

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 5, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to introduce to members of the House a guest in the loge on my right, Mr. George Olive, member of this House from 1945 to 1952 firstly for the constituency of Springfield and from '49 to '52 for the constituency of Kildonan-Transcona. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

We also have with us in our gallery 38 Grade 6 students of the St. John Brebeuf School. These students are under the direction of Sister Socouman and Miss Pucci. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights. And 35 Grade 5 and 6 students of the Harrow School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Holenski and Miss Lambert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood; 39 Grade 5 students of the Gillam School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McCready and Mr. Baschuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill. And 25 Grade 11 students of the Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Froese. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this afternoon.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (River Heights): The Honourable Minister of Finance would like to know what's my reference to the north, and I must say that I was I think implored or asked or requested by the Honourable Member for Churchill to rise in this debate, and that is exactly what I intend to do.

Now I intend to make a few observations on the discussion that has proceeded in this debate and to follow them with some suggestions as to future direction that the government might take in determining its northern policy. I think that one of the most relevant points in the debate thus far was made by my colleague, the Honourable Member from Swan River, when he stated that the northern problems were above and beyond all political argument. I would sincerely hope that everyone in this House would accept this as a statement of fact. With regard to the question of whether or not a northern Task Force ought to be reconstituted or not, I believe there's no doubt that continuing consideration must be given to the development of this area in order to create opportunities for the people of northern Manitoba which thus far has been denied them. It seems to me, however, that the real concern of the members who have spoken on the issue of a reconstituted Task Force has been their desire to see the present recommendations acted upon by the government and not have efforts in achieving this end dissipated in further studies.

Now upon reading the recommendations and listening to the arguments that have been presented so far, I believe that there is a definite need for action now in areas which have already been identified. The residents of the isolated northern communities certainly deserve nothing less than immediate action by the government to begin to alleviate some of their very real problems, and I also think it's incumbent upon the government to show its good faith on this matter by acting now. I would like to discuss, however, certain recommendations regarding future efforts in establishing northern development policy. I believe, and there may be some disagreement with this, that there are really two norths in Manitoba. There is the historic north with its origin in the era of exploration and the fur trade and its associated persistent and complex problems, economic, social and political of human adaptation to the requirements of a modern society. And there is the new north, the north that has come into its own in a post war era, based on a large scale exploitation of the mineral, forestry and hydro resources and

May 5, 1970

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . its associated problems of large scale investment both private and public, and the virgining urban centres the resource based industries have brought into existence.

The terms of reference of the Special Committee on Northern Affairs, which is our Northern Task Force, were sufficiently broad for to examine the problems of both norths, and I quote: "To consider and report upon the requirements for the economic, cultural and industrial well-being, growth and development of Northern Manitoba." There was a wide scope in the terms of reference, yet this report has largely limited its attention to the historic, traditional north. But the two norths I suggest are interrelated. Further involvement of the Indian and Metis people in the emerging modern society of the north will depend upon the growth and the development of opportunities for them, at least for many of them, in the new north, and their capability for employment in the major resource industries and the developing service and secondary manufacturing industries.

The Northern Task Force properly focuses attention on the problems noted and solutions suggested by the people of the north, the people who live in the area, and the report appropriately is entitled: "An Interim Report from the Citizens of Northern Manitoba to the Manitoba Legislature Compiled by the Northern Task Force." But while hearings were held at both remote isolated communities and at growing centres, the emphasis I suggest is on the problems of the smaller isolated communities almost to the exclusion of the problems of the urban centres of Thompson, Flin Flon, The Pas, Lynn Lake. Except for some general reference to inadequate housing these recommendations that have now been made should be examined. The emphasis is still on the economy of the smaller settlements, based on fishing, fur trapping and hunting to the exclusion and the consideration of the major resource based industries of mining and forestry and the means for encouraging their development, and I suggest these now have to be examined.

The Task Force visited 41 northern Manitoba communities to hear from the people their problems and solutions. The report does not establish any priorities for a program of action. Indeed there very well appears to be an inconsistency in the preamble to the interim recommendations, and it's on Page 55, and I quote: "These recommendations are submitted according to various problem areas and no attempt has been made to establish relative priorities. The Task Force strongly urges that concrete action be taken with regard to these recommendations." Well I suggest that action will require the establishment of relative priorities.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'd like at the conclusion . . .

MR. GREEN: Well, right on this point.

MR. SPIVAK: If the honourable member does not mind, I'd like him to ask me at the end of my . . .

MR. GREEN: I just don't want . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Will the establishment of relative priorities be done by a reconstituted Northern Task Force? Will the establishment of relative priorities be done by the Cabinet? Will the establishment of relative priorities be established by the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet? These questions have to I believe be answered in this Legislature.

The task force findings constitute a catalog of the continuing problems which face the native citizens of the remote and isolated communities. The range is from the financial problems to economic development to hunting rights. The interim recommendations thus cover a wide array from basic community services to education and economic development. These recommendations have far-reaching implications and priorities will have to be established. The implementation of many of the recommendations is beyond the jurisdiction and the financial resources of this province and a joint attack on the problem must be mounted by the Federal and Provincial governments. Now it's interesting to note that the interim report makes no mention of the findings and recommendations of the Mauro Royal Commission. This is particularly surprising in the case of both the findings and recommendations on transportation and communication of the Maurc Royal Commission Enquiry into northern transportation, an area where the Mauro Commission makes a comprehensive and detailed examination. Both the Task Force Report and the Mauro Report must, I suggest, form the basis for a policy and programs for northern development.

It's also interesting to find that the interim report contains no reference to the recently

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . established Northern Manitoba Regional Development Corporation, called Nor-Man., a local organization which should contribute to implementing proposals and programs for economic development.

The Mauro Report states at 436, and I quote: "Provision of public services is one aspect of the role of government as a positive agent in the development of Northern Manitoba but government must also encourage individual and corporate enterprise. Policy for the northern frontier should not only assist private utilization of extractive resources but facilitate integration and stabilization of a diversified and permanent economy. It is important to note, however, that while the Provincial Government is actively involved in assisting and directing the development of Northern Manitoba it must act within the limitations imposed by revenues and authority. The tax resources and public credit of Manitoba are insufficient to meet the requirements of a comprehensive program of northern development." The Commission's plan for northern regional development is contained on Page 444 of the report. It is my intention to read rather extensively from these recommendations: "Implementation of this program will require" the report says - "co-operation and co-ordination between the various levels of government - federal, provincial and municipal. Determination of appropriate policy requires determination of the kind of North which the nation seeks. What kind of North can make the fullest economic contribution to the nation? The answers must lie in: (a) undertaking comprehensive inventories of physical resources; (b) expanded research into all aspects of northern development; (c) the encouragement of designated growth centres based on effective town planning; (e) provide adequate housing, health and education facilities; and (f) provide improved transportation and communications. There is little question that Northern Manitoba as Northern Canada generally will continue to develop even without co-ordinated policies. But the involvement of governments can direct the nature and an orderly rate of economic expansion. It is essential that a plan for northern regional development be instituted immediately." These are the Mauro's recommendations. "And such a program would be analogous to the existing ARDA - FRED programs in designated southern regions. These rural rehabilitation and development programs are oriented primarily to removal or amelioration of economic disparities and the elimination of pockets of poverty. The proposed northern development program would be based on joint federal-provincial involvement in a plan for prosperity, a plan for maximum and effective use of our own resources."

The highlights of the plan are set out in a summary of conclusions and recommendations on Page 48 and 49. "For the North to make the fullest economic contribution to the nation it is essential to undertake comprehensive inventories of physical resources; expand research into all aspects of northern development; encourage designated growth centres based on effective town planning; provide adequate housing, health and educational facilities; provide improved transportation and communications.

"In view of the requirements for co-ordination of activities within the Province and the urgency of a joint federal-provincial involvement in northern planning, we recommend that consideration be given to expanding the present office of the Provincial Commissioner of Northern Affairs as a status of a full Department of Northern Affairs." --(Interjection)--The Honourable Member from Churchill agrees. "In this same context we emphasize the need for co-ordinating transportation policies within the province. The recent establishment of the Provincial Department of Transportation" - and may I suggest that Mr. Mauro did not realize then what we all realize now that their recent Department of Transportation was to be a farce in the hands of the present government. --"reflects the acceptance of the need for considering overall requirements rather than a single modal approach. Co-ordination of policies relative to rail, road, air and water are of particular importance in the north where capital costs are high and the fiscal penalty resulting from duplication correspondingly high. While the authority of the Province in transportation is limited the interest and concern extends to every mode. Such agencies as the Manitoba Transportation Commission" - and we really don't know whether that's in existence today -- should --(Interjection)--you read the report. I have a feeling based on the discussion that's taken place in this House and the references that have been made by the previous speakers, that no one else has read this report --"such agencies as the Manitoba Transportation Commission should be expanded to provide for continuing studies of problems of specific concern to the north, including the availability of facilities and services and relevant rate levels.

"In addition to direct financial assistance to established research centres, consideration

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . should be given to the establishment of research centres or institutes at such points as Frobisher Bay, Churchill, Yellowknife and Inuvik. Each would deal with specific problems such as permafrost, marine biology, power transmission, vegetation and growth cycles in northern latitudes, glaciology, social and economic problems including community planning and the effect of isolation.

"Provision of transportation to a multiplicity of communities will prove costly. It is more economical to focus the transportation system on designated growth centres. Planning for the provision of new facilities and services for the extension of existing facilities and services should form an integral part of a policy directed to discouraging population dispersal and encouraging designated growth centres.

"A national transportation policy designed to meet the particular requirements of the Canadian North is critical to its development and to its integration into national economy. It must bind the northern regions to the rest of the nation and provide northern residents with an equal opportunity to enjoy the economic and social benefits available to all Canadian citizens.

"More intensive studies on a national scale may indicate that direct carrier subsidy for the movements of commodities is warranted and administratively feasible. However, it is our view that at present national transportation policies for the north can be achieved in the following manner:" I think these are of great significance in the development of any northern policy and I have a suspicion the Honourable Member from Churchill and the other members from the north will agree on these conclusions: "The provision of necessary facilities including air fields, navigational aids for air and marine operations in construction of roads. Assistance in the provision of essential transportation services similar to that provided in the National Transportation Act for the reimbursement . . .

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it's proper for the member to be reading from this report in this manner that he is?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Crescentwood will learn that I'm perfectly in order and I wonder if I could continue.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I understand that the rule does allow for someone to read from a report, but as long as it's understood that the member doesn't read from a speech that has been written in advance for himself.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I have no objection to the rule as long as it's applied to all members of the House in equal ways, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if we try and introduce it now why we'll have some fun as time goes on.

MR. SPIVAK: I have the report in front of me and if the Honourable Member from Crescentwood would like me to read directly from chapter and verse I will.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order please. I do feel that the rule prohibiting the reading of speeches has been violated on several occasions - and on both sides of the House. However, I would ask the honourable members' co-operation in assisting the Chair and enforcing the rules of the House. I well appreciate that on occasion it may be necessary for a member to follow his notes very closely, and if that is what is being done then certainly a Chair could take no objection to that. But I in no way condone the reading of speeches. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, by way of clarification, I've already indicated that I have referred to the specific pages from which the quotations have been taken. If anyone wishes they can get a copy of the report and they can in fact follow me. I feel that I should be allowed the freedom to at least continue in the way we have practised for so long, or as long as I have been here.

Now I'd like to, if I may, go back to the portion dealing with what can be achieved in terms of a national transportation policy. First, "the provision of necessary facilities including airfields, navigational aids for air and marine operations and construction of roads. The assistance in the provisions of essential transport services similar to that provided in the National Transportation Act for reimbursement to railways, for passenger service operated at the public interest, and the extension of this policy to regional local air carriers." So that there'd be no misunderstanding of what I said, what is being suggested is a direct subsidy be given for passenger service and for air service to the north. And something which I think would reach agreement with the Honourable Member for Churchill and possibly other members from the north - indirect compensation to the individual residents of the north, for the burden

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . imposed by high transport costs through revision of income tax legislation and regulations.

The picture that the Task Force presents of the requirements of residents in small northern communities is not new. The evidence of misery, and squalor, and poverty in our northern region and among our Indian and Metis people is not lacking. The problem of these people who are undergoing a process of transition have also been fully examined; they've been documented by provincial and federal government departments and agencies and commissions, committees of enquiry, and by special studies by both public and private agencies. I'd like to refer to some recent Manitoba studies to indicate that there was and still is a wealth of information on which government action can be forthcoming. There's a three-volume study on the people of Indian ancestry in Manitoba by Jane Lagosse in 1958 and '59; there's the Mauro Commission Report itself; there's the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board Report or the Fifth Annual Report of 1968; on the Federal Government Reports which would be available as source material for any study and determination of policy on this matter, we have the Economic Council of Canada's Third Annual Review; we have the Fifth Annual Review 1968; we've got the Report of the Royal Commission on Health Services; we've got the Report of the Carrothers' Advisory Commission on the Development of Government in the Northwest Territories; we have the survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada. This latter survey is a detailed report of economic, political, educational needs and policies prepared in two parts for the Indian Affairs Branch at Ottawa, in 1966 and 1967.

In 1964 the then Minister of Citizenship and Immigration asked the University of British Columbia to undertake in conjunction with scholars in other universities, a study of the social, educational and economic situation of the Indians of Canada and to offer recommendations. Indian Reserves and settlements across Canada including southern and northern Manitoba were also included in the study. Part 1 of the findings on Page 409 is concerned with economic, political and administrative matters; and to quote the purposes and goals of that report, and I'm quoting: "The problems that call for detailed and objective study were concerned with the inadequate fulfillment of the proper and just aspirations of the Indians of Canada to material well-being, health, to the knowledge that they live in equality and dignity within a greater Canadian society. The Indians do not now have what they need in some of these matters and they cannot at present get what they want in others."

And Part 11 of the findings on Page 251 is concerned with educational and internal organization of the Reserves. On June 25, 1969, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Affairs, the federal minister, placed the Federal Government's statement in Indian policy before the House of Commons: "Now I suggest the time is now opportune for enunciating and for implementing a joint Federal-Provincial policy and programs for the development of the country's people of Indian ancestry. There are questions that now must be asked by us, by those of us who have listened to the report, have read the interim Task Force Report, who have listened to the various speeches, who have listened to the emphasis that has been placed properly in the concern for the north.

What action, if any, has the government taken to examine and study the recommendations of the Mauro Report and the other reports which I referred to? What department or departments are carrying out the studies? Is the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet involved? And why was the Mauro Report not considered by the Legislature's Northern Task Force Committee? What liaison has been established --(Interjection)--You'll tell us? You'll tell us after we ask, yes I know. What liaison has been established with the appropriate Federal Government departments and agencies with a view to considering the feasibility of implementing the Mauro Report's recommendations? For example, the Arctic Transportation Branch of the recently reorganized Department of Transportation. What liaison has been established with the various transportation modes and carriers in Manitoba--the CNR, the Air carriers, the Motor carriers, Marine Transport Limited, for the same purpose.

The findings and recommendations are evidently not unanimous nor may they reflect even the views of the majority of the members of the Task Force. Now the Foreward of the Interim Task Force says and I quote: "All members of the committee" - this is of our interim report - "All members of the committee have reserved their right to comment on differences of opinion and priorities relative to recommendations which have been made." This, Mr. Speaker, sounds very much like the action of the government who simply have always adopted the position that all members of the Cabinet and all members of the caucus have a right to talk on whatever they say, whether it is government policy or not.

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) .

I respect this statement, but I also feel that the next move really belongs to the government. I therefore ask the government to take these recommendations, set the priorities and bring forth a program. This, Mr. Speaker, is not the first occasion in which I and many members on the opposite side have asked the government to give us a program. We have heard much about the present government's desire to improve the quality of life in Manitoba. Now they have an opportunity to exhibit their sincerity and ability to achieve this commendable goal. The House and all Manitobans, especially those who live in our north, await their response. There is much to be done in terms of study in the new north and no one can expect the government to formulate desired policy in this area, detailed policy, at least, although it could certainly make its intentions clear. There is now however, I suggest, in the information that I referred to in the various reports that I've indicated, sufficient information available regarding the needs of our traditional north, of the citizens of our smaller isolated communities who await a degree of government input in order to help overcome their only too familiar problems.

Well, let the government not disappoint them, and let no member of this House forget his or her obligation to support reasonable policy to this end. And I may say that I, along with the members on this side, will be prepared to stand up and support government policy in this connection but we await your plan and we await your action.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put a question to the honourable member. Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member not aware that the first activity that the Task Force set for itself was to deal with the questions as articulated by the people themselves in the isolated communities in northern Manitoba? That that was essentially their first job and that this report represents that phase of its activity.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I've already quoted, and if I have to, I will quote again from the Task Force terms of reference: "To consider and report upon the requirements for the economic, cultural and industrial well-being, growth and development in northern Manitoba" and as I suggested to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, there are two norths and they're interrelated and they cannot be separated.

MR. GREEN: I'm asking the honourable member whether he is not aware that as the first phase of its work within those broad frames of reference, certainly there was a member of his caucus on that group, that the Task Force undertook to go to the isolated communities of the north and to get their expression of view as to their problems.

MR. SPIVAK: I answer this, Mr. Speaker, by saying to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the intent of what I've suggested was not to say that this should not have been done, but suggest to the honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that there is sufficient material, there has been sufficient study and there is sufficient understanding of the problems of the isolated communities, and what was needed was not just the communication, although this is necessary and essential when you have a determination of policy, but what is essentially needed and what should have been done in terms of devoting the time and energy, was to try and implement a program. Now you've produced a report, we say, fine, we have a report; we are now going to wait another period of time before action will occur, because there really is nothing that has been presented so far in terms of the estimates' presentation. --(Interjection)--Well, there will be--and I'm going to wait with some interest--(Interjection)--well, I'll wait with some interest as to the action that will be taken to relieve the problems of poverty, to in fact have that government input, but so far there's no evidence. The problem with the report itself is that it does not in any way, I think, effectively deal, other than to explain the position of those who live in the isolated communities, it does not effectively deal with a plan of action and all I have suggested is that action is needed and not words.

MR. GREEN: Is the honourable member not aware that both in the Throne Speech and in the Bill that is presented before the House that action is being presented at this session of the Legislature?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've been aware of many general statements that have been made by the government in a variety of fields in which action has not taken place and if I was to believe the pattern that will be followed here by the examples that have been set in other areas, it could be many years before there's action.

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

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism, 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; Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs but he's out of his seat so I'll direct it to the First Minister if I may, and ask him if he can confirm that the River East School is being canvassed today by so-called New Democratic Party activists on the subject of the government's automobile insurance program?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea on that matter at all.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, before you go on could I redirect the question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Oh, I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary, and ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs if he will look into the matter and report to the House as to whether this canvass is being undertaken?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will reflect on the question he just asked, he will see how silly it is.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . I direct the question to the Minister of Youth and Education, and ask him if he will see whether the River East School is being canvassed today by the New Democratic Party in the form of party activists, so called, on the subject of the government's automobile insurance program, and that includes the faculty and the student body.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): I'm sure the School Board of River East is quite capable of running its own affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Well, Mr. Speaker, a question on the same subject directed to the Minister of Youth and Education. Is it not his concern as to whether or not unauthorized persons are disrupting class and students at a school during the time of . . . I think that's the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MILLER: That's not a question; it's assumption and an allegation which I can't answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister last week was making some predictions as to timetables and a variety of things. We have now reached the early part of this week. I wonder if the First Minister can tell us when we can expect the automobile insurance Bill?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker. I recall my answer at the time was that the Bill would likely be distributed early this week. I said early this week, approximately, and I believe that that answer is approximately correct.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. We get into the matter of definition of what's early. I consider this is early this week and we're closer to the time. Could the First Minister give us a closer approximation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I said early this week, and give two or three days, that answer stands - sometime this week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm or deny that two senior officials of his department will be leaving their positions? If this is true, will they be removed into some other area of the department or will they be relieved of their positions?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I have no knowledge of any such movement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Are you aware that the Honourable Mr. Bolt the Minister

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) . . . in charge of government insurance in Saskatchewan has been relieved of his duties?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is most interesting and it's probably indicative of certain other factors that have been brought to bear.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Minister going to give me an answer?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member asked a question and the honourable minister made a statement in reply. The Honourable Member for Birtle Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. In view of the fact that the hours of the Lower Fort Garry site have been now announced for the summer season, would the Minister consider changing the hours of Sunday visiting at the site because of our Centennial activities, from noon till 8:00 p. m. to 9:00 a. m. to 9:00 p. m.?

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the hours as far as the Lower Fort Garry is concerned I'm afraid that perhaps the honourable member should take this question up with the federal authorities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table an Order for Return No. 17, dated April 13th for the Member for Morris. May I say in tabling it that this Return was prepared last week. The member in question is not with the department; he's on an extended leave of absence for personal reasons. However the Order is filed as if he is still working for the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: I'd like to ask the Minister of Transportation whether he would care to confirm or deny that he's been made an honorary member of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Have you been contacted by the "Save the Village Committee of Wawanesa" regarding a possible meeting in Wawanesa to discuss government automobile insurance and its effect on the Village of Wawanesa and district?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a message was left in my office yesterday through my secretary requesting an appointment. Certainly I'll be very happy to meet with the representatives of the Village of Wawanesa and also if the honourable member would like to attend with the same representatives, I'm very happy to meet with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to that asked by the Member for Crescentwood. Might I ask the Minister of Transportation if he has received an offer of an honorary membership to the Binscarth Chamber of Commerce?

MR. BOROWSKI: Not yet, but I'm waiting with bated breath.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Just before orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, another question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Does he have any idea what school will be canvassed tomorrow by the NDP activists on the automobile insurance issue?

MR. SCHREYER: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it may be that those who are allegedly doing this canvass, if they are, may see fit to canvass some schools in Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, they're welcome . . . democratic process . . .

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the table Return to an Order of the House No. 2 on motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

MR. GORDON JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): This question is for the Minister of Transport. Sometime ago it was revealed that there was an investigation in the Highways Department in the Dauphin-Ochre River area and I understand that he has the investigation report. Could he inform the House as to any action that may be taken based upon this report?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated sometime ago, I did receive an interim report. The investigation is continuing and it's my hope that we will have a report in about two weeks time. I may add that there was no investigation in Ochre River but there is two



(MR. BOROWSKI Cont'd) . . . other investigations dealing with two other areas where we have had reports of wrongdoing. As soon as these reports are in the House will certainly be informed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL MACKLING Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker during the discussion of my estimates I had a question asked of me and I advised the honourable member that I would give the information to the House. The question I believe was placed by the Honourable Member from Rhineland as to the circulation of the Manitoba Gazette and I am pleased to advise him that the number of Manitoba Gazettes printed weekly number 1,625; the number distributed through subscribed mailing lists is 1,512, and the balance retained for sale as individuals copies 113. I don't think this is necessarily the best seller in Manitoba but it has a pretty fair range as you can see.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. On March 17th I asked for an Order for Return for the correspondence between the Manitoba government and the Canadian government in relation to the Pembina Dam. Later I asked again and I still haven't got it. I wonder will he please give this his personal attention.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have been and I will give it my personal attention.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan in amendment thereto, and a proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West which I have taken under advisement.

I approved the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. I have the impression--order please. I have the impression that it is the intent of the honourable member to effect such a change as to gain support of those who may find themselves on the horns of a dilemma by electing either to support or reject the amendment. Those members who prefer to accept the concept of merit increases as proposed by the amendment rather than increments as referred to in the main motion, may find it difficult to support the amendment because in their opinion it may not call for sufficient information. The same members may find it equally difficult to oppose it because they choose to speak of merit increases and not increments. Beauchesne recognizes this fact in citation 201 when he states "The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who without such an alteration must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon."

In my humble opinion it is for their benefit that the sub-amendment is proposed. Therefore, I rule the sub-amendment in order. Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, after having waited I don't know how long to have the government make up their minds on this matter, one cannot help but wonder why the apparent nervousness on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite.

MR. SCHREYER: Not so, not so!

MR. JORGENSON: They have acted so nervous, they acted like a long tailed cat in a room full of rocking chairs. They have squirmed, they have delayed, they have attempted to avoid answering this question; sir, you have never seen such a performance by a bunch of political acrobats in all your life. Political acrobats, sir, are those that dodge questions, evade issues, straddle the fence and at the same time keep their ear to the political ground, and that is quite a feat, but the gentlemen opposite are able to perform it. One cannot help but wonder, sir, why the delay and why they have endeavoured so strenuously to avoid answering these questions. Sir, this is the third Order for Return I've placed on the Order Paper this session and if it takes as long to get answers as it takes to get them through the House, then I suppose there's good reason to believe that I'll never get the answers.

Now then what is the reason for this? Well, sir, I can only assume that it is an apparent attempt on the part of government opposite to protect that image of the Premier, that knight in shining armour, his avoidance of attempting to answer questions that are quite proper in this chamber, the shining image - I think, sir, we could him Ajax except that he won't come clean when we ask him questions. He refused to speak on two occasions when this motion was before the House and yet saw fit to outside the House unburden himself to the press which is a normal

(MR. JORGENSON Cont'd) . . . practice when he doesn't want to answer questions in the House.

In his statement to the press he said there were three areas upon which we had no right to ask questions and the first one was security, and that sir, makes one wonder - are we to have a security police force in this country that he is now worried about and wants to make sure we don't ask any questions about? He suggests that there are matters under consideration and I don't know what matters he has in mind. I understand that there is a ruling that matters under consideration by the courts are not properly the type of questions that can be asked in this House, but matters under consideration by this House is an entirely different matter and one can only wonder what he means by "matters under consideration."

He also suggested that personnel relations are those that could not be discussed or questions could not be asked in this chamber. Well, sir, he should have added one more, and that fourth one should have been departmental and interdepartmental documents or working papers passed between the civil service and the government which they clamoured so loudly to have tabled when they were on this side of the House. That was an entirely different situation. You see, sir, it makes a big difference to them, whether on this side or whether they are on the other side.

MR. ENNS: All the difference in the world.

MR. JORGENSON: Sir, one cannot help but notice the difference in the attitude of honourable gentlemen now that they are on that side of the House. I see that the Minister of Transportation is edging toward the exit and I hope he doesn't leave because I have a few words that I would like to say to him and I was hoping that he would stay. --(Interjection)--How quickly they forget the role of opposition now they are on that side of the chamber.

It seems strange the attitude that has been taken by a number of the gentlemen opposite when we have endeavoured to seek information, and, sir, I'd like to, for the benefit of some honourable gentlemen opposite, and particularly for the Minister of Transportation who has had several things to say, and I regret very much that he is not in this House, but particularly for his benefit, I should like to quote from a statement made by Arthur Meighen about the role of opposition and perhaps some of the gentlemen opposite who complain so bitterly and who yell so loudly when gentlemen on this side of the House are speaking, might listen to these words by the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen: "If parliament is to preserve" --(Interjection)-- the honourable gentleman from Elmwood suggests that I speak to the point. Well this is the point, sir, the very point I'm making, the right of members on this side of the House to ask questions. He wouldn't know anything about that although he exercised that right quite freely when he was in opposition. Now Mr. Speaker, Arthur Meighen said "If parliament is to be preserved as a living institution, Her Majesty's loyal opposition must fearlessly perform its function. When it properly discharges them the preservation of our freedom is assured. The reading of history proves that freedom always dies when criticism ends. It upholds and maintains the rights of minorities against majorities. It must be vigilant against expression and unjust invasion by the Cabinet of the rights of people. It should supervise all expenditures and prevent over-expenditure by exposing to the light of public opinion, wasteful expenditure or worse. It finds fault. It suggests amendments. It asks questions and elicits information. It arouses, educates and moves public opinion by voice and vote. It must scrutinize every action by the government and in doing so prevent the shortcut through the democratic procedure that governments like, " - and particularly this government - likes to make. The absence of a strong opposition means a one-party state and a one-party state means an all powerful cabinet."

That, sir, pretty accurately defines the role of opposition and I remind honourable gentlemen opposite of that role because they seem to have forgotten in this short little while. You know the Minister of Labour who sits there and continuously lectures members of this House has said some rather interesting things and one can only wonder, one can only wonder why, sir, that they want us to stop asking questions. It seems to me, sir, that they hate to see any of their past performances exposed. One repeated suggestion on the part of the Minister of Labour, he said it to the Member for Lakeside, he said it to myself and he said it to others, "we'll get you at the next election," and I wonder what he means by that. I wonder what kind of a scheme they have in mind, other than totalitarian, or maybe no election at all. On other occasions he has said, and this you know, coming from a Minister of the Crown, "Oh mind your business. You sit down until I am finished." He wants the right to speak; they all want the right to speak over there but they believe --(Interjection)--yes, and we're not denying

May 5, 1970

1607

(MR. JORGENSEN Cont'd) . . . you that right; but what I am suggesting, sir, is that they want to deny us the right speak.

HON. RUSSELL RAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Oh no, oh no.

MR. MACKLING: Will the honourable member yield to a question? Will the honourable member yield to a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: Never have I seen anything like the Attorney-General. Sir there was an admonition made today, there was an admonition made today about reading speeches, and, sir, if you were to apply that rule, my honourable friend couldn't even answer a question in this chamber. His only contribution, his only contribution is when somebody else is up on his feet he must get up and ask a question from time to time. Just to get on the record to show that he's still in the place.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote further from the very worthwhile comments of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour. He said --(Interjection)--he continues to tell us that we must not say anything in this Chamber and he said "While I'm prepared as a member of the administration to listen to the admonitions of my honourable friend, I do suggest that he would be well advised to sit down and just listen - just listen." That is the kind of rule that honourable gentlemen opposite would have cut out for us. Now then sir, they continue, and the Minister of Mines and Resources, I remember on one occasion when the Minister of Industry and Commerce read a statement into the record, I believe it was appointing certain gentlemen to an advisory board, and before my colleague from River Heights had an opportunity to even stand up and speak he was called out of order by the Minister of Mines and Resources before he even knew what he was going to say, and he admonished him saying you've got to stick to the terms of that particular statement. You can't go beyond that. But when my friend from Ste. Rose spoke, why he wandered all over the place, but because he was not critical of the government, he let him go on. There was no suggestion at all that he should stay within the rules on that occasion.

This, sir, is a continued repetition of what we find from day to day in this chamber. My honourable friend the Minister of Transportation--well it would be interesting to find the Minister of Transportation. He had some rather caustic things to say about members on this side of the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: Point or order. The Honourable Member for Morris who has just finished accusing us of not wanting to allow them on the other side to speak has been speaking away and forcing us to listen to him. But my point of order, sir, is that I believe that the contents of my honourable friend's remarks in the last minute or two are a reflection on the impartiality of the Chair and therefore I believe is a valid point of order.

MR. JORGENSEN: You know that is a spurious point of order if I ever heard one. There has been no reflection on the Chair. I have made some comments concerning the House Leader and I have said nothing about the rulings of the Chair and you, sir, know that I have not done that.

I was going to comment on some statements made by the Minister of Transportation who continues to criticize members because we take up time asking questions in this House, although asking questions in this chamber is the right of members and indeed it is the duties of members and the responsibility of members on this side of the House. On one occasion he even went so far as to suggest, sir, that instead of criticizing, and instead of asking questions, that our job was to get up and praise the government. They, sir, honestly believe that the Legislature is called into session for the purpose of them glorifying one another, and the amendment to a resolution that was proposed by the Member for St. George the other day is a pretty classic example of that sort of thinking.

The Minister of Transportation said, how many of you fellows ever get up over there and praise the government? Well, you know, sir, they honestly believe that this is the only purpose and the only reason for the session called into being, that we can give them every opportunity to spread themselves with glory and for us simply to act as straight men for them. Well, it won't work that way, sir. They continue to evade the kind of questions that are being asked in this House. The First Minister when asked by my colleague the Member from Wolseley about a certain gentleman who was appointed to the Centennial Board, and although he knew the answer to that question, and he was asked that question on two occasions, never answered it in this House. I thought that would bring my honourable friend to his feet.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . yes and you certainly deserve it my friend, because you're reflecting on the integrity of a member of this House by your last remarks, Mr. Speaker, when he suggested that the First Minister refused to answer questions when he was in possession of the facts at that time. Now if that is not a reflection on the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, then I don't know what is a reflection on the integrity of an honourable member of this House and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Morris withdraw that remark.

MR. JORGENSON: If my honourable friend will want to check the record he will find that the question was asked on a Monday; the First Minister said he would answer it the following day. The question was asked again on Wednesday and the First Minister said he'd answer it the following day and it never was answered in this House until I asked him the following week.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, that has nothing to do with the point of order that I have raised --(Interjection)--But you made a different statement today. You cast. . . reflected on the integrity, the sincerity of an honourable member of this House. I respectfully ask, Mr. Speaker, that if the honourable member will not of his own accord withdraw the imputation that you request him so to do.

MR. JORGENSON: . . . no such imputation and the honourable gentleman knows that. All I said was that he refused to answer a question in this House.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . what my honourable friend said that the Honourable the First Minister knew the answers and refused to give them, and that I say is not the proper conduct of any honourable member, and while we may make some allowances, while we might be able to make some allowances for the likes of the Honourable Member for Morris, that's going too far.

MR. JORGENSON: Sir, my honourable friend is getting himself awfully exercised over nothing because I made no such imputation. I made no such imputation and my honourable friend knows it, Sir.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I call upon you to ask that member to withdraw. There was certainly an imputation that was phrased in his remarks. He's been called upon to withdraw.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Sir, I'll be happy to withdraw if you think there is something to withdraw, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: Again I ask you to consider the remarks of my honourable friend and request him to withdraw those statements.

MR. JORGENSON: As long as it's made clear to me what I am to withdraw.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I'm sure that we can't penetrate the ivory on top of my honourable friend's shoulders, but I'm sure he needs no other sentence from me as to what he said. He knows what he said, we know what he said, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, does a . . . Protestant have the right to jump up and down like this?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . from any place has the right to ask an honourable member in this House not to reflect on the integrity of another honourable member.

MR. JORGENSON: Apparently my honourable friend is--

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I have made a request - and I'm not requesting - if my honourable friend, as I indicated, is not prepared, I'm asking you, Sir, as the presiding officer to consider the remarks of my honourable friend, and I will abide by your decision.

MR. SPEAKER: When I have the opportunity to review the comments made in Hansard I'll consider them and give my ruling thereon after having done so.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, let me say right now, Sir, that if I have made any statement that contravenes the rules of this House I will be happy to withdraw them, and let it rest at that. My honourable friends are again getting pretty nervous and one would seem to get the impression that I'm getting fairly close to the truth when I speak in this Chamber. Well, Sir, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . you may even hit the truth. --(Interjection)--it's all right to say that.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Sir, they asked us to place our faith in them, they asked us to trust them, and we have a statement here from the First Minister: "We shall" and he made this statement on August 21st, Page 119 of Hansard, August 21, 1969, he says: "Sir, we shall in fact, Mr. Speaker, try much harder, much much harder, we shall try to get away from

(MR. JORGENSEN Cont'd) . . . this great reliance on secrecy as a crutch for government to take the easy way out." And yet day after day, Sir, when we asked questions in this Chamber, when we tried to get information from honourable gentlemen they are relying more and more on the crutch of secrecy in order to prevent information, legitimate information from coming to this Chamber. --(Interjection)--I asked the question in an Order for Return from the Minister of Transportation concerning Executive Assistants some time ago when I wondered why a certain Alex Filuk had not been on that list the Minister of Labour in exaltation jumped up and said, why he is not an executive assistant. Well, Sir, the question never related to executive assistants, the questions related to ministerial assistants; and then they tell me that he is a technical assistant . . . --(Interjection)--. . . And yet when you look in the telephone directory, Sir . . . (Interjection) . . . when you look in the telephone directory, . . .

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): On a point of order, are we re-entering the debate of something already passed? I think . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I am dealing, Sir, with my right to ask questions in this House and to seek information as I am doing in this Order for Return, and surely this is relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . but I'm sure that the honourable member is aware that it is improper to reflect upon matters already decided by the House, and I seem to have the impression that this may fall within that category.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I'll leave that subject then, I'll leave that subject, Sir, except to say if my honourable friends will check with the telephone directory and find the listing for that gentleman and his title they might get a little bit of surprise themselves. That's their own directory, I didn't print it.

Now, Sir, there were other questions. I asked questions about the legal counsel drafting the government automobile insurance bill, and again there was a skating around the corners and evading the issues, avoiding answering the questions. They say, Sir, that we must not, we must not ask any questions about civil servants, let's not get into a debate about that sort of thing. But my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has no hesitation reflecting and talking about civil servants, and for the edification of my honourable friends I will quote some of his statements from Hansard, Page 746, and here is the Minister of Agriculture speaking. And I want to say for the record, Mr. Chairman, that I had a hard time to convince our former Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce that this was a wrong course to follow, a very difficult task. --(Interjection)--I don't think I did, I think that's one of the reasons why we parted company perhaps. And then there was an interchange between him and the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, then he goes on to say this: "In the field of agriculture I would say he was intruding. My honourable friend ought to know, my honourable friend ought to know that when a Deputy Minister of another department state deliberately to try and influence the decisions of another department Minister then he is going far beyond the realm of the terms of reference" . . . and it goes on and on.

They say that we are not to ask questions about civil servants, that we're not to comment on them, we're not to say anything, and yet they have no hesitation, they have no hesitation whatsoever of talking about civil servants in a derogatory fashion. I suggest to you, Sir, that if it applies to one it applies to the others. They continue to prevent us from asking questions in this House on the grounds that we are attempting to say derogatory remarks about the civil servants. It's nothing of that nature at all, Sir. It's nothing of that nature. I suggested earlier in this session that I feared that the government is carrying on a purge of civil servants, and my purpose in asking these questions is to find out if that indeed is not a fact, and the very avoidance of the issue, the very fact the honourable gentlemen opposite do not want to provide that kind of information is an indication of their attitude. --(Interjection)--Now we have one of those intelligent remarks from the Minister of Transportation, and his interjections are always welcome because we find them most illuminating and they contribute greatly to the dignity of this place.

Well, Sir, they talk about not asking questions; and yet, Sir, members of their own party in Ottawa have no hesitation about asking questions on civil servants. Here is a question on Page 85 of the House of Commons Order Paper, No. 100, and here is a question that was asked: "January 22" - this is the date the question was asked but Monday, April 13, this is the date of the Order Paper. --(Interjection)--This year - this year. --(Interjection)--"For each government department, Crown corporation or agency, what was the salary range of the Deputy Minister and Assistant Deputy Minister or the equivalent position as of January 1, 1957, '62,

(MR. JORGENSEN Cont'd) . . . '67, and '69." They have no hesitation asking questions of that nature, Sir, none whatsoever. And further on, here's another one that is asked on Page 87: 1. "How many civil servants or employees of Crown corporations or government agencies have been dismissed or have been given notice of termination of employment. 2. Of these employees how many in each department agency, etcetera have been employed by the government up to ten years, to 15 years, 15-20 years, more than 20 years; and 3. Of these employees dismissed or who have been given notice of dismissal, how many are 40 to 45 years of age, 45 to 55 years of age, more than 50 years of age." These questions, Sir, were asked by the Member for Winnipeg North, Mr. Orlikow. So the kind of question that they ask when they are in opposition to them is perfectly legitimate, but when we ask the same type of question then suddenly there is all sorts of objections to that kind of question. Sir, it's an indication, it's an indication of how much they have changed in the short period from the time that they were on this side of the House 'till now, when they got on the other side.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the kind of machiavellian approach that the honourable gentlemen have towards government is rather interesting. --(Interjection)--The Minister of Transportation doesn't know who Machiavellia is, so maybe I'd better acquaint him. I read the definition of machiavellianism from Funk and Wagnall's standard international dictionary: "The theory and practice of power politics elaborated from Machiavelli's "The Prince," envisaging first, the seizure, maintenance and extension of absolute power by the nicely graduated use of guile, fraud, force and frightfulness respectively. No. 2 Reliance and expediency and reasons of state as justifying any departure from morality needed to hold power; control then being maintained by the ruler of all avenues of communication thus facilitating the deliberate moulding of public opinion. No. 3. Use of a common enemy as political cement in holding together allies needed in acquiring power and the ruthless liquidation of those allies and all other rivals once power has been acquired." And I tell my honourable friend from St. Boniface to beware. "The employment for surveillancing . . . activities who can be disowned and liquidated by the ruler who thus escapes the blame for their atrocities." Sir, that's the definition of the sort of thing that we're beginning to see from honourable gentlemen opposite. --(Interjections)-- Well, Sir, the attitude that we have been confronted with in our efforts to get information from honourable gentlemen opposite leads me to believe that the machiavellianism that I just read about is being applied. I don't know who the person is who is applying it, but it would be interesting to know who the power is behind the throne. Well, maybe it is Cass-Beggs.

You know, Sir, Mr. Speaker, we have been criticized because we've said things about members about the government hiring people coming from outside the province. You know that's a rather interesting thing, because during the course of the debate on the Minister's estimates, the Minister of Transportation's estimates, he made some rather interesting comments, and one of them was the statement to the effect that he was very very upset about CFI hiring people from outside the province. Here's his statement from Page 867 of Hansard, April 13, 1970, and this is what the Minister says: "Right now CFI as you know is bringing in the majority of their workers from outside the province and I think it is a shame. We put all that money into a project" -- I presume he means that it was his money --"and the jobs are being created not for Manitobans but for people from Ontario, Quebec and in fact for some people from outside of Canada." Sir, in the light of that, when we have the audacity to question the credentials of Mr. Scott an American citizen appointed to the Centennial Board, then there's a great hue and cry raised over there, we're accused of racism by the very Minister who himself who himself criticized CFI for hiring people from outside the province.

MR. BOROWSKI: You're sick.

MR. JORGENSEN: There was no hesitation about bringing Cass-Beggs in this province. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Hasn't that remark been withdrawn?

MR. BOROWSKI: He's sick.

MR. JORGENSEN: What's out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I would urge the honourable member to withdraw that remark. That was an issue before this House and my recollection is that it was resolved to the satisfaction of both sides.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do withdraw that. I know that the Minister has withdrawn that comment and I apologize to him for it. But this is the situation, Sir. We have the government on the one hand saying one thing, and I can only assume that the Minister of Transportation, who speaks very frankly in this Chamber, and outside the Chamber - you

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . don't have to guess where he stands on any issue. The Minister knows and if he criticizes the CFI people for bringing in outsiders, then he must honestly believe that it's wrong to bring in outsiders. Surely then he can't condone the practice of this government bringing in people from all over the country into this province, taking jobs that should belong to Manitobans.

MR. BOROWSKI: Name them.

MR. JORGENSEN: Dozens of them -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I hate to interrupt the honourable member but I must remind him that he has only five minutes remaining.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, I hadn't realized that time had slipped by so quickly, but Sir, this criticism, this criticism of the Americans by honourable gentlemen opposite, and particularly the Member for Crescentwood, who has made a career out of criticizing American investment in this country, criticizing American involvement in this country, American development of our resources, has nothing to say, nothing to say at all about bringing in people to put -- Americans to sit on our boards, and particularly a Centennial board. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm not against Americans. I'm just saying that honourable gentlemen should be consistent; either they're one thing or the other. Let's not be all over the place.

MR. GONICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does the member not know that Mr. Scott was not brought in from the United States; he has been living here for many years.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . whether the Honourable Member for Crescentwood has a point of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: That's a pretty weak thing for even an intelligent gentleman like the Honourable Member for Crescentwood to say. The fact is he's been in this country, I don't know how many years, nine years - hasn't bothered to take out a Canadian citizenship. Now that shows his interest in this country. And yet he's appointed, he's appointed to a board . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: What do you know about it?

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . to help us celebrate our Centennial.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . isn't it?

MR. JORGENSEN: There's the tomcat from St. Boniface, who sits up there and interjects.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . there's little Dief up there.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, he's finished his time long ago.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend who is indebted to his imagination for his facts, continues to -- when he's standing up in his seat he's more indebted to his . . . than when he's sitting down - continues to interject and that is his stock-in-trade, interjections preventing other people from making their comments in the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: You don't interject when I speak?

MR. JORGENSEN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface made a speech in this Chamber the other day that had to be the model of unparliamentary speeches that I've ever listened to.

MR. DESJARDINS: I should have asked your permission; I'm very sorry.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, you didn't need to ask my permission, but I think the honourable gentleman, when he makes that kind of a speech in the Chamber, should be very much less critical of other people who say anything in this Chamber at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: What about . . . or maybe you don't call that a speech.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend through the years has continued that practice and I don't think there's anything that's going to stop it . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You don't like it.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . because that is his contribution to this Chamber . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right; I do my way, you . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . one that we deplore and one that -- a running commentary. It must be that he's had some experience at hockey games and continues to give running commentaries of what's going on.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right. You kick the manure off the tractor wheel; I play hockey.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, it doesn't appear as though I've been able to convince my friends opposite that they should mend their ways, that they should be consistent; if they're

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . . going to take one approach, let it be a consistent approach; if they're going to tolerate opposition in this place, and I'm sometimes wondering whether they're going to, then for heaven's sake, don't criticize members on this side of the House when they ask questions or when they criticize the government. That is the role that we are supposed to carry out in this House. That is a responsibility that we have, and we intend to carry out that responsibility, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I've been listening to a bunch of pickled herring.

MR. JORGENSEN: I ended the debate, Sir. I closed the debate, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: You did not. You see, Mr. Speaker, my honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I was of the impression that the Honourable Member for Morris was speaking to the sub-amendment.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, are we sure that we were speaking on the sub-amendment or were we speaking on the motion as amended?

MR. SPEAKER: As I read the Order Paper, there's a motion, an amendment, and an amendment to the amendment, which I have just ruled in order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the only point was that Mr. Speaker took this particular sub-amendment under advisement and ruled it in order, and then the honourable gentleman who has just sat down - for Morris - spoke at length on the sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Brandon West. -- (Interjection) -- because we are not going to accept it.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I had thought that the amendment had been put and passed and that it was the motion as amended.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no!

MR. SPEAKER: I must inform honourable members of the House that that had not happened. The debate is on the amendment to the amendment. The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. PAULLEY: You see, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, who loves to rant and rave in triviality, didn't even know what he was speaking on. It's very evident that he didn't know what he was speaking about, but surely a man of his vast experience and knowledgeability in some areas at least should know what he was talking about and what motion he was speaking on, and I think this is indicative of the absolute lack of knowledgeability of my honourable friend of the rules of the House or the rules of the proper conduct in debate, and I hate, I hate to repeat some of the suggestions that my honourable friend has thrust toward us, such as being tolerant. Well, Mr. Speaker, after listening to my honourable friend for over 40 minutes, if there are any accolades or words of merit for tolerance, surely they should be given to members on this side of the House, and if my honourable friend, some time in his more leisurely hours, would take the time to read his oration and the tripe contained therein, then I'm sure that he will invite us out to Morris in a gesture of apology for his utterances here this afternoon. And for an honourable member such as the Member for Morris, who has been in this House but in the twinkling of an eye, to stand and talk about this government, about their actions when they were in opposition, certainly is intolerable and displays absolute ignorance of the history of this House.

My honourable friend came into this House, came into this House -- (Interjection) -- Oh, it's poppycock he gave; it surely is. My honourable friend came into this House just a short time ago and now he stands and presumes to know of the deficiencies of this government by comparison of the efficiency when it was on that side of the House. I want to say to my honourable friend, there has been no endeavour on this side of the House to prevent him asking questions, as stupid as some of them are. Nobody's ever suggested to my honourable friend that he shouldn't ask questions. We would be the last to try and deprive our honourable friend from the right to ask questions, but there is a difference in asking a question and answering them, when in the opinion of this House and the opinion of this government they are either not worthy of answer or they have every indication of casting this House and the government on a witch-hunt for information. It is this type of question that this government refused and will continue to refuse if it is in the interest of the morale and the well-being of the civil servants of this province, and if my honourable friend hasn't any respect for them, then we have. And this is the objective of my honourable friend and he knows full well.



(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

But let's go back a few years; let's go back a few years; let's go back a few years when some of us were privileged to sit on that side of the House and we did obtain an education that will stand us in good stead now that we're on this side of the House, and we'll be here for a lot longer than my honourable friend will be over there. My honourable friend in his discourse castigated me because I suggested that he and the Member for Lakeside would not be around very long, and I really mean it, Mr. Speaker. And I think the Member for Morris clearly indicated today the reasons why he will not be around much longer, and if his constituents only had the same opportunity as we have had today to listen to the poppycock and the guff from my honourable friend, they'd make sure that he'd be out before too long.

My honourable friend did say one true statement during his 40-minute discourse, and he said, "We're getting fairly close to the truth." And I believe him, Mr. Speaker, I believe that he did get for once close to the truth, and I want to thank my honourable friend for admitting that for once he may have got a little close to the truth because he's been so far divorced from it on other occasions that it was really an admission by my honourable friend that — (Interjection) — he was, was he? I'm only quoting from my honourable friend because I wrote down exactly what he said. He said: "Now I'm getting fairly close to the truth." — (Interjection) — Oh, they sure were words of wisdom emanating from the lips of my honourable friend from Morris.

Then he talks about certain Orders for Return and the listing in the telephone book. What telephone book? The telephone book hasn't been changed since the change has really taken place insofar as some of the members that have been hired. The Government Services one has, yes. — (Interjection) — He didn't describe it at the first time, but anyway, even that one still hasn't been changed in its entirety because I was only listed the other day as Minister of Government Services, and I'm sure my honourable friend is aware of it. — (Interjection) — Yes, it will be for a long time.

So I say to my honourable friend — and I note he's vacating the Chamber, which is relatively common practice with my Diefenbakerish friend from Morris, to get up and rant and rave and then fold his tent like the Arabs and silently steal away. But I say, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to dwell as long as my honourable friend has, on a sub-amendment. I suggested the other day, I suggested the other day that in my opinion it appeared that what was being attempted was to come in by the back door what was refused by the front door, and you, Sir, were asked to make a ruling and you did, and of course we accept it. Then that gave vent to my honourable friend who didn't even know what he was talking about.

So I say it's improper, in my opinion, improper in my opinion to disclose the information which can be obtained privately, if required, without the possible embarrassment to any of the members of the Civil Service, and I think that as Minister responsible generally for the Civil Service, the Civil Service Commission, I would be quite within my rights to take the stand in opposition to the sub-amendment as we did to the change of the main motion — I apologize. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, sent me over a copy of a page out of the telephone book dated February, 1970, which lists Mr. A. Filuk as an Executive Assistant, but as I indicated on the Order for Return, Mr. Filuk was a technical advisor and not an executive assistant. However, — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: Ministerial assistant.

MR. PAULLEY: I recall — in my opinion, I thought it was executive assistant. We can check that back for the record between my honourable friend and myself. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, one could go on.

MR. WEIR: Now who doesn't know what he's talking about?

MR. PAULLEY: At least I have the courtesy, I have the courtesy to indicate to this House if I make an error, which I would highly recommend a similar procedure to even the Leader of the Opposition and to his colleagues on that side of the House as well, but I doubt very much whether some would have the intestinal fortitude so to do, which was indicated during the discourse of my honourable friend, the Member for Morris.

So I say, while we were in Opposition, the government headed by the now Leader of the Opposition and his predecessor the Honourable Duff Roblin, and prior to that the Liberal administration, on many occasions rejected Orders for Return which asked for answers to questions proposed by myself while I was the Leader of the Third Party opposite, and the same thing happened insofar as the Liberal Party when they were the Party in Official Opposition led by the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. This is nothing new. My honourable friend the Member for Morris read excerpts from Hansard. Well, I get Hansard too and I saw those questions asked by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North in respect of the Civil Service and their salary ranges, and if you ask questions of that nature you'll get the answers, but if you ask questions of a nature which can pinpoint an individual or individuals, then that's a horse of a different colour and I could not accept the contention of my honourable friend the Member for Morris.

But I do want to thank my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker. Every night we look in the newspapers and we see ads for shows, talks about Academy Awards. My honourable friend treated us in this House this afternoon to one of the best shows that I have seen this year. We don't have to pay for it, fortunately, but I do say to my honourable friend that while it was free, financially, it surely cost the people of Manitoba a lot to have to keep us here an extra day or two to listen and watch the show of my honourable friend the Member for Morris and I want to say, I want to say to my honourable friend, as he stands and he gesticulates and he waves and he rants, boy, the honourable gentleman that honoured us the other day surely was a good tutor. Surely the Right Honourable gentleman who was here the other day, were he here today he would point his finger at my honourable friend and say, By gosh, I really taught him, didn't I? So I thank my honourable friend for his show this afternoon. I'm sure it will go down in the annals of history of this Legislative Assembly as the best yet.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: When I'm finished. So I say to my friend, thanks a million. We've loved it.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: It seems to me I heard the Minister say that by answering the Order it would pinpoint and embarrass someone in the Civil Service. Well my question is, in what way would this identify anyone by answering that question? How could that question identify anyone?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . of the Civil Service and the increments, that's what it's dealing with. Maybe my honourable friend had better take another look at it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should clarify the question, but there are three questions asked and each one starts by asking for the number of deputy ministers, not the names or not their positions, but the number. And how would that identify a person?

MR. PAULLEY: Because if it was only one that didn't receive the increment . . . That's the whole basis of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I regret the departure of the Leader of the Opposition because I had some choice phrases to frame in his way. However, Mr. Speaker, with less reluctance than I'm usually wont to display, I'm happy to address a few remarks to this House in respect to this amendment. These remarks arise primarily out of the treatment that we received at the hand -- well, I should say at the mouth of the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. MCKELLAR: Can't you take it?

MR. MACKLING: Not at all. I loved it; I thought it was a charming performance, a charming performance, but after all, you know, like some performances some aspects were a little pathetic. It had a great measure of pathos, particularly at the end when the actor discovered that he had been playing his part at the wrong time. He had indicated that he had closed the debate and he was terribly chagrined, as we observed, and obviously he had played his role at the wrong time. Obviously the Honourable Member for Morris and some of his colleagues, who seem to have some particular expertise in the henhouse, have been scratching around on the floor and come up with what you generally find in a henhouse, and that's the kind of treatment this House heard for some time. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I could describe what the Honourable Member for Morris has said as being what you generally find on the floor of a henhouse. However, his feathery remarks were rather encumbered by some of that grit on the floor of the henhouse.

But he has styled himself, Mr. Speaker, in some manner as the spokesman for the Conservative Party in respect to the rules of this House, and he is continually rising in his seat to admonish the Speaker to some point of order, and he's always pointing out the inadequacies of some remark that has been made on this side. But I happen to know that the .

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . Honourable Member for Morris has referred to Beauchesne from time to time. He has opened the covers of this book, that apparently it's some measure of a guide to him, so I'm astounded, I'm astounded at the remarks that he made.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): . . . Beauchesne. I don't think so.

MR. MACKLING: Yes. Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Was he a Canadian?

MR. MACKLING: Oh, Beauchesne - I don't know about his nationality. I'm sorry about that. I think perhaps he may have been an early Canadian but I wouldn't be sure. But he talks, you know, he talks very learnedly. He quoted from Niccolò Machiavelli, the Prince, and apparently he's some sort of an expert about political power, and I would think that a lot of the members of the Conservative Party are somewhat expert about political power and how to use it - and of course how to lose it - and Niccolò Machiavelli of course may be a good guide to the Honourable Member for Morris. He certainly seems to have taken great interest in that work, as have some of the other nefarious leaders in history, of politics, particularly in Europe, but he talked about power and the misuse of power.

The Honourable Member for Morris was elected in a by-election in February 1968 along with two others of his colleagues. Now here he is - yes, he was elected in February 1968, and despite the fact that he had a comfortable majority, despite the fact that they had elected three out of four in by-elections in February '68, who displayed Machiavellian instincts in June of '69? Who went to the people, thinking that the New Democratic Party without a Leader, that the Liberal Party with a new leader, would be subject to their great political power? Who had the Machiavellian touch at that moment? Obviously the Member for Morris was one of those who counselled an early election because he was so fired up by his recent by-election victory. This is a display of naked Machiavellian power that has never seen quite the like in this province, when a government dumped over 60 bills that were waiting passage in this House. Why? Because they were interested in greater political power, and the Honourable Member for Morris has the audacity to suggest that there is something wrong in some of the questions sometimes being objected to on this side of the House. This Order for Returns and some of the questions that have been put have obviously been an attempt at meddling in the affairs of the Civil Service. Obviously.

The Honourable Member for Morris, the self-styled parliamentarian -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'll answer your question if you have an intelligent one, later - this Honourable Member for Morris, the self-styled parliamentary expert in this House, has sat there when his colleagues, day after day, in the Question Period have asked the most inane, asinine, repetitious, unintelligent questions, and the Honourable Member for Morris, this parliamentary expert, is familiar with some of the questions that ought not to be placed in parliament - and let me refer to the authority. And he's familiar with him, Mr. Speaker, this Mr. Beauchesne whose nationality I'm not very certain of. -- (Interjection) -- The honourable member can sit down. The honourable member can sit down until he has something intelligent to say.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I have something . . . On a point of order, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. MACKLING: You may sit down. You'll never be able to stand up. Please sit down.

MR. JORGENSEN: I rise on the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MACKLING: Oh, he's got a privilege.

MR. JORGENSEN: The honourable gentleman has reflected on your conduct of the business of this House.

MR. MACKLING: I have not.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, the determination of what is a question that is proper for this Chamber is up to you, not up to me or anybody else, and the honourable gentleman is reflecting on your conduct of the business of this House and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, again we have this display. The honourable member rises on a question of privilege. I did not say that they were improper questions. I said they were inane, asinine, repetitious, unintelligent. It's up to the Speaker to decide whether or not the Honourable Member for Morris is out of order. If he happens to feel that it's not an abuse of the House, by leave certainly the Speaker will allow these questions to continue.

But I would like to point out to the honourable member who is an authority, that questions and the calibre of questions are dealt with in this treatise by Beauchesne and for his edification;

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . and so that he might draw the attention of his honourable colleagues to the propriety of certain questions, I would like to refer to Beauchesne for a few moments and I'm quoting from this volume, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, published by Carswell and Company.

MR. JORGENSON: Probably the first time you've seen it.

MR. MACKLING: Oh, not at all. I saw it together with my honourable friend the other day in the Coffee Shop and he was remarking on the fact that so many questions had not complied with the rules, and the questions of course emanate from the Opposition, as the honourable member is fully aware; but apparently, Mr. Speaker, he hasn't taken the trouble to edify the Honourable Member from Lakeside or others in his party as to what the rules provide. And let me quote from Beauchesne:

"A question, oral or written, must not . . ." and this is Page 147 of that book - "A question, oral or written, must not (a) be ironical, rhetorical, offensive, or contain epithet, innuendo, satire or ridicule; (b) be trivial, vague or meaningless." How many have offended against that? "(c) multiply with slight variations a similar question on the same point." Oh, How I long for the presence of the Honourable Member for River Heights. "(d) repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused." And I think the Honourable Member from Arthur should take particular heed of that question. "(e) enquire whether statements made in a newspaper are true.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. MACKLING: Oh, I'm sorry - the honourable member woke up. I didn't realize he was awake.

MR. WATT: Well, the garbage that was coming across from that side of the House, I'm sorry I wasn't really listening, but would he repeat that last . . .

MR. MACKLING: Well, apparently I was right; he was asleep. I'll read that again. This is Page 147 of Carswell's Edition of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Procedures, and the honourable member would be interested to note that "a question, oral or written, must not repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer has been refused." I trust that the honourable member will reflect on that and consider it in future. "(e) enquire whether statements made in a newspaper are true." You still don't understand the rule. I'll allow him to ask further.

MR. WATT: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I simply say to my honourable friend that I have asked sensible questions and I've never yet got a sensible answer from that side of the House.

MR. MACKLING: Here we are again; here we are again. He's asked question after question after question identical in nature, but he says they're all very sensible and not repetitious.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): How about speaking on pizza?

MR. MACKLING: On pizza. Well, you should be an expert; you should be an expert. "(e) enquire whether statements made in a newspaper are true." How many times have the honourable members considered that one? "(f) contain an expression of opinion. (g) be hypothetical. (h) contain inference. (i) contain imputations." Oh, you don't like to hear about the rules. The Honourable Member for Morris is so troubled by a recitation of the rules that he has to leave. "(j) be framed so as to suggest its own answer." Hm, how about that one? "(k) be a speech, however short." Again, how I long for the presence of the Honourable Member from River Heights particularly. "And not be of unreasonable length" - oh, I see. "(l) - seek for purposes of argument information on matters of past history." Now surely, you know, this is relevant today.

Well, I could go on and on - "reflect on or relate to character of conduct of persons; refer discourteously to persons," and so on. There are many many rules and it's so unfortunate the Honourable Member from Morris isn't here because I'm sure that as an expert on the rules he would be able to confirm that what I have read is a correct interpretation of these rules and that he could then admonish his colleagues to follow them a little more closely, and then we would get on with the progress of the work of this House a little bit more expeditiously.

But what we had today has been a long harangue by the honourable member - to what effect? To the effect that he found that he had spoken at the wrong moment in time. Again he'll go down in history as some sort of a poor actor. It's unfortunate that this occurred but I think it has given us an opportunity to once again indicate that when sensible, proper questions are

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . put, we intend to give full and frank answers - and we have. -- (Interjection) -- The fellow says "ooh". The honourable member says "ooh" and "aah". . . . Reports that were asked by the former administration were not tendered but in this House reports have been freely and fully tendered, and I know this bothers my honourable friends on the other side because the comparison makes them feel rather pale, but however, these are the facts and any endeavour on their part at sniping, at picayune endeavour to try and trouble us in connection with personnel, is not going to dissuade us from answering, fully and frankly, questions that are sincerely and properly put. But certainly the expedition that's involved in this Order for Return is one where people are trying, obviously trying to catch fish, polluted fish or something, to the embarrassment of this government.

There are no polluted fish; there are no polluted civil servants; and when civil servants choose to leave this government of their own accord - and a couple of them have - they have gone very graciously, and I think the Honourable Member from River Heights would be the first to admit that some of these civil servants were hand-picked by some of the former ministers, and it's not without reason that from time to time there could be a personality clash or a difference in views which would precipitate one of the civil servants from deciding that he would rather work for some other firm or in some other role. Now this is perfectly understandable, but the endeavour by the Official Opposition - certain spokesmen of it - to meddle and create what is in effect a witch hunt, is to be resisted by any responsible government.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I have been in this house for 12 years, and never have I heard anybody get up and speak so ridiculous as the gentleman has before me, the Attorney-General. He's been in this House exactly 11 months. I have sat both on the government side and the opposition and I have heard many questions asked by the New Democratic Party in the past and I had hoped always that the cabinet ministers who were in front of me answered them, and I know they did to the best of their ability, but at no time did they lecture us on the number of questions that were asked by the opposition or the quality of the questions, and I think it's about time, Sir, that you as Speaker, you are the one that decides on these questions; you are the one who is going to stand up and say these questions are legal or not legal; and it's not for the Attorney-General to stand up and lecture us here this afternoon like he has presently done. He is a new man and he's got a lot to learn, a lot to learn in democracy in a Parliament, and I hope that in the next month or two before he leaves this House forever that he will have learned a lot more.

And I'm telling you right now, Sir, that if you're going to be a parliamentarian that you've got to give and take, and it's about time that some of you -- I realize the honourable member here, I know what he's talking about this afternoon, we lecture back and forth, we have a lot of fun in this House and it's got to be that way. Surely, surely, Sir, that you can overlook some of the things. Maybe you don't think these questions are important; maybe you think we are wasting the time; maybe you think we're not important here; maybe you think we should go back to the farm; but I'm telling you that we are elected by the people to be representatives in this Chamber and we are important and we are going to be heard and we are going to be heard for a long while from now on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources -- (Interjection) -- (Stand.)

Order for Return, the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to review this Order for Return and it is acceptable to us.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: In view of the absence of the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge,

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . . I will allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable the House Leader is absent on government business at the present moment. It is my impression that there was agreement that we would go to the second reading of Private Bills. I wonder if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, may we do so or may we have leave if it hasn't already been done, to go to the Private Bills on Page 10 of the Order Paper.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Whip I have no knowledge of this, but I don't see any objection at this particular time if the House Leader desires that.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): I thought the Honourable Member for Churchill was eager to go on his resolution. I wasn't consulted on this matter and I had no idea that the government was intending to go to second readings.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, my honourable friend has the recourse . . .

MR. FROESE: I think the Honourable Member for Churchill is eager to go on his resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Well if my honourable friend is rejecting leave that's quite all right with me, Mr. Speaker, I just rose to ask that question, that was my understanding in order to process the bills, but if leave isn't given, then of course, Mr. Speaker, we have no alternative but to go to the Order Paper.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Private Bills are that contentious that they would take that much time.

MR. PAULLEY: It does require leave though to change the Order Paper.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: We're prepared to give leave.

MR. FROESE: I'm prepared to give leave if everyone else is prepared to go along.

MR. PAULLEY: Well that's fine, Mr. Speaker. Then can we proceed then with Bill No. 36.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the indulgence of the House to have this Bill stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 45. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN presented Bill No. 45, An Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, this bill I think is one that has considerable interest to the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg, and particularly those people who live in what might be described as the north or northwest section of the Metropolitan area. In the past there was a number of hospitals located in this section of the city, and I mention in particular Children's Hospital which was located on Redwood Avenue near the Redwood Bridge, which has since moved from the area; and St. Josephs which was located on Salter Street, which is now I believe a senior citizens home or nursing home. At one time north Winnipeg was served by two hospitals, and other hospitals which have been located in the more central part of the city have also moved in some cases further south and in some cases further west, so that the needs of the people in this area have not been adequately met.

This bill is really the first in a plan that will eventually see a hospital built that will serve the needs of some 150,000 to 200,000 people in the entire northwest region of the Metropolitan Winnipeg region. The plan, as visualized, would have several stages but would aim for a 250 bed facility to begin with, and it would serve the needs of the City of Winnipeg, the City of West Kildonan, Old Kildonan, and West St. Paul. I think the interesting feature of this bill is that really it's an experiment in inter-municipal co-operation. Also, it will be a publicly owned and operated facility. The Manitoba Hospital Commission has given its full approval to the principle of this bill.

I might just point out in passing that the first chairman of the body that formulated the plan for a Seven Oaks General Hospital was the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, and the present chairman is Mr. Joseph Zuken, Alderman of the City of Winnipeg.

Funds for this new hospital may not be available for three to four years, but this bill really is establishing the legal entity so that the planning and preparation for the new hospital can begin now and it is only later that the actual monies will be acquired and the construction will begin. So I recommend to all members of the House Bill No. 45, An Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I just wanted to have one or two questions on the bill. We know that the province is divided into hospital areas or hospital districts. I'm not sure about the Greater Winnipeg area, is it all one district and is this part of the Greater Winnipeg area, this Seven Oaks Association now? Maybe the honourable member could give some explanation on this, because as was in the past, 20 percent of the cost of the hospital had to be brought up by the local citizens of that particular area. What is the situation here? Are they soliciting funds from the whole of Greater Winnipeg or is this purely a matter of private citizens getting together and trying to set up hospital facilities for that particular area?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer that question. Twenty percent of the funds will come from Metropolitan Winnipeg. I have to leave further refinements to the Honourable Minister, but I did say several times that there was participation from Winnipeg, West Kildonan, Old Kildonan and West St. Paul in the project and it will serve the needs of those areas.

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) presented Bill No. 46, An Act to incorporate Club de Golf St. Malo, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, the Act to incorporate this Club de St. Malo is one with which I have no hesitation to explain because I'm in deep sympathy with, and I hope that the rest of the House will be as well.

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.)

St. Malo is an aggressive community led by young people who are interested in the development of their community with a particular emphasis on the recreational aspect, one that has been noteworthy as a development in that area. It's not only for the sake of St. Malo that these people are petitioning the passing of this Act but rather for the people of Manitoba, and more specifically for the people of Winnipeg who motor down to the resort area of St. Malo on Weekends and enjoy themselves immensely.

I would like at this point, because I have been called upon to explain this bill by the Minister of Highways, that because of the great interest the people of Winnipeg have shown in the resort area of St. Malo that a congestion has occurred on Highway 59 at the entrance of the park, and I certainly hope that he will note at this point that this is an area which must be looked into, and with his co-operation and good graces he will see that an additional lane, a turnoff lane will be provided there for the benefit of the Winnipeggers, the benefit of the people of St. Malo and specifically for the safety value it offers.

Now I have spoken briefly before on the importance of recreation being provided the people of Manitoba and I feel very sincerely that this is one aspect in which we are short-changing ourselves. I was convinced that when I accused the Minister of Cultural Affairs and the Minister of Tourism of being short-changed on the estimates in comparison to the portion given to the other Ministers, that I would get some reaction and hopefully next year that the Minister of Tourism will get a little more in that area.

Now the Act simply asks to incorporate a group of people who wish not to petition the government to install a golf course at St. Malo but rather because they are aggressive organizers and they are enthusiastic about the development of St. Malo, they wish as a private enterprise to plan, to begin, to sketch and to bring a proposal to the attention of potential developers of this golf course at St. Malo. This golf course would be situated in the vicinity close to the present resort that is really being used, probably over-taxed, but however it will be in the vicinity of that area and will attract a number of people who are there for weekends or for vacation during an entire week or more. I'd like to suggest that it will also be of use to the local people, the people of the vicinity, but it will be in competition really with no golf course in the area because the closest would be Steinbach and I'm sure that the clientele would be a different one altogether.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is there discrimination?

MR. GIRARD: I fear answer you, Sir, if only I wouldn't be accused, but I feel that there is absolutely no discrimination. As a matter of fact, they are all very welcome.

Just in closing - just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to throw a bouquet to the former MP from Provencher, the present member for Morris, because the people of St. Malo - and I think it's timely - the people of St. Malo appreciate the fact that the development there occurs and they realize that he is in a large part responsible for it. By passing this Act, Mr. Speaker, we will enhance something that was very worthwhile in the beginning and is much more so now.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? He made reference to the Honourable Minister of Transportation and made a request for a road. If the road is built, will the Honourable Minister of Transportation be given an honorary membership card to accompany that that he now has for the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. GIRARD: I'd be delighted. Mr. Speaker, I will give the Honourable Minister the assurance that I will personally request that an honorary membership be given to that Minister if he does it this year.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's a bribe I think and this is not allowed in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I have a question of the honourable member. I am wondering - perhaps he may have said this in my absence, I was called out - but is this club, is it open to all members of the public, all members of the community of St. Malo?

MR. GIRARD: No, it's open to all the public. I understand it's 100 shares, so that's the limitation.

MR. MACKLING: Well, my question is any member of the public in the community can attend and play golf there on payment of a fee, a green fee, is that it?

MR. GIRARD: Oh, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in with the Member for Emerson in



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . . bringing forth this bill and providing a recreation facility for the constituents of that riding, and I'm sure that quite a number of my constituents on the east side of my constituency will be using the facility. I'm sure that they are great supporters of this project and I certainly want to wish them well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my honourable colleague I think that we want to indicate, I would like to indicate on his behalf that certainly it is my view that this is a most commendable project and I think the Minister of Recreation has indicated to me, at least privately, that this is his view and I think that it should be made part of the record that we warmly encourage the citizens of such communities, as has been indicated by the work of the citizens in St. Malo, to develop in their areas sound recreational programming. I happen to be aware of some of the quickening interest in some recreational activity in parts of rural Manitoba. I'm not altogether unfamiliar with the development in the last decade in rural Manitoba of numbers of excellent golf courses which have brought a new dimension to recreational facilities in the rural part of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Roblin too.

A MEMBER: That's the one that's not on the map.

MR. MACKLING: Well, I don't know which map that is. That may be a former administration's map, but I'm certain that this one would be highlighted significantly on any map, particularly if my honourable colleague the Minister of Transportation has anything to do with the production of the map. But we certainly are interested in the fullest development of the recreational potential of the Province of Manitoba and certainly heartened by the efforts of individual communities who have helped themselves in programs of this nature to enrich the quality of life in rural Manitoba, and we warmly commend the development that is exhibited by the passage -- or the introduction and hopeful passage of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, the eloquent remarks that have been made today, it seems to me -- I realize you'll be calling the question on the second reading, but with the support that's been given to this bill on behalf of my colleague -- I'm sure he's delighted -- possibly you could put the third reading and we'll get the job done with today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, having been the member of the Village of St. Malo for some time and knowing the people on this group that did the organizing and the very tireless effort they put into the job, I think this must have started about three or four years ago. I just wish to let the Honourable Minister, the Attorney-General know that -- I don't know if he was perhaps indicating that this is only for the rich or richer people -- well, this is something that's a little different in the Village of St. Malo. They're all one class, they have none of the lower ones or none of the higher ones, so I think he can rest assured -- and there are a few New Democrats, a few too many perhaps, but they don't really go by politics so much in that village, they like the life they live down there. In fact I can assure the Honourable Minister that the Village of St. Malo is on the map and very much so, not only with the golf course they're going to have now but also as far as the Federal Government is concerned. They have quite an investment in their little resort there and I think most of you from the City of Winnipeg have been down there. I'm sure that if some of us had put the kind of effort into a project as some of the individuals -- and I could name quite a few of them -- I certainly want to join with the others and certainly wish them well.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, Bill No. 11. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, this has been standing while the Member for Riel has been checking it. I was just talking to him earlier and we'll be happy to have the bill passed at this time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas) presented Bill No. 44, An Act respecting The Town of The Pas, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, basically this bill is to extend the town boundaries. It has two purposes. One purpose is to include within the Town of The Pas certain areas that are

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . . being developed and a new subdivision in a certain area that the town hopes to develop in the future. The second part of the bill is to bring together into one piece of legislation various previous pieces of legislation which describe the Town of The Pas so it will be available within one act or one bill. That's basically the purpose of this Act, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this matter stand. I wonder if there is some error on the Order Paper. I don't believe it's been stood before, although it's indicated that it has on the Order Paper. I beg leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, to have this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK presented Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Election Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, this bill itself is self-explanatory. Mr. Speaker, I believe I mentioned at the last session of the Legislature that I would be bringing this bill in if the government didn't do it, and all that I need to say at the present time is what the bill does is remove the 12-month or one year waiting period for any person in Manitoba to be able to exercise his franchise in a provincial election. It's bringing it more in line with the Federal Election Act which does not require any time with the exception that if you are in the constituency at the time that writ is issued, then you can exercise your franchise and you can vote.

So all that the bill is doing in this case is removing the one year waiting period. For the last few elections that I have been involved in, and particularly the constituency of Assiniboia and in the area of west Winnipeg where there are many people coming in from outside of Manitoba, they were greatly concerned and brought it to my attention in no uncertain terms but very strongly. These people say: look, we're making a very large substantial investment in Manitoba by buying a home, we're paying a provincial sales tax, we're paying property tax, we're paying income tax and still we're denied our franchise; we're classed somehow as second-rate citizens by having to wait a full year before we can take an active part and vote in provincial elections. And, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that most members of this House will agree that this is the case. Anyone coming from another province to live in Manitoba, you have to wait a full year, while on the other hand the Federal Act states as long as you're in the constituency at the time that the writ was issued for election you can participate. And that makes real sense to me.

So not only that, Mr. Speaker, these people when they do move in here, they have such-- they're participating in a democratic process. Also, they have made these large investments, they're paying sales tax, income tax and property tax, and I feel they should have the right to vote. But on the other hand, today we're living in a society in Canada where there's a tremendous amount of transfers taking place, there's a tremendous amount of movement of employees and people from province to province, from a corporation to branch offices, and this takes place in any area of the city, and particularly in new areas perhaps this is much more prominent than in some other areas. So all this act does is to remove the one year waiting period. As long as the individual is in the constituency at the date the election was called, he can participate in a democratic process of government and be able to vote.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Flin Flon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In starting this I'd like to go back and review the resolution first of all, because in respect to the fact that the "therefore" asked -- There's something going on here that I don't like, Mr. Speaker, but I guess I can't do a great deal about it. It says: "Therefore Be It Resolved that open negotiations be conducted between the Government of Canada, the Province of Manitoba, Representatives of the North West Territories and the community of Churchill on the advisability of Churchill

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . . peninsula becoming a part of the North West Territories, and Further Be It Resolved that the Government direct the Churchill Local Government Administrator and his Advisory Council to call for an election of such a Committee, at a Public Meeting immediately so that the people of Churchill can be assured of being involved in all the meetings."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in this I would like to make sure that members of this Assembly are aware of actually what it does, and really in my mind it opens the door for participatory democracy for the people of Port of Churchill and it establishes their democratic right to help plan for their own future. Certainly the image of Port Churchill today in western Canadian business and commercial world emphasizes the complete failure of western Canadians to properly assess the true economics of investing in this type of resource. The people of the Port of Churchill have waited for too long for the spring that our Prime Minister recently referred to in his last visit to Churchill. We believe that the resource of Port Churchill is as ripe for the picking today as it ever has been, and we are concerned in that the Federal Government and the Manitoba Government are continuing to procrastinate and play the waiting game. For Port Churchill and the Hudson Bay Route Association, too many springs have come and gone; the winters grow longer and the watered-down programs have the bitterness of yesterday's coffee.

There'll be of course many Manitobans who will fall back on the old argument of the chicken and the egg; others will say we cannot afford to give even a corner of the province away. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in my approach today I will recommend a 1970 philosophy which points out the fact when it says that it was not the apple on the tree that caused all the trouble but rather the pair on the ground, and I think we should draw on a great deal of imagination and inject some positive thinking into the development of the port if it ever is to become more than a small dot on the map.

Let us go back to the pair on the ground. They should represent the irresponsible attitudes of both senior governments. How could this pair do an about-face? I suggest two complementary programs, neither of which will be economically sound without the other: (a) the modern development of the community of Churchill which should be authorized through grants under the Federal \$200 million program for aid to designated undeveloped areas of Canada; and (b) the immediate passing of legislation to incorporate a Port Churchill Authority with its head office in Churchill to develop business, encourage trade and warrant the expenditure of money to carry out the first part of this program. This would be a progressive productive pair for all Manitoba, but let me warn government that it will be of little value to incorporate a Churchill Port Authority unless they are prepared to include a large development fund to expand services, facilities, docking area, freight sheds, ice breakers, modern harbour incentives and other needs of a growing expanding modern harbour with an operational period of at least nine months a year. Most of all, this is not the time to take one step at a time. We're already too far behind in northern Manitoba.

And now I'd like to refer extensively to the State of Maryland. The State of Maryland is a prime example of positive thinking. Maryland has a population of some three to four million people, which is about the size of our three prairie provinces. They incorporated the Maryland Port Authority in 1956 and they had these objectives: First, improvement of the physical port facilities important to maritime commerce of the state; (b) the protection and enhancement of advantages of that particular area; and (c) the development of trade and promotion of maritime business of the area. They also established a Maryland Port Authority Fund which has completed its thirteenth year. Their report states that through the efforts of the Authority, Maryland has continued to hold its position as a modern trade-oriented and progressive state.

In outlining its duties to the citizens of the state, it points out that they have accomplished the following: (a) an improvement of the physical port facilities important to maritime commerce of the state. The port facilities and waterways in Maryland represent the greatest asset of the state. The total net asset value of the state's investment in the port facilities are now some \$48 million. And (b) as construction needs considerable financing, their liabilities increased last year to about \$1,500,000. However, those equity assets less the liabilities representing state ownership increased some \$6 million and now stand at over \$32 million. They point out that the fierce competition of ports brought about by the race for container facilities requires not only sound business judgment but also the need for adequate financing. Striving to keep the State of Maryland container facilities modern and progressive will necessitate

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . a considerable capital outlay. And as we go on, we are going to be talking about a great deal of money, Mr. Speaker. The development of trade through promoting Maritime business in the States has been successfully pursued at a cost of about \$350,000 during the 1969 fiscal year. The benefit from this activity is being felt in every city and county of the State of Maryland.

Their other objectives include considerable non-revenue producing services to the port community such as dredging, surveys, soundings - and Mr. Speaker, I note ice breaking, debris removal, oil spill control and others. And this is at a cost of about a million dollars a year. The report states that the State of Maryland, through its Port Authority, is very much engaged in the great competition with other ports along the East Coast for the lucrative traffic of trade and commerce between the United States and other parts of the world.

It points out that the successful competition in this field of commerce requires a vigorous business-oriented management, constructing and operating the necessary facilities to take advantage of their geographical location. And I think this again is very important, they have taken advantage of their geographical location rather than throwing up their hands. And the benefit. The justification for operation rests on the great benefit the citizens of Maryland derive from the efficient modern and well-known world port, but Manitobans in return have debated for some time the advisability of government lending money to outside interests with little security or no direct return. Here in the Port of Churchill we have renewable and a lasting resource which government could develop with the hope of not only profiting from the indirect return but also the direct returns to the treasury. It would also offer a wide range of jobs for many people. Government would not be intruding or duplicating business already established in the province; government would be creating jobs and not destroying livelihoods as we hear today.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you in your mind to exchange the name of Maryland for Manitoba and the Port of Baltimore for Churchill. Maryland has built Port Baltimore into the sixth largest city in the United States and Manitoba has reduced the Port of Churchill area into a non-identity, that even the Minister of Finance admits that foreign countries know nothing of.

The Hudson Bay Route Association also found that during the great sale - the first great sale of wheat, I might mention - to the Russians, that the Port of Churchill was not considered nor was it ever mentioned to the Russians as a shipping point, and it was only through the Hudson Bay Route Association's insistence that it was used in the future year.

Baltimore's wages per year amount to about \$2,500,000 for the port operation. The port's income amounts to approximately \$50 million per year and last year the import-export volume was approximately \$1,600,000,000. The Maryland Port Authority Fund was authorized in 1958 to spend some \$15 million and they issued \$15 million and redeemed about \$5,486,000. In 1961 they issued \$10 million again and they used it and they redeemed \$445,000. In '67 they issued \$50 million and they have drawn \$4 million and have redeemed nothing in that year, but to date the total that they have funded for the Maryland Port Authority is \$75 million; they have used up to \$29 million now and they have redeemed already \$5,931,000. The Port Authority grant for operations in 1971 will be about \$5,750,000, along with three-quarters of a million interest on the bond, and that is the operating cost.

They have also, and I think it's one of the most important things, set aside allowances to administrate and promote and set up offices in Baltimore, London, Brussels, Tokyo, at a cost of some \$600,000 per year to develop trade and promote Port Baltimore for the State of Maryland and for the United States. These offices, they tell me, are important to cater to the shipper and the buyer, a very important approach which we have ignored for the last forty years.

And what has all this done for Maryland you will ask. It has induced the Bethlehem Steel Inc. to locate in Maryland, representing the largest fully integrated steel industry in the world available to service their customers both overseas and at home, and, Mr. Speaker, you will be interested to note that the iron ore that they use comes from Africa, South America and Labrador. The coal is brought a distance of some 300 miles or more by railroad and the nickel is shipped from Japan and Canada.

Let's compare these tremendous costs of transportation to that of our own resources. We have our own nickel at Lynn Lake and Thompson; the iron ore in almost its pure form from areas within 600 miles of Churchill; coal from either Estevan or Sidney. We have unlimited amounts of Hydro power at Gillam and it could be produced on the Churchill River a couple of

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . . miles away from Churchill. And in grain, Baltimore shipped from 50 to 100 million bushels of grain per year along with 3 to 4 million tons of products to Japan. Last year they imported some 225,000 foreign cars and their prospect this year arise to 250,000. Ten percent of these are from Japan and the rest come from Europe, Great Britain, etc.

I spoke extensively of the Maryland Port Authority to prove that it can be done, and we are blessed with a huge treasure house of raw resource material in northwestern Canada, probably the largest in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, to date, Port Churchill has not participated to any extent in any of the development, and of course they have not profited from these operations in northern Manitoba, and while we have gloried in the magnitude of our resource, we have limited our horizons to that of the collective end of our Manitoba noses. We live poor because we lack the imagination to group together to find ways and means of obtaining the greatest return from the world's richest product. We are sleeping giants who have allowed other countries to grow rich through doing their thing, in buying our raw product and selling them back to us at a thousand percent profit. Our lack of imagination has made us No. 1 on the sucker list in the world's trading market. Shall we continue to debate the wisdom of raising the royalty rate on resources or should we be doing something about using our raw materials to create industry and jobs here in Canada with or without foreign investment. And while I have spoken of Maryland's approach, I point out that we can use our port for many other types of product. We don't necessarily have to follow their industry.

Now let us again return to the apple on the tree and another pair on the ground. I see our pair through the eyes of a critic evaluating Manitoba's industrial and financial contribution towards opening the north. It appears that they would rather fight taxation in a large urban area such as Winnipeg than to send their sons out to expand and use the rest of Manitoba. We need more of the imagination and drive that opened the West.

And how about Winnipeg? Long known as the gateway and distribution centre for Western Canada, it has lost its position because the people are waiting for business to come to Winnipeg. How much has the Winnipeg business man done to promote the Port of Churchill? I would be interested to know what the oldest business in Manitoba has imported through the Port of Churchill in the last 40 years. I am told that while they used the Hudson Bay route a couple of hundred years ago, they have never used it since Churchill was established as a Manitoba seaport. And so it goes down the line with business and government in the world of Manitoba. This indifference has affected our other prairie provinces.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to the last pair, and I have left them until the last because I feel that they are the ones to provide the most productive results. Port Churchill has been kept in a state of incubation too long for the other studies or springs. This time I look north, Mr. Speaker. It appears that in the minds of many, that Churchill's location and environment is more closely associated with the north pole than it is with the 49th and 50th parallel. It is hard to develop any sudden enthusiasm for the introduction of funds to an area so remote from the southern economy and industrial-oriented areas of Manitoba. We have heard the message from the southern Manitobans over and over again. They feel for us but they just can't get around to any real program of an immediate nature as there are too many bridges to build, there are so many urban renewal programs, investments in health, education and agricultural programs, the floods in the spring, are all a high priority program of a highly populated southern part of Manitoba, and we must also admit that never will we be able to populate the north in our lifetime to compete on a representation by population with southern Manitoba.

For logical purposes, productive growth and location, the immediate association of the Port of Churchill with the Keewatin area of the N. W. T. appears to be the practical solution for the Port of Churchill. Many of us feel that if this should take place the apple would become much sweeter, for not only the pair on the ground but for western Canadians generally. The time for such goings-on should be now. Members have some information which I will refer to -- they have not got the information which I can refer to at this time, but there are some other ones which you have received and you will find that in transportation they are reaching right across the Arctic to the last peninsula which separates them with Churchill.

I would point out that many of us can see the growth of Port Churchill closely associated with the \$75 million exploration program this year for the mineral and oil in the North West Territories. Undoubtedly this will prove to be a successful program and will encourage more exploration programs and eventual building and resource production. Port Churchill is only a

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . pipeline away from the tremendous oil reserves of the Western Arctic and Alaska. All of these programs of expansion will require the use of the best of communications and transportation headquarters in the north and Churchill has those facilities. No location in the North West Territories can compete with the Port of Churchill for rail, water and air facilities. We can accommodate any size plane, large railroad yards, and with little capital, the largest of ocean freighters in this natural port.

While it is unfortunate that the industrial development of northern Manitoba has failed to provide any reason for Port Churchill's expansion, we are convinced that the development of the North West Territories can make use of the harbour. Churchill is frantically looking for assurance that they will get a fair share of the action. The Port of Churchill needs the North West Territories and the North West Territories need Port Churchill. However, the unfortunate thing is that North West Territories will go on with or without the Port of Churchill.

And it is only fair to discuss the political background at this time. The North West Territories at present are looking for provincial status, and the people are saying to the Federal Government that they want the communities within the boundaries used as the development centres for the north - the North West Territorial people. This is only logical and good politics on the part of the North West Territories, but we all know what it is doing for Churchill, both from past history and at the present time, and with future withdrawal, in the very near future in fact, everything in the Port of Churchill of any value represents an investment by the Federal Government. This tremendous investment is a sprawling, ill-informed and uncoordinated muddle of brick and mortar waiting for direction and continuity. Many of the administration staff belong to the North West Territories. The Northern Vocational School, a large portion of the patients in the hospital, the Department of Public Works Service Centres, passenger and freight cargo is all northern-oriented.

The hope of developing an Arctic Research Centre and modernizing the town all depend upon federal funds, and Churchill looks with envy at the progress that the northern transportation company has brought to the inland Port of Hay River which has over \$11 million allocated towards the upgrading this year. Churchill - nothing. The Selkirk Steel plant has announced that it is building the largest barge ever produced in Manitoba for the Hay River area and they have other contracts for more in other centres. Your North West Territories pamphlet shows a transportation system that reaches throughout most of the Arctic centres. Churchill of course could provide, along with an association with the northern transportation, the rest of that link as I have already pointed out.

It is no secret today that Edmonton distributes almost 100 percent of the products from the North West Territories. If the Churchill area were a part of the North West Territories, we are convinced that all Manitoba would benefit. It stands to reason that Churchill would use the City of Winnipeg and the CNR to distribute the materials necessary to develop the central and eastern part of the Arctic and help keep the Hudