd be quite willing to abide by your ruling, but I certainly don't want to embarrass my honourable friends across there because I know they were acting with good will.

MR. PAULLEY: May I assure my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be embarrassed. No matter how the vote is, we are not going to deprive the opposition of the right to adjourn the debate.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I hesitate to say anything because I think that saying anything at this point is like appealing the Speaker's ruling, because really you did have one and I asked to have it recorded, and I don't really want to take one side or the other. My fear is that a dangerous precedent might be established in this type of thing, and I would be prepared to abide by your judgment and go according to your judgment in terms of whether the vote could be taken and whether it would require leave or what . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared on this side to support the motion of my honourable friend of the adjournment of the debate by standing up or sitting down.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, if I may add a word or two, I believe it was called for on division, and you accepted that from the floor and we must vote.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion was to adjourn debate.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barkman, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Chernack, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Fox, Froese, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hardy, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller,

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.). . . . Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Spivak, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Watt and Weir.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 48, Nays nil.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I was paired with the Honourable Member for St. George, had I voted I would have voted in favour of the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the last vote would it be in order to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to seek out those members voting "No" on the first vote?

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rock Lake, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The names of all ministerial assistants that have been hired since July 15, 1969, in each of the departments of Government.
2. The background and qualifications of each of the above.
3. The salaries paid to each of the above.
4. The duties that have been assigned to each of the above.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, am I entitled to make a few comments on this?

MR. SPEAKER: If you're going to debate the matter - no.

MR. JORGENSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of making any undue comment. I just wanted to thank the honourable members of the House for standing this motion for me for two days while I was absent.

MR. PAULLEY: I may say, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, as far as the government is concerned we have no objections to accepting the Order for Return of my honourable friend.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The amount of monies in monthly figures collected in medicare premiums only, by the Manitoba Hospital Commission from April 1, 1969.
2. The amount of monies in monthly figures owing in medicare premiums to the Manitoba Hospital Commission from April 1, 1969.
3. The amount of monies in monthly figures paid out to patients for medical expenses by the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation from April 1, 1969.
4. The amount of monies in monthly figures paid out to doctors for medicare expenses by the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation from April 1, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept this Order and provide the information. I don't know whether the collections are by the Hospital Commission or by the Medical Insurance Corporation itself, but the material will be given to the honourable member.

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

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the amount received by the Manitoba Government from the 5 percent sales tax in each month from January 1, 1968, to July 31, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to this Order.

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

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on Second Reading, on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this particular Bill will be very, very brief. It might be a little bit historical. It gives me so much pleasure to be on this side of the House at the time that we are proceeding with the Bill to establishing the office of an



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . Ombudsman. It gives me that pleasure, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that, while sitting on the other side of the House some few years ago, there was a member of the Assembly sitting immediately behind me at that particular time, representing the great constituency of Brokenhead, who took part in a debate and suggested that it would be really worthwhile for the province of Manitoba to take the lead in Canada in establishing an office of Ombudsman. That member, Mr. Speaker, is the present Premier of this province of Manitoba, my leader, the Honourable Edward Schreyer. That was the first time that the subject matter had been introduced into this House. I appreciate and I realize that a formal resolution was presented the following year by the then leader of the Liberal Party, and I give to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose full marks for picking up the suggestion of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead and introducing a formal resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise on a point of privilege. I feel I must correct the speaker on a point of fact, if that is in order. The facts are that the Leadership Convention, at which I was chosen as the Leader of the Liberal Party in 1961, in one of the working papers and a resolution had proposed the appointment of an Ombudsman along with other matters in Manitoba, and this is a matter of record. I don't intend to enter into a "Who did what when" but the suggestion was that I had adopted someone else's idea. I didn't dream up the idea, but it was proposed at this convention.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate my honourable friend and I am glad that he mentioned that this was done at a Liberal convention in 1961. I was referring to a statement made by my present leader in 1959, so if it was picked up by the Liberal Party at a convention, rather than my friend, it was still two years after it was first introduced into this House, in a debate, by my honourable present leader. So this is what I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. As a member of the Executive Council of this administration, I am happy to know that we are now in a position to establish the office of Ombudsman. Now if I wanted to be mean and picayune, I could say that this might have been done before May 22nd, but certainly I'm not that type of an individual, am I?

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make this comment in respect of this Bill. It is a worthwhile advance in legislation in the Province of Manitoba. I want to say that, as far as I am concerned in my dealings with past governments, past administrations, be it Liberal or Conservative, that I have always received the utmost of cooperation from the Civil Service in general, in trying to air complaints and to have them solved, but I do think that under this present legislation that it will no longer be necessary for a member of the House, or an individual who has a complaint, to have to take steps in order to solve their complaints as in the past, but they will have an individual who will be able to investigate into their reasons for complaint and this, I think, can be achieved in the Bill now presented by my honourable friend the Leader of the government.

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

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments that I would like to make with regard to the office of Ombudsman. I feel this is a position that is long overdue. There are a few laws which I feel are unjust. One that I had occasioned during the last election, one of my constituents had come to me with a problem regarding an outstanding debt, and I was quite amazed and surprised to find out that there is a law which allows a bank, a credit company, to have a bank account frozen and then the person receives a summons after the fact. I noticed in the paper that Mr. Val Werier had also written regarding a situation where a lady had a contract with one of the Health Spas Companies, whatever you classify them, and that her account was also frozen. First of all she had made an understanding that she asked for two months leave while she had gone to Europe. On her return she found that her account was frozen and that there was no notice given until after the actual fact. I feel that the position of Ombudsman, in cases like this, would be something that would look into these laws which require revision. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable members who have taken part in this debate, and to thank them for the suggestions and views that they have put on the record. I refer, first of all, to the comments made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking to Bill 25 now before us, the Ombudsman Act. As I recall the main thrust of the remarks made by the honourable leader, he said first of all that he had no real objection to this government using its judgment to revise the Act before submitting it

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . to the House so as to lessen the restrictions that would be placed on the powers of the Ombudsman to investigate alleged grievances that are brought to him by citizens. But the honourable leader did suggest that perhaps it would so work out that, because we were making actions and decisions taken by individual Ministers investigatable by the Ombudsman, that there might be a tendency for Ministers to become a little gun-shy, to use a colloquial expression, and to simply not exercise their discretion and judgment as much as they ought to; that they would seek refuge in doing their decision-making in committees of Cabinet, or in Cabinet itself, which is not subject to investigation by the Ombudsman.

Well, this is the kind of argument or point that the honourable leader makes that may certainly prove to be valid - only time can tell. We thought that it would be more useful if we were to lessen the restrictions and then see whether giving this additional power of investigation to the Ombudsman, whether this would have a negative effect, an undesirable effect on the operations of cabinet government. If it does, I would assume that this House, this government, or any subsequent government, will want to make the necessary adjustments in the opposite direction so that we would arrive at the right balance between restrictions on the Ombudsman and his freedom from restriction.

The Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose gave me the impression that he was not happy with the change in the tenure provision, and suggested that because we were limiting the length of time that an Ombudsman may serve, that it would make it more difficult to get a person of adequate stature and sufficient calibre to take on that job and that responsibility. If I interpret what the honourable member wished to say correctly, I must say that I'm not sure that I agree. I think that since the bill provides that the Ombudsman shall be appointed for six years and then he may be reappointed for an additional six year term, twelve years in all, that this is really a sufficient length of time for one to exercise the kind of discretionary power that is vested in this office.

I really don't believe that Canadian society, or society in Manitoba is short of people of the calibre needed to carry out the responsibilities of this office, important as I think it is, because I believe there are quite a large number of men of sufficient competence and integrity to carry out this work. And that is not meant to be in any way a reflection on whoever is finally decided upon by this Legislature as Ombudsman. That's why I think it is, as a matter of general principle, better to have a term definite on this office, on this appointment rather than leaving it as a life appointment subject to the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the pleasure of this Legislature.

I do believe that we are providing in this bill sufficient safeguard to ensure that the Ombudsman shall feel free from political pressure. He simply cannot be removed except by a two-thirds vote of this Legislature, and I think that's important. A mere majority vote is no safeguard for the Ombudsman, no safeguard against political pressure - and I'm not suggesting this is likely to happen but it could happen - whereas by making strict provision that he can be removed only by a two-thirds vote puts it in almost the most complete sense of the word beyond the ability of any one political party that happens to be in office to try and bring political pressure to bear on this officer.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose made some reference about as to who was the first to make reference to this concept of Ombudsman. I just want to say to my honourable friend that I really believe in the philosophy once expressed by John Locke that there is no limit to the amount - and I'm trying to paraphrase now - there is no limit to the amount of good that men can do providing they do not care who gets the credit. And so if we could -- because I'm quite willing to concede that the former Member for Lakeside, former Premier of this province, may very well - in fact he has according to the letter that was put on the record by the honourable member last week - that the former Member for Lakeside apparently had correspondence with the Government of Sweden, or a representative of the Government of Sweden relative to this office of Ombudsman way back in 1955 or '56 as I recall, which certainly would be at least three or four years before I had ever made public mention of it. All one can conclude from this then is that this bill, the very concept which is embodied in this bill, should have the complete and warm support of members of this Party, members of the Liberal Party, and presumably of the Conservative Party as well, simply because the previous administration was prepared to introduce a bill similar to this even if there were certain differences as to the kinds of powers to be vested in this public officer.

I go on to make some mention now of the -- oh yes, I must make mention of this, Sir.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) The Honourable Member of Ste. Rose, if I interpret the gist of his remarks correctly, seemed to suggest that, if anything, we should reduce even further the restrictions placed on the Ombudsman's power to investigate and theoretically I'm in agreement, although I simply say in reply that we have in fact made a number of changes here, all of which or almost all of which have the effect of lessening or reducing the restrictions on the Ombudsman, and so I don't feel that we are really under any kind of onus now to go even further in reducing restrictions on this office although it may be that in the course of human experience over the next year or two or more, that experience may demonstrate that we should be increasing the Ombudsman's power or, conversely, reducing the restrictions on his powers to investigate. I think we would all want to have an open mind on it.

Now as regards the Honourable Member for River Heights, he had some comments as to what should be the salary paid to this public servant, Ombudsman, and at this particular time I don't feel that it's really all that relevant to the debate on the subject matter of the bill. In a general way I would agree with the honourable member that the salary that should be paid should be somewhere in the order of salary that is paid to a judge or deputy minister. Certainly I think it can be said that it should be a salary that is paid to a senior public servant which puts it somewhere between \$18,000 and \$24,000, or \$25,000, somewhere in there. The practice in other provinces, those that have Ombudsmen already established, that is Alberta and New Brunswick, it's difficult to draw any lesson from that because, as I understand it, in the case of Alberta the Ombudsman's salary is \$20,000 and in the case of New Brunswick it's \$6,000 more. It's difficult to understand. One would rather have expected the opposite. However, I think I can say that I think most members here would agree that it should be approximately equal to salary paid a senior public servant which still doesn't pin it down precisely.

The Honourable Member for River Heights expressed some concern about the deletion of one sub-paragraph in Section 18 of the bill that was originally proposed by the previous administration. We did decide to delete the sub-paragraph (e) of Section 18 of the original bill because we do feel that at least to start with that it would be just as well not to restrict the Ombudsman, just as well not to prevent him from investigating any actions or lack of action on the part of a counsel that is in the employ of the Crown. This is really the gist of the effect of removing this sub-paragraph that the Honourable Member for River Heights seemed to be concerned about.

That is about all the reference I have here, Mr. Speaker, except the Honourable Member for River Heights did go on to suggest that this new administration should be getting busy to pass an Administrative Practices Act, a Rights of Privacy Act and allied kinds of acts, and conceptually I think I could agree with the Honourable Member for River Heights except I really fail to see how he can regard this as a matter of urgency when there has been all of time itself up to now to work on the drafting of bills of that kind. Except I do concede. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I never suggested that this was a matter of urgency at all. I suggested, and I think I interpret my remarks correctly and the First Minister may be in a position to show me where I said differently in Hansard, I simply suggested that this had to be legislated along with the Ombudsman Act.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's in that precise sense that the honourable member made reference to the need for legislation relative to rights to privacy and administrative practices, then I would accept it in that light. I think it is logical that with the establishment of an office of Ombudsman there be certain ancillary legislation passed which would complement the legislation establishing the office of Ombudsman.

Unfortunately, and I apologize to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I did not have any comment to make on his remarks. Perhaps it was because I was in general agreement with them. If something he had said was something which I could not agree with, I suppose I would have made a note of it.

So all in all, Mr. Speaker, we are at that stage in time now where the Province of Manitoba is really on the verge of having established an office of Ombudsman. It is my hope that when this bill goes into Committee, Law Amendments Committee, that members who are really keenly interested will want to make further comment and perhaps offer certain amendments. This would be all in keeping with the spirit with which this legislation is proposed. I am confident that we have good legislation here and I'm also confident that it will be possible to appoint the Ombudsman in a way that I had hoped years ago would be possible, and that is

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . rather than by action of the Executive Branch that the appointment would be made by the legislative branch so that the public officer would be in the truest and fullest sense of the word an officer of this House and of the public rather than of the government per se.

The many changes - I say many, there aren't really that many - but the several changes that were made from the previous bill I believe they have been covered now. They have been referred to adequately by myself in introducing the bill and by other members who have spoken, and I simply solicit the support of all honourable members for this legislation.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister if he'll answer. I may say that I do not want to go contrary to the rules and therefore it will be necessary to present a hypothetical case in which then to ask the question based on the statement that he's made with respect to the deletion of the Section (e) of 18. Now if that's agreeable I would then simply give a hypothetical case and then ask the question. That's the only way in which I can deal with it at this time. But in view of the remarks - and this is the first time that I think the policy statement of the government has been stated on this item - if you will allow it, Sir, I would just pose the hypothetical question.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . referred to the particular section of the bill, that the honourable member would have ample opportunity to debate the matter at length in Committee.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to make it difficult or to try to make it difficult for the honourable member to put his question framed in a hypothetical case, but I would ask him if he would not want to do it in Law Amendments Committee where we can have some give and take of opinion on it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think again, in view of the fact that the policy statement of the government has been made in connection with this for the first time, my question is pertinent. I'm prepared to wait, but I am also prepared to ask it now if I have leave to do it in that way. I'd just present my hypothetical case and the question right after.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to present his question? I'll allow him to state his question, but . . . .

MR. SPIVAK: All right, Mr. Speaker. The hypothetical case would be a highway traffic accident in which someone is killed and the solicitors for the Crown in the Attorney-General's office upon investigation of the police reports makes a recommendation that no prosecution take place. The parents of the person who was killed would then have the right, under the section that's been deleted, to go to the Ombudsman and the Ombudsman would be given the right to investigate the recommendation of the solicitor that no prosecution be undertaken. Do you feel in deleting the section that the practice should be allowed whereby the Ombudsman would be able to oversee the judgments of solicitors of the Crown in criminal and civil matters and would in fact be in the position to go contrary to their recommendation to the Attorney-General in the case of prosecution in this particular instance.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I see the point of the honourable member's question, but at the same time I have to express some bafflement because if a citizen feels that a grievance has been committed, that some administrative act or some failure to act on the part of the administration has caused them some injury or harm, then if this office is to mean anything the citizen must know, must be able to feel that all actions that went into the final decision as to what should be done will be investigated.

MR. SPIVAK: One more question, Mr. Speaker. Is the First Minister aware that the section which was deleted is contained in the Alberta Act and the New Zealand Act?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we can learn through experience here as well.

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

MR. SPEAKER: If I may just make a comment from the Chair. I would hope that this did not establish itself as a precedent of allowing questions based on hypothetical cases. Perhaps the uniqueness of this particular bill may make it necessary. And secondly, I do have reservations about questions of this type. At this point we make a specific reference to particular sections of the bill.

Second reading of Bill No. 31. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 31, an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this bill, as is indicated in the explanatory notes - and really I don't know that I should have to read the explanatory notes because I don't think that they need any elaboration at this stage - so that I will be prepared to listen to specific questions and try to answer them.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . speech on that motion that I just gave to give the Honourable the Minister of Education an opportunity to find his way to his seat. We were about to complete, at least I imagine we are going to complete his estimates very quickly, there being very little remaining to be dealt with, just the last portion under Libraries and Historical Research. And then as we had already announced our intention, to proceed at the end of Youth and Education into the supplementary estimates, which of course we're prepared to do. But I'm wondering -- I think we can now proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing with the Department of Youth and Education. Resolution 108 (6)(d)(1)--passed; (2)--. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there were certain questions put to the honourable Minister. Maybe he has the information for us now?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, some questions are put; I have some of the answers, some I haven't yet received. I stated then that I would give the honourable members who asked questions the answers in detail, and as I get them from the department I'll hand them out to the various members involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 108 (6)(d)(2)--passed; (3)--passed; Resolution 108--passed. That completes the department of Youth and Education.

MR. CHERNIACK: I then ask, Mr. Chairman, that we move to supplementary estimates of current expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: At this point of our proceedings, it's one of the difficulties we have in having estimates in two pieces like this, but I'd kind of like to know what the Chair's latitude was going to be on the other departments as we go through them. If there was reasonable latitude going both ways, I think that our group would be prepared to see the supplementary go through with not too much discussion here. As far as I'm concerned, one discussion is ample and I'm a believer in the fact that we don't really need two. Now if there was going to be reasonable latitude on the Minister's salary of the other departments on all of these items that are here, outside of giving the Ministers an opportunity to give us a general explanation on the items so that we know what it is when they get there, or whether they do it then, I would be prepared to see the supplementary go fairly quickly. I think I can speak for everybody here in my group, although I'm not too sure. I'm really speaking on my own at the moment, but I think that I can have these go with that kind of an assurance if it was there.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the co-operative suggestion made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. It would be our proposal to deal with the supplementary estimates giving each Minister an opportunity to introduce the specific items under his jurisdiction plus any questions that are asked on these specific items, and as indicated by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, they may be limited questions it is understood in the Minister's debate, in the debate on Minister's salary of the main estimates, you, Mr. Chairman, will not refuse to permit discussion on the items that may come up from the supplementary estimates as incidental to the Minister's salary debate.

I would expect, however, that once having dealt with this, that any items here would be dealt with under Minister's salary only, which of course would be the right anyway and would not then spread out into the rest of the estimates. So that on that basis I'm sure that we on this side would be quite agreeable not to object to questions that may be put or discussions

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . raised on Minister's salary in the main estimates if in doing so they would refer to items in the supplementary estimates. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if that's a satisfactory description of our attitude.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I ask it for a reason because as we know the rule prohibits us from dealing with something that's already been dealt with at this session; and if it was considered in that light we'd find ourselves, you know, being co-operative in trying to get things done without an opportunity to debate. I think all we want is to make sure that we have the one opportunity, and one only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it would seem that once we're dealing with the main estimates that I can, in keeping with the suggestion, take a wide interpretation. However, this would I think preclude a re-hashing, you know, of what we had gone over in terms of the supplementary estimates. In other words, some allusion or reference would probably be in order but we certainly don't want a total duplication of debate.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we can't have a little more -- if we agree amongst ourselves that we more or less essentially pass the debate over to the other area and restrict ourselves here, if we can't have essentially the general debate there on the total estimates we may very well have to I think go through it all twice. Here and now we can get away with

MR. CHERNIACK: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that it should be necessary to in effect throw the supplementary supply into the main estimates; we don't intend to do that. We intend to request debate on the specific items. Of course none of them do involve the Ministers' salaries and I think that we'll go through these, deal with them properly. Then, as I say, when we come back to the Minister's salary on the main estimates there would be the opportunity to debate, but I do feel that the debate on the specific items ought to be on supplementary. I'm indicating that we wouldn't object to some latitude allowed under Ministers' salaries, but I certainly agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there should not be duplication of debate. But if there were to be specific matters then I think they should come under the supplementary estimates. If they're general, then I don't think we'd object.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think in general this might be quite agreeable although we must remember that some of the estimates have already been discussed and completed on certain departments before these estimates were introduced, so that any portions that come under those departments certainly would have to be discussed at this time when we deal with the supplementary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure I can make the distinction precisely, but the questions of policy and so on will of course take place under the Minister's salary but the specific debate relating to questions on supplementary estimates should in fact take place under supplementary estimates.

MR. WEIR: I think we've got an understanding that we're probably prepared to ride with and take a chance. I would hope it would work, because if things don't, it makes it more difficult on other occasions, that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall we proceed? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I think some policy matters will have to be discussed under this because under the original estimates there's no provision for some of the items that we're discussing on supplementary. Let's take under Agriculture - Potato Producers - there's nothing under the regular estimates yet we find in the new estimates here there is a provision for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the Member for Rhineland is correct in that the policy related to specific items in supplementary estimates can be discussed but not general policy, but policy relating to this would be in order.

Resolution 1 - 1(a)--passed; The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I beg your indulgence. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I recognized the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, earlier in this session I questioned the First Minister as to how they arrived at the indemnities that were set for this session, and apparently a meeting had been held where this had been discussed. I naturally wasn't invited and didn't attend. However, I would like to know from the Minister concerned - and I'm not sure under whose jurisdiction this comes right now, whether it's Finance or whether it's the House Leader - as to how they arrived at the indemnity for this special session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1 - 1 (a) -- The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was waiting for the Honourable Member for Roblin who asked for the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I haven't even got my supplementary estimates here. I apologize to the House. It was announced -- well, I was the last one who was speaking the other night when the debate was adjourned on the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think your colleague will facilitate that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the question was asked as to how these amounts were arrived at. A simple division will inform him that the government considers that for this session it is sufficient for the indemnities to be one-half of the normal in view of the fact that the government feels that it shouldn't take more than half the time it normally takes for the winter session.

MR. FROESE: Was it strictly based on time then? Not on the other aspect, such as that I feel at this particular session we're dealing with most of the things that we normally deal with. I question the matter of calling this a "special" session. After all, it's the first session of the new Legislature. We're dealing with estimates; we're dealing with the Throne Speech; we're dealing with legislation; with resolutions; everything that normally comes on the Order Paper, and even some of the departmental reports that were not finalized will have to be finalized at this session. If I recall correctly, the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations did not meet and did not finalize concurrence on their work. I think there's other work that needs to be completed and this is why I'm just wondering whether we're correct in calling it a special session in the first place. I also question another thing, whether we're just basing it on the time that will be spent. At the moment I'm not so sure whether it will be just half the amount of time we spent earlier this year in the session. I think this is debatable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Again I appeal -- I see now that I have a copy from the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Would there be opportunities in Youth and Education for the Minister, to ask him any questions that were . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I certainly think so. The general point I think is that we're dealing with these items and with policies related to these items. It would seem offhand that it wouldn't be necessary to, you know, re-debate them as such. We will certainly have an opportunity -- although may I point out to the member that we have passed the Department of Youth and Education already and that these estimates will deal with only certain portions of Youth and Education. We're not going to re-open that debate.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Rhineland is still asking questions, and rather than making a statement he asks whether these estimates for the indemnities are based on time only. I'd say time and volume of work. You can stretch time to an endless item with the same volume of work, or you can keep it confined to the volume of work that's before you. I remind the honourable member that we have spent 80 hours in the last session dealing with the main estimates that we are dealing with now and have already spent some hours on -- how many? Already spent almost 16 hours, 15 hours and 50 minutes on the main estimates which makes it 95 hours and 50 minutes so far on the same main estimates. It is our impression that -- freedom is given of course under the rules to members to debate the estimates for 80 hours, but our honest evaluation of the work that is involved in dealing with the estimates, and I speak mainly about the main estimates, is that it shouldn't require another go of 80 hours.

The number of Bills that are being put before you are considerably less than those in a normal session, which are 100 to 120 in a normal session, and this time I don't know if there'll be more than, I would say, I don't know if there'll be more than five to 10 Bills that take any extensive debate. Most of them are bills that have been dealt with at the last session, up to a stage, and are more administrative in nature. So that on that review, we felt it was honest and proper that the cost of this session should be limited to the sort of time and volume of work that seems to be required.

Now the word "special" session is a word that some of us have used in our own light with our own interpretation. It is of course not called a special session, formally, legally or in the forms before you, and therefore I believe that I've answered as best as I could the question asked by the Honourable Member from Rhineland. And I want to understand from him, does he want a full indemnity for this session?

MR. FROESE: No, I haven't asked for a full indemnity. I have been questioning how you arrived at this and what the reasons were back of this, because I wasn't to the meeting where you discussed this and decided on this and I just wanted the information, the background to this. Certainly this is the proper time to ask these questions and I don't think there should be any objection on their part to have these questions come forward.

MR. PAULLEY: No objections. You have your rights.

MR. FROESE: So this is why I put them at this particular time and I think if that is the answer to them, I will accept it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: I didn't intend to take part in this discussion, but a few comments of the Minister of Finance brings me to my feet because there was some talk about the fact that there had been discussion of 80 hours on estimates at the last session, and I acknowledge this, Mr. Chairman, to be true. But estimates, you know, in the House and the manner in which they work are more than sorting out just the expenditures of money. And the way they are, it's the opportunity that we have, with freedom, to discuss a policy across the House both ways, and not necessarily related to money. We have got quite a number of new members in the House on both sides, many of whom probably have some thoughts that they want to express and I expect that they will use this vehicle to express them within that period of time. That doesn't say it may necessarily go 80 hours, but it does I think recognize the fact that the discussion isn't necessarily related entirely to the money and that there is an area that goes along with it.

In terms of the indemnity, we on this side are prepared to accept the proposition that is put forward by the government. We do say that the amount of the indemnity doesn't affect in any part our judgment on how long the session should take. We'll give the bills the scrutiny we think they should have; we'll give the estimates the scrutiny we think they should have; and we will accept the indemnity that is being proposed by the government.

MR. CHERNIACK: I agree with the statement of the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Since the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the 80 hours and also the Minister of Finance, I feel that just because we have completed the 80 hours on the estimates under the rules at a previous session, this certainly doesn't mean that we should not be allowed to discuss any and all items that come under the estimates because we have a new government. We certainly are entitled to any change in policy that might be coming forward and so on, and I think it should be all right to question them. Then, also, a number of the departmental estimates were not even discussed at the previous session. We had completed the 80 hours and so the departments were not discussed, and I feel that especially those departments that I will certainly want to take my part in discussing those particular estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1 - 1(a). The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate the government's concern when they feel that they have a limited amount of legislation to propose and that they do not intend to go beyond a certain area or a certain set of programs. I appreciate that and I know their problems, having only been in office for a month. But after having said that, I don't appreciate being constantly harped at and reminded that this is a special session and it should be kept short. After all, it isn't for a political party to decide the length of the session. There are 27 new members in this House here and their first responsibility is to speak for the people they represent, not to speak for the Party they represent, and if we are getting into that trend, well then my concept of democracy and some other people's concept of democracy is not going along the same street at all. Now I can see my honourable friend the Minister of Finance wants to get up and...

MR. CHERNIACK: Only on a point of order, and now that the honourable member put it that way, then I do want to make the point of order. I'll have to check Hansard as to what I said, but I don't believe that I used the word Special Session - I think the Honourable Member from Rhineland did - and I don't think I said it should be kept short. I think I said that in our evaluation we thought it would not take as long and probably half the time. Certainly there is no suggestion that I made today that should or would or could restrict members of this House from dealing with the estimates and the bills as they see fit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party and the members of the government and so on to try not to open this debate up too wide and get into the election and strategy and everything else, and to try to specifically deal with the amounts in the estimates and perhaps the reasons given for them, but not to stray too widely for fear of,



(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) . . . shall we say, a replay of the past election.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate your concern. You have your position to fulfill and we certainly don't want the members to go off on tangents, but still the government have made a proposal on what members should be paid. Now as I understand it, members of the Legislature are in control of their own affairs and this is the first time that I can recall in my six or eight years in the House where the Cabinet has decided ahead of time what is going to happen.

MR. CHERNIACK: No.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes. The last summer session that was held, there was no motion dealing with indemnities until three or four days before the end of that particular session. This time we have a cut and dried proposition put before us and it is constantly held over our heads, well this is going to be it and if you want to sit here extra days that's up to you. So I don't think that's the way that this House should operate. I don't think that's the way that this House should operate at all, that members are treated like school children in a class, that there should be any inhibition of discussion whatsoever. Twenty-seven new members in this House and they have every right to speak on any department they wish. They have every right to enter into every debate that they wish and this includes government members as well as members on this side of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: There has been no indication we . . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well I have the feeling that there is some pressure.

MR. PAULLEY: You have the feeling but we haven't done it or attempted to.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: So the Throne Speech is eight days; the budget speech is eight days; with two afternoons for private members discussions. We have also been told in no uncertain terms that the government doesn't intend to take very much part in private members' resolutions. Now reluctantly there is some action coming, but we have been told rather firmly that it is not the intention of the government to encourage any discussion from their members, and this is something new in this House. I don't think there was ever any impressions put forward like that before. So, Mr. Chairman, I will leave that for the moment as there are two things I do want to discuss briefly under members' indemnities.

I think it is time that after redistribution where rural constituencies are so large and require so much time of a member if he is going to do his work properly, there should be a differential in the indemnities between an urban representative and a rural representative. I know in my own case I represent a rather small urban constituency, but still there are five councils - one city council, one town council and three rural councils - who require and would hope to see me from time to time to help them with their problems. Some members in this House have 10 or 12 councils. They have constituencies that are 70 miles long by 40 or 50 miles wide, and it is not a matter of doing everything by telephone or getting in your car and driving two blocks. Some of these members have to take a day off at a time to go to work on a problem in a far off part of their constituency, and I think the time has come when members who represent constituencies such as these should be treated in a different manner than someone who has an urban constituency. I believe in Ontario there is a differential there. I believe that a rural member receives \$1,000 more than an urban member to compensate him for his extra work and his extra expense. The urban man has long distance telephone calls; he has a great deal of mileage to put onto his car besides the fact that it takes his time.

Some years ago being an MLA was a small part-time job - a few winter months was enough to suffice. Now it is not. Now it is four or five months of the year plus committee meetings, plus the more involvement which is called upon for the member. If he is going to do a proper job at all, he has to sit in on council meetings and hospital board meetings and school problems. The whole concept of the MLA's function has changed considerably in the years that I have been in this House, which is only seven years. So I would like to recommend to the government that they consider this, that they consider giving adequate expenses where there is mileage and telephone allowances, or whether it's in dollars and cents that they recognize the fact that an MLA that represents 4,000 square miles and 16,000 people obviously has a more difficult job than an urban MLA who represents three or four square miles and 18 or 20 thousand people.

One other item I would like to mention is the matter of the Speaker. I believe that the Speaker should receive a special expense allowance in much the same manner as is done in some of the other provincial jurisdictions. If the Speaker is required to do some travelling or some entertaining or some goodwill work on the part of the province he should not have to be

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . required to be a man of considerable means, he should be able to have this paid for by the taxpayers who he is representing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I thought I would make those few points at this time. I am not satisfied in the way that the government has decided beforehand how the indemnity of the members is going to be arrived at; and also, the recommendations I made with regard to the responsibilities of members.

. . . . . continued on next page

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words. I would hope that there would not be any misrepresentation or misunderstanding. I haven't heard one word from the government side or anybody suggest or ask that the debate be curtailed in any form. I think that the government made it quite clear. They said that it was their intention to bring their major program or platform, or whatever you might call it, at the next session and I think that many of the members of the opposition agreed with this. This is the only thing that was said, and to say also that the government will not let the backbenchers discuss private members' resolutions, I don't think this is quite right. Certain private resolutions that are suggesting a change in plans, it's been explained very carefully, very thoroughly, that there will not be too much new legislation coming at this time. This is clear. But that doesn't mean that the other members of the opposition, or any other members as far as that goes, could not bring in any suggestion. It will not be discussed as much or taken seriously at this time by the government. This is the only thing that has been said.

As far as the money received by the MLAs, everybody has talked about the hours that we spend here, what we have to do, but nobody has talked of Manitoba and about the people that will have to pay this, and I suggest that we had a full session and if we didn't do the work maybe we were overpaid at that time. I don't think that there is anything wrong in the government. If you don't do it this way, you are damned; so you are damned if you do and you are damned if you don't. The government and the Minister of Finance came out clearly and said that for the work - for the hours that we wanted to spend in here, this was up to us - but for the work that is required by the province, that half of the indemnity would be enough. And I agree with this; I think that half the indemnity would be enough. We could stay here four months if we want, but it's not necessary. It is felt that it is not necessary by the government. Maybe the government is wrong, but it is felt that it could be a short session. Nobody is forcing a short session; it is a regular session.

As was mentioned, it's the first session of the new government, but it is felt by this government that there is no need to have a lengthy session and that the MLA's would not be losing anything if they would accept half of the ordinary indemnity and then get ready for the following session. I certainly endorse this, and in fact I compliment the Minister of Finance for telling the members now, and if some members feel that this is all they get and let's go home, well maybe that's a darned good thing. I am not opposed to it at all.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Did the Member for St. Boniface get the impression that I was asking for more money? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I take it from his remarks that he was suggesting that I was disappointed because I was not receiving more money. That wasn't the gist of my talk at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not what I meant at all. I just thought that the member might have given the wrong impression, the member from Portage or the House Leader of the Liberal Party, in saying that this government was trying to curtail. This is not true. They say themselves that they want to get down to business and they are entitled to this. This is the way they feel, that's all I'm saying, but if the other members want to take more time this is fine.

As far as the indemnity, the member said that he didn't like to be treated - what was the impression - like a club over your head and so on, and I don't think this is the point at all. I think that the government has to decide what is required, how many hours work is required to go ahead and proceed with the work of Manitoba. The people of Manitoba have already paid to their elected representative \$7,200 and now it is going to cost another \$3,600 - and I'm not going to rehash all the last session - but that was not needed. The Honourable Member from Portage knows it and I know it - Manitoba could have done with one session. This is added expenses and I think that it's fair, that's all I'm trying to say.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Did you say the government should decide the number of hours required to conduct the business?

MR. DESJARDINS: I didn't hear the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question was, should the government decide the number of hours?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I never said that, but I say that the government might feel that so many hours are required to advance the work of Manitoba and if the members for some other reason, either because like was suggested there are new members and more of the members want to speak, this is up to us. But let's not penalize the people of Manitoba, that's all I'm saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance indicated a few moments ago in his remarks that the 15 hours that we have spent on estimates was really in effect an extension of the 80 hours from the prior session, making it now 95 hours on estimates. Now we have started going all over the same estimates that we did consider in the 80 hours in the last session but we are still leaving departments that had not been considered. Since the Member for St. Boniface now appears to be the spokesman for the government, maybe he could indicate to us why we are starting on an extension of the 80 hours and going back over the same estimates again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I gave my opinion and it is my opinion that we are now dealing with the 96th hour. It's an opinion and the Honourable Member for Arthur has the right of course to disagree with it. If he feels that not sufficient time was spent on the departments that were not dealt with at the last session, then that was no doubt the decision of the opposition of the time which decided to debate the estimates that were dealt with within the 80 hours. Now, as must be recognized, the opposition really controls the number of hours, as has been said often here in the past, and we, when we were in opposition, recognized that we were in control of the use of the 80 hours. Now the shoe is on the other foot and the Honourable Member for Arthur, I believe, can discuss amongst members of the opposition how best to use the remaining 65 hours.

Specifically, there were two points made by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party. Firstly was that there ought to be a differential between urban and rural members' indemnities in the future, and it seems to me he made an interesting proposal and one which should be considered, and it occurs to me that since it is proposed that there be a committee established to study the rules and regulations and procedures, and how a private member can play a greater role in government, it seems to me that that might be an occasion when this point can be discussed and recommendations brought back, because I certainly don't reject the suggestion. I can see merit to it.

He also mentions Speaker's expense allowance, and again I think that's something we should look at. I believe he does have an expense allowance of some size -- yes, it is. His expense allowance, I believe, is set up in the internal economy. I'll try to get the answer, but I do assure him that this will be looked at for the next Session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to rise in support of the contention made by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Portage la Prairie, and in response to the position taken a moment ago by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the subject of the attitude of the government where debate on the estimates is concerned. And although I don't think that an attitude on the government's part of objection to lengthy debate on the estimates has been necessarily militant or aggressive, I think that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is perfectly correct when he says that a feeling, an impression has been created that members on this side of the House are wasting the time of the people of Manitoba if we do participate in a lengthy debate on the estimates, and I would cite Pages 295 and 296 of Hansard for Thursday, August 28, 1969, with specific reference to comments made by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services in support of that point.

On that occasion, the Minister of Health and Social Services said, "Mr. Chairman, I'll conclude my remarks. Let me repeat that the estimates that we are talking about are now - and I want to make it perfectly clear that the same will be true of my estimates - they are estimates that were prepared for us by the previous administration. We have not changed them. If that is our fault, blame us for that but don't say that those are our estimates. As we are going to present those estimates, we feel that they should be accepted by the people who prepared them without debate. If they choose to debate for 80 hours on those estimates, that will be their choice, but they will be arguing against what they themselves requested legislative approval for not more than three months ago."

Now, what the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is saying is that as far as almost half the members of this Chamber are concerned, regardless of which side of the House we're on, we did not request legislative approval for them, and what he is saying is that there has been an impression created that to examine and debate those estimates is a waste of public time, and I concur that that impression has been created and I concur in his position that it is

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . definitely not a waste of time, either of the members of this Chamber or the people that they represent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item I just want to point out one further matter; that is, on several occasions it has been pointed out that members should just go back to Hansard from the previous Session and check in Hansard, read Hansard, and they'd get all the information. I don't think that that suffices. I think we're dealing with these estimates and we should be able to debate them. Secondly, I was down to the Printer's office trying to get certain Hansards and they're out of them, even from this current Session. You cannot buy Hansards, Hansard copies, and I just wanted to advise some of the honourable members of the situation that these Hansards cannot be bought. They're just not available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 1. (a)--passed; (b)--passed. Resolution 1--passed. Resolution 2. 3 (a)--passed, (b)--passed. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, a misprint: 3 (b) should read 3 (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the Minister please repeat that?

MR. CHERNIACK: 3 (b) should be 3 (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: And so therefore item (a) as well should read (c). No? (a) is okay. Okay, sorry. Item, Resolution 2 3 (a)--passed. . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just what is the reason for that? Does that deal with other matters in the older -- in the regular estimates, that are not recurring items in the supplementary? Is that it?

MR. CHERNIACK: 3 (b) in the category in the main estimates refers to the Leader of the Official Opposition; 3 (c) refers to the Leader of the second opposition party; 3 (d) refers to salaries, and the only change proposed, the addition proposed is in (d).

MR. FROESE: Then the intention is not to provide any additional indemnities for the leaders for this particular Session. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: The leaders of the opposition parties are being paid on an annual basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . there is no Section (c), am I correct?

MR. CHERNIACK: There are certain . . . categories in which all the estimates are broken down. The supplementary are only showing supplementaries to those particular items in the main supply bill which are required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 2. 3 (d)--passed. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I'm just wondering . . . here in Opposition. It quotes \$15,600 and the next one mentions the salary of a Cabinet Minister -- it mentions salary and representation allowance. Is that representation allowance exempt, any part of the \$15,600, from taxation?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member looking at the main estimates?

MR. PAULLEY: We're dealing with the supplemental only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind members we're dealing with the supplementary estimates and that the numbering and lettering correspond to the main estimates.

(Resolutions 2 and 3 were read and passed.)

Agriculture -- Resolution 4. 1.(j)--passed? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think we should have an explanation from the Minister on this and just what assistance we are providing, and could he spell it out for us?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the announcement that was made in the House some time ago, that is Item 4, 1. (j) - Emergency Assistance to Potato Growers. This has to do with the request of the industry to assist in some way for losses that potato growers suffered last year due to the inclement weather conditions. I can elaborate on that point perhaps, if you will. We had to recognize that last year we had something like five months of rain in some parts of the province, in particular the Red River Valley, and many producers of potatoes were unable to harvest their crop as a result, in particular in areas where we have the heavier soils in which machinery was unable to function in such a way as to enable people to do a harvesting operation. The assistance is paid to producers that have lost over 30 per cent of their crop. In other words, the producers that haven't lost 30 per cent or more would

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . not receive any assistance at all. This was based on a calculation done on the basis that if they had crop insurance they would not get 100 percent coverage in any case, and this was at the request of the growers themselves. They were not expecting 100 percent compensation. They recognized that some of their loss they have to share and that they were prepared to accept this form of assistance. — (Interjection) — There is no crop insurance for potatoes; there was none available for last year's crop, and that is the reason why the government took a very sympathetic attitude towards this request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments on this item and I must say that I am very disappointed to find in the supplementary estimates that there is no money provided for agriculture generally across the province. Now I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the move made by this government to supply aid to one segment of the industry on an acreage basis, and of course I have to remind my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture that during the past years he has constantly debated with me and debated against me in respect of acreage payments to farmers in the Province of Manitoba. And I say again that I now have no objection to the move insofar as assistance to these people are concerned, but I must say that I am very disappointed that consideration has not been given to other segments of agriculture in the Province of Manitoba who are in just as much trouble at the moment as the potato growers.

The question has been asked in this House repeatedly, since the House opened, what the Minister is doing insofar as the quota system is concerned and the movement of grain within the Province of Manitoba, what he has been doing insofar as representation to the Federal Government, the Federal Minister and the Canadian Wheat Board, and we have had nothing but negative replies from him. I recall during the last Session, Mr. Chairman, that between the present Minister and the former Member for Ethelbert-Plains that I was constantly harassed about financial aids or direct aid to farmers in the Province of Manitoba, and at that time I announced that there would be no assistance to the potato growers because, in doing so, I would find myself in the position of where I would be expected — and justifiably so — to bring some relief to other segments of agriculture in the province who were in trouble at that time and are in deeper trouble now.

There are many of us in Manitoba who have not been able to deliver more than three and one-half bushels per acre of grain insofar as marketing in the 1968-69 crop. There are not very many potato growers in the Province of Manitoba who have not marketed more produce than the farmers directly operating grain farms in this province. We are in deep trouble now insofar as the grain growers are concerned and particularly in the area where I live, the constituency that I represent, and particularly at the delivery point near where I farm, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that for all the times that the Honourable the Minister got up in the House and denounced me for lack of action insofar as effective help to these farmers was concerned, I have to say that the situation is an awful lot worse now. I can recall several instances where the present Minister got up when he was in opposition on this side of the House, and demanded that I resign because of ineffective action on the part of the Minister of Agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out here now, on this item, that through the past — how many years, may I ask the Honourable the House Leader? 20 years, 30 years that the Socialists have had representation in this House and have constantly pointed out our lack of policies — (Interjection) — if the Honourable Minister would just sit down and listen I'll start all over again for him.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I thought you were asking a question. I wondered what it was.

MR. WATT: I was asking you probably how many years — I'm not quite sure — that there has been representation in this House by the Socialist Party.

MR. PAULLEY: As I recall, Mr. Chairman, the first Socialist in here was the Honourable Rodmond Roblin.

MR. WATT: But constantly over these years, Mr. Chairman, the Socialist Party have talked about policies and the lack of policies on the part of the government of the day, and particularly in the ten years that I have been a member and subsequently a Minister of Agriculture on that side of the House, and for ten, twenty, thirty years or whatever it is, the Socialist Party have been paid their indemnities and paid actually to bring constructive or alternative programs into this House for agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. They now say they have no policy to bring forward at this Session which they are apparently unable to describe

(MR. WATT cont'd.) . . . . . whether it's a Special Session or whether it is the Twenty-Ninth Session of this Legislature -- or the First Session of this Twenty-Ninth Legislature, pardon me.

MR. PAULLEY: That's okay, Doug, we appreciate it.

MR. WATT: But I just wanted to point out, Mr. Chairman, that after all these years that they have been paid their indemnities, salaries, secretarial assistance and office space in this Legislative Building in the Province of Manitoba, to produce and come forward with policies, they say now that we're simply sitting housekeeping, that we have no policies for agriculture. The Minister has been asked consistently to tell us what negotiations have been going on with the Federal Government insofar as the grain situation is in the Province of Manitoba, and he's had nothing but negative answers. Really, Mr. Chairman, I should ask him to resign, as he constantly asked me to resign, but I can't see anybody on that side of the House that could take his place. He's just about as close to the bottom as there possibly could be in any Legislative Assembly that ever sat in this House . . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We've had some discussions already as to our approach to these supplementary estimates. We are on 1 (j) and that item reads: Emergency Assistance to Potato Producers, and I think that the honourable member should have a little patience and when we get into main estimates he can deal with the Minister's salary or the general grain problem, but it seems to me now we are dealing with emergency assistance to potato producers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I feel that the member is generally dealing with that item - most of his comments, anyway. He's straying a little and I might remind him that he'll have an opportunity to deal with general administration on the main estimates, and that he should try to . . . .

MR. WATT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand your position. I sat there for a couple of years and I found many members, particularly on this side of the House, out of order from time to time, and in most cases I really let them go ahead. But I appreciate your position and so I'll withhold the rest of my remarks until Agriculture comes up. But I just want to point out to the Minister that I am not asking him to resign today because I haven't really ascertained anybody on that side of the House who knows anything about agriculture that could take his place, and I have my doubts about his ability. So I'll just leave it at that for the moment, and when agriculture comes up I'll have something further to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must say that that's the most pleasant request for a resignation I've ever heard. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the Minister for the information that he volunteered. However, there are quite a few things that I question in connection with this whole matter of emergency assistance. How come this was the only area that received assistance? How come the potato producer was picked out as the one to receive assistance? Did they do the most lobbying, or just what were the reasons for this particular action? What are the maximum and the minimum payments, per acre payments, to an individual or to a producer? What range was there in which these payments were made, and probably he has some total figures as to per individual. What was the maximum total figure given to any producer? I think this would be of interest to members. Just under what legislation is this assistance being given, too? I think if we have legislation of this type on our books, maybe we could put it to use more often, because I'm sure that there were farmers last year who had other special costs - for instance, the buckwheat growers, quite a number couldn't harvest their crops. I know there were other special crop growers who were also in a serious plight, and I think they probably just didn't think that anything would be coming forward, otherwise we might have had more people on the government's doorstep in this regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the last speaker's remarks - why were potato producers the only ones that received some consideration - I want to say, for the benefit of members, that everyone is receiving maximum consideration as far as the problems in agriculture are concerned and insofar as this government is concerned. But I think we have to appreciate the fact that we are dealing with a specific problem area here which was indeed neglected by the previous administration, neglected because they -- although in recognition of the fact that there was no crop insurance provision for this product, a commodity which has a very high input per acre, seed and fertilizer costs at about \$50.00 an acre, no crop insurance, as compared with the cereal crops, for example, of two or three dollars an acre in seed plus

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . whatever variations in fertilizer and there are some variations, but much smaller investments, but insurable. On that basis, I find it difficult for any member on the opposite side to challenge the discretion of government with respect to this kind of assistance. This was done simply on the basis of arriving at a consensus of need, you might say "compassionate" if you like, but in recognition of the fact that here were people, major producers of a major commodity, that had no recourse but to come cap in hand to the government, hoping that something would be provided for them. In the future, as of this year, they are covered under the Crop Insurance program, so we will not have them at our doorstep from this point on. But I must ask the House to recognize the difference between providing assistance for producers of a commodity that had no crop insurance under which they could have provided coverage and that this is indeed a special situation.

As to why others weren't considered in the special crops areas, which are also not covered, I may tell you that across my desk I have no other submission from any other group for assistance. So really I don't know that there was a need for assistance to any other group. If there was it hasn't come across my desk and -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? Oh yes, I was talking about rationalizing agriculture, I want to point out, the need for this government's involvement in the development of agricultural policies at a national and provincial level of a long-term nature so that we could project where agriculture is going.

But this is a matter that's entirely different, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure my honourable friends, if they didn't want to be facetious today, they would admit that I am right and we were dealing strictly with a brush fire situation, had to give consideration to a problem that deserved consideration, and I have no hesitation to say that I thought -- and I'm sure I can recall to my honourable member the former Minister of Agriculture that I asked many times in the House why his government hadn't considered favourably toward the potato producers when we were in session in the last Legislature. I know that it's a difficult question to answer; I know that there are many pressures; but we have to use some discretion at some point if we feel that there is some legitimacy to the request, and in this instance I have to say that there is a great deal of legitimacy.

The over-all input per acre of potatoes before they're harvested amounts to something in the neighbourhood of \$100 an acre. It's a far cry from the input in any other commodity outside of sugar beets and some of the other special crops areas.

MR. WATT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. WATT: The Minister gave us the gross input; could he tell us the gross return for an acre of potatoes?

MR. USKIW: I don't think it's important at this stage of the game. If you've lost your crop you don't have any return, Mr. Chairman. All I'm pointing out is that the inputs are high, and without crop insurance it's a complete disaster to some people, and I can tell you that a lot of people either went out of business or substantially reduced their production because they were in a position of not being able to afford feed and fertilizer this spring, and this is why I was insisting in the last session that your government do something about it at that time. This is a little late, I can appreciate, but I know that the producers will appreciate it regardless of the timing, and I know that this government is going to be careful to assure that as commodity groups request, we will try to broaden the scope of the crop insurance program so that we have all major crops covered under the crop insurance program in the future.

I've asked the crop insurance people to advise me as to any other commodities that it may be feasible to provide crop insurance for and I will be having a report from the Crop Insurance Board at some time in the very near future, and for the next session of the Legislature there may be further amendments or consideration to the expansion of that program.

So I'm not neglecting agriculture in that sense, Mr. Chairman. I regret that suggestion. I regret the fact that in this session, called indeed to handle the work load of what was to have been done by a previous administration, the area of neglect in other words on the part of the previous government is what we are involved in today. We would not have been here today, Mr. Chairman, had the previous administration conducted the affairs of this province in a proper manner.

A MEMBER: The farmers didn't put you there, Sam.

MR. USKIW: The farmers didn't put me here? I'm not concerned whether they put me here or they didn't put me here. All I'm saying is that we have a responsibility to respond to



(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . the needs of society as we see them, and in this instance we responded contrary to that of the previous administration.

As to the amount of assistance, the minimum of course, if one has lost an acre of production over the one-third, would be \$40.00; the maximum assistance is \$1,400.00; and one that produces 50 acres of potatoes and lost the total amount would receive the maximum. In other words, they would receive payment on 35 acres, the other 15 being the 30 percent deduction.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I didn't mean to get into the discussion on grain or cereal crops or potato growing, but I am inclined to agree with this type of assistance. The only question I would have to ask in that regard, in Manitoba in the Selkirk area and in the Portage area, and I guess there are some others, there is quite a root crop industry building up and I would hope that the Minister could give the assurance that the same type of assistance would be available for anyone who is making their livelihood from root crops - and I'm talking of carrots, onions, turnips, celery, tomatoes and the like. I gather from his remarks that they only have to make a reasonable brief or presentation and they will be considered in a favourable light, the main reason being that they are not covered under any other types of insurance. Is that correct?

MR. USKIW: On that particular point, I want to point out the problems in dealing with requests of this nature wherein you have no records or statistics on production or sale. It was made possible insofar as the potato producers are concerned only because of the fact that the laws of Manitoba require that every potato producer that is within the southern part of the province were required to register through the Manitoba Marketing Commission which has records of production, records of acreages, records of losses, and for that reason it was feasible to go back one year and say we will consider some form of assistance. Wherein there is an area that we are not able to ascertain this kind of thing, well you can recognize the impossibility of trying to do something for other groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, there is one comment that the Minister made that I should make a comment on. He seemed to infer that the gross input related to the net return in the potato industry was so much greater than other segments of agriculture that it should be considered in this light, and I simply have to correct him on this because I think if he looks at the situation closely over the Province of Manitoba he'll find that there is not too much difference in the gross input into the production of any crop, whether it's cereal, potatoes or special crops related to the net return, that there is not very much difference. I want to point that out, Mr. Chairman, and I think that in talking about crop insurance I should remind my honourable friend that the crop insurance was brought into this province in 1961 on a trial basis and it was gradually expanded over the years, and that through those years that there were crop losses in areas where crop insurance was not made available to and there was no retroactive programs at that time set up insofar as acreage payments were concerned for those areas that suffered a crop loss.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about retroactive programs. This is not a retroactive program. The matter was before the previous government as late as this spring; it was before this political party as late as this spring; and it is not something that is reaching away back into the archives of 100 years ago.

MR. WATT: I just ask my honourable friend how far back he could go and say it was still retroactive?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I'm not quarrelling with the total amount and the assistance that is allocated here. In fact a program of this type is probably much less costly than operating an insurance program like we do under crop insurance. I don't have any quarrel in that regard. Was this matter already under consideration by the previous administration or was it brought in after you were elected to office?

MR. USKIW: My understanding of it was that there was a brief presented to the previous administration which that administration rejected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4 - 1 (j)--passed; Resolution 9 (b)-- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Could we have an indication from the Minister the very purpose for this item of \$199,000 - where's it going to be spent?

MR. USKIW: In answer to the question, Mr. Chairman, they both have to do with the ARDA-FRED program. They are both 100 percent financed by the Federal Government although they appear through my department having jurisdiction over the ARDA-FRED program in the Interlake.

One is a grant to the Indian Brotherhood. This is an adult education program co-ordinated by the ARDA-FRED administration but carried out completely independently by the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. That is part of it. That's in the amount of \$60,680.00.

The other one has to do with a feasibility study on the Interlake region. This is through the auspices of the Planning and Priorities Committee; also 100 percent financed by the Federal Government through the ARDA-FRED arrangement. This is a socio-economic data bank that has been established for the Interlake and it's a program to initiate the operation of such a system on a test basis, intended to be of value of individual departmental - I'm sorry - this system is intended to be of value to individual departments for the purpose of operation and development of programs related to the Interlake. It's a matter of providing factual information for evaluation purposes on the impact of the FRED-ARDA program to know what is taking place, the rate of progress in individual sections of the program and the likes of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I just gathered the last part of the first statement the Minister made. The \$60,000 was to the Indian Brotherhood. Was there any to the Metis Federation or is that under a different program?

MR. USKIW: No, I think this grant comes under a different category, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5 - 9 (b)--passed; Resolution 5--passed. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'd like to just stand down the item No. 8. The Minister's been away for a couple of days and he's not ready today - Resolution 6 and 7. If you can now proceed with No. 9, Industry and Commerce.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll now proceed with Industry and Commerce. Resolution No. 8. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on the supplementary supply of the Department of Industry and Commerce, I would like to make a very brief explanation as to the reasons why we are asking here for supplementary supply of \$325,000. It has to do with development that has taken place during the course of this calendar year and in a sense, I suppose, with the study and work that went into the TED Commission Report in preceding years.

The reason we are asking for \$325,000 is because this government is anxious to encourage maximum progress in our economic development. I'm not suggesting that the previous administration wasn't, but this one certainly is, and as has been pointed out by the TED Commission, it is incumbent on government to show leadership and provide appropriate assistance to private industry so that it can meet an opportunity and a challenge when they arrive. And in that connection, in response to the challenge of the TED Report, we feel that that, plus the fact that the Federal Government in its recently announced policy of about three weeks ago that much of Manitoba, all of southern Manitoba has now been declared a designated region for purposes of economic development under programming that comes under the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion, it seems that the provincial government here, the Department of Industry and Commerce, should have the capability to respond to any federal willingness to assist industry in further development and expansion here in Manitoba.

Really, I suppose, it can be said that the purpose of the supplementary supply is to ensure that industries in Manitoba have additional encouragement to avail themselves of opportunities in export markets, to take advantage of new assistance for expansion and new development under the incentives program of the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and to encourage firms here to innovate and develop new products and processes.

The supplementary supply, if passed, will provide meaningful additional assistance and incentives to the amount of \$50,000 for export promotion; \$125,000 for feasibility research and expansion planning; and an amount of \$150,000 for technical assistance and research and development incentives. With the approval by the Legislature of these funds, the Department of Industry and Commerce during the balance of the fiscal year will conduct an aggressive campaign trying to call on every manufacturing company in Manitoba to ensure the following:

(1) That they are acquainted with the opportunity for expansion available now under the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion;

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . .

(2) Every possible encouragement will be given to help firms meet the challenge of external competition and reach new export markets by improved marketing and merchandising practices; and

(3) That our firms will be helped further to undertake new innovations and design of their product and methods or technique of manufacture.

It should be made clear to honourable members that these additional funds for economic development are in the form of incentives to encourage increased effort on the part of the private sector. I take this opportunity to challenge the private sector to use these incentives so as to make the most of their opportunities for the good of Manitoba's industrial capabilities.

Needless to say, Mr. Chairman, if there is nothing concrete that comes out of this, that the supplementary supply will simply go unutilized and will lapse back into consolidated revenue.

So if I might simply summarize, we are asking for the supplementary supply in order to give the department the capability to respond to the present situation in which there is good possibility that the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion may very well make monies available to industry here in a way that will encourage industry to become even more successful in export markets, in a way that will encourage them to adopt more innovation and design and production methods.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the First Minister when he was referring to industrial development if he doesn't consider the building of feedlots and piggeries and things like this under industrial development or does he not. Does he just consider it more industry?

MR. SCHREYER: It depends on the interpretation one wants to give to the word "industry". Certainly one can regard agricultural production as an industry, but because we have a certain organization of government with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Industry and Commerce, it would seem more logical to use the services of the Department of Agriculture and to use the organization of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to assist farmers in the specific industry of food production. But I hasten to add that there is no reason why, if it is felt that the Department of Agriculture or Agricultural Credit Corporation are not well suited to help farmers in the setting up of larger economy of scale feedlots, for example, no good reason at all why we couldn't use the Department of Industry's services and the Manitoba Development Fund. It is just that if one has to choose as between the two, I would rather that we keep the distinction easier to understand by utilizing the Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Credit Corporation.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked the question is because there has been so much emphasis put on industry and not on this other. I didn't know that it would be coming through Agriculture, but the main thing is if it's coming.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, when the honourable member speaks about agriculture and the possibility of encouraging farmers to group together to set up larger scale feedlot operations, the honourable member is speaking of something that is very dear to my heart. I would like nothing better than to see us develop the organization to marshal the capital, provide the management consultant service to farmers so that they can, by working together, set up efficient larger scale size feedlot operations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take up too much time on this part but I would like to put on record again my feelings in respect to the federal policies which I suppose has brought about some of these estimates that are before us today, because certainly I condemn the Federal Government in discriminating against the northern part of the whole of Canada in this new program; and secondly, it was the federal political expediency insofar as I am concerned in this program in turning to assist urban areas, and if you look throughout the whole federal program it was centered on assisting urban areas and disregarded the rest of the province. Now I have the feeling that they have forced government into bringing in a program in which they will have money ready to go along to complement this type of, might I say, discrimination.

So in the hopes of perhaps the First Minister taking this into consideration that there will be forthcoming assistance if this money is not picked up, then perhaps we can turn it to as

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . good use at least, or maybe better, in starting small industries in the north. I would wonder if the department could communicate with the Federal Government and their different agencies, such as Indian Affairs and Northern Development, where they seem to have an abundance of money, if they couldn't encourage them to move into the areas of their responsibility, the Indian reservation places where the people are asking for work and where there are many different types of possibilities of work for these people who seem to be taking the stand they are not going to leave a community and come into an urban area. And many of the urban areas problems are that they are attracting labour to places such as Winnipeg where they don't fit into the community, and they are causing problems in welfare and everything else just because there is not work available.

Where the north is coming into its own, I would hope that maybe services of government through assistance in development funds, etc., would be oriented towards bringing in small programs, which there are many that we could discuss and which I would have hoped to have been able to discuss under the Minister's salary a little later on, but if the urban area is not ready to accept or doesn't apply for this money that is available for them now, I would hope rather than going into the Consolidated Fund that perhaps it could be turned around and say, well here is an opportunity; we have the money; let's make it available, not as a gift but on a loan basis, to help co-ops and such on and get into the development of small industries in the north rather than having to build big or larger industries in the south to send the product to the north. I think that there are many products that could be manufactured in the north on a cottage-type industry, which I would like to speak on later on, but if we can think of it as cottage-type industry, then I think that probably we could put a lot of this to good use and show it as a profitable turnover rather than what has in the past been used as a welfare basis to support the people in these small communities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments but I wonder if the First Minister could answer a few questions. I apologize, I was absent when he commenced his remarks, but do I understand that it was suggested that part of the supplementary estimates would deal with items that would be involved in the seeking for Manitoba investors successful applications under the new incentive program of the Federal Government?

MR. SCHREYER: Basically, the purpose of the supplementary supply, Mr. Chairman, is to give the government or the department the capability to respond quickly if the need should arise, to respond quickly to any federal willingness to cost share in assisting the private sector, private industry in improving its export capabilities.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the First Minister would indicate, is it not a fact - and I must say that I think this supplementary estimate should be welcomed by the House because I think it is recognition by the government of the prime responsibility of the Department of Industry and Commerce in economic development and of its commitment to further the economic development of this province and to follow through with the program that has been reasonably successful and still appears to be producing results, and I hope will continue and should continue to accomplish the overall objectives of increasing our economic activity and with it the resultant increase in the incomes of our people - but is it not a fact that part of this would be because there are additional requirements based simply on the number of applications today of additional requirements for the technical assistance grant program, research and development grant program and for the design improvement program.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, that's right, the honourable member is right. As I indicated earlier in the introduction of my remarks, export capability development is one; design, assisting industry in improving design is another; and production techniques is another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I am rather interested too in this whole program. During the last session I questioned - I think it was the last session when I questioned the Honourable Minister at that time in connection with the ADA program because we were have a federal revision of that particular act, and I think three other acts and they were combined into one. We in the southern part of the province were in the designated area as we are now, and I must go along with the Member for Churchill when he complains that northern Manitoba was not included, because I feel that this program should apply to northern Manitoba as well.

A number of individuals and corporations have been benefitting through this legislation in our part of the country and certainly it has inspired people to go into industry and set up

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . projects and provide employment, and if I am correct, the new grants are dependent on the number of people that are employed in a certain project and I think the maximum available to any individual project is also increased under the new legislation. I asked for these particulars at that time and the answer I got at the last session was that the matter hadn't been finalized, and I don't think it had at that time. I wonder if the department could provide us with some more specific information on some of these details as to what the program entails, what is available and under what conditions.

MR. SCHREYER: Under what program?

MR. FROESE: Under the ADA, the new ADA program - grants. Maybe members could individually write to Ottawa for this information, but I think this information is most likely available to our department and if they could provide members with this information I think it would be appreciated. What I would like to know now is, does the new program, as it is revised, work to our advantage in Manitoba? What is it doing for us, or were we better under the former arrangement? And what can we do as individuals, as members of this House, to encourage other people to activate this business section more and more so that we can get more industry into this province, especially in rural Manitoba. I know we are in great need of newer industries and to provide employment in our local areas.

In this way we will be able to keep our people in our rural Manitoba, in our smaller towns and centers and not have this migration to the larger centers taking place indefinitely. I feel this trend should be arrested and I think this is one way of doing it, arresting this trend of migration from the farms to the cities. I think we should not just subscribe to the matter of depleting our farm communities of population and that we just have a few large centers. I think our province - and this applies to the prairie provinces - are that much better off if we have more rural communities and that we just don't see them devastated by them all leaving the farms.

Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister what can be done; what has the program to offer; and what can we do as individuals of this House to promote this type of activity?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can try to answer some of the questions asked by the Member for Rhineland. He asks just how the new ADA program, as he calls it, would be of benefit to our part of the country and to the rural areas of Manitoba in particular. Since this is a new program that's been announced by the federal authorities we have a problem with definition of terms. My honourable friend talks about a new ADA program, and if he were to talk to a federal civil servant now he would shudder because they are trying to get away from the old terms and use new terms, and by the time you learn the new terms they will probably be onto some other designation.

But briefly put, as I understand it, the Federal Government has declared all of southern Manitoba, all of Manitoba excluding Census Division 16, as a designated region for purposes of development and incentive grants from the Department of Federal Regional Economic Expansion. So it is not an ADA program, I say, Mr. Chairman, but rather a designated region program, and it will, under its terms, provide for federal grants to the province, and through the province to rural centers for the building of training and orientation service for the preparation, you might say, of a manpower supply trained for industrial work.

It also provides funds, federal funds for the building of, they call it, basic infrastructure in the growth centers that are picked in the designated region, which is all of southern Manitoba, and if my honourable friend would like some elaboration as to what is meant by federal monies for building basic infrastructure, I'll try to explain it as follows. It is now realized that for senior government to come forward with industrial incentive grants, good as that might be, it's not enough because oftentimes a community that does have industry locate there because of incentive grants, under the old ADA for example, finds that it faces a terrific municipal problem in the providing of sewer and water to service the industrial park or the industrial area where the new industry is located. They find that new homes have to be built to accommodate the additional manpower and then that means schools and hospitals, and the communities find it difficult, and especially now when we are at a time of such a terrible money market situation that municipalities can't even float debentures, or finding it very difficult to float their own debentures.

So the Federal Government is now saying yes, we recognize the problem faced by communities where new industry locates because of industrial incentive grants they used to receive, so now we are going to provide federal funds to not only provide incentives for industry but

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . also to assist communities in building the sewer and water plant that goes with it, in building the additional school and social service facilities necessary to it. To me, it sounds very very comprehensive and very grandiose, if I may say, and I'm a little worried that it will all materialize because the more comprehensive a plan becomes the more difficult it is to actually get down to doing it and we face the danger - I hope we can overcome it - but we face the danger of trying to plan so comprehensively now that the planning process takes so long that years pass before you actually get down to the business of turning the sod for an industrial development. Still, I don't quarrel with the concept here that lies behind the newly announced federal program.

To answer further my honourable friend, there is an addition then to federal funds for training of local manpower and for building basic infrastructure like sewer and water to support industry and a growing population. There would also be federal funds, as there used to be under the old ADA program, for industrial incentives to encourage industry to locate or to encourage private enterprise to set up an industry in a given area.

And the fourth, not the last but the fourth of the more important aspects of the federal designated region program is that there will be federal funds available to the province for undertaking programs of resource conservation.

Now, to elaborate even a little more, it seems to me that we cannot hope that this new federal program, designated region program, will become a reality in southern Manitoba unless we all come to a consensus, unless we agree that the only way we can develop the economy in the southern part of the province and assist the communities to build the sewer and water and basic services to support industry, is if we agree - this is my point - that we have to settle on the idea of growth centres, regional growth centres. In the case of my honourable friend the Member from Rhineland, it seems to me we can take a practical example. There's a good possibility with this federal program that the Town of Altona or the Town of Winkler, both of them having the potential of regional growth centres, that a plan could be developed where industry locates through an incentives program, that basic infrastructure, the expense of building that could also be cost shared by the federal and provincial governments. But if you say yes in the case of Altona and Winkler, what is the likelihood of being able to say yes with respect to Gretna or Horndean?

You know, the advice that I get is that part and parcel of our modern regional development programming is the crucial idea of there being such a thing as a growth centre in every region of the province and that this is where we should focus our attention for the attracting of industry and for the building up of modern kind of services - sewer, water, schools, hospital, the whole range - of the kind of standard and quality that we can all be proud of. There's a bit of cruelty involved for those who are sentimentalists, but the program doesn't have very much to offer for the small community.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Churchill also had some comments to make which I would like to reply to. Really, I have no quarrel at all with the Honourable Member for Churchill. His attitude and comments are the kind that I subscribe to completely. I think that it is really unfortunate that the federal program has been so announced, that the designated region has been so drawn that it excludes all of the true north of Manitoba. I should have thought that if there was ever a need for building basic infrastructure in order to help bring industry of whatever size to northern Manitoba that it was here, that it was the new federal program that should have been applied to Census Division 16 - north of 53.

There are many thousands of native people living in northern Manitoba, in communities which are isolated in many cases, with very little in the way of employment opportunity. At one time they could hope to earn a living on simply long-standing occupations such as fishing and trapping, but today the resources are either depleted or alternative means of trapping and fishing have made it impossible for people to get into this kind of work profitably except on a large scale of operation. So that if there was ever a need for industrial incentives and senior governments sharing in the cost of building basic infrastructure and community services it's in the north, but yet it's excluded.

So if the Honourable Member for Churchill is puzzled, so am I. But I say to him that there is no reason to despair completely because it is possible - and I have no reason to doubt their word for it - that according to words of the officials of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in Ottawa it is possible, despite the fact that the north has been excluded from the designated region, it is possible to set up designated areas, specific localities into

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . which federal money and provincial money could be applied. It requires the drawing up of a rather comprehensive plan for development by our provincial departments. And it really involves more than one department. It involves Industry and Commerce, it also involves Mines and Resources and it also involves Education and Health and Social Services. But we hope that in perhaps two or three or four of the potential growth communities in the north, outside of the bigger cities I mean, or the bigger towns - for purposes of example, Wabowden or Gillam or such places - that it will be possible to come up with comprehensive plans for development on a designated area basis, not regions, and that the federal monies will then be forthcoming. We have to persuade them on the basis of individual plans for each growth community in the north that we settle on.

I think the Member for Churchill is certainly correct when he says that there is little to hope for in many of these communities in the north unless senior governments come forward with the funds with which to build - and the word used these days is infrastructure - sewer and water service, certainly better schools, medical facilities.

The Mauro Report on transportation also talks about basic important infrastructure needs in these northern communities. Many of these northern communities require landing strips. Some have them already. In some cases they're inadequate. Some should have landing lights along the strips whether they're gravelled strips or not. Mr. Chairman, it's 5:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 p.m. this evening.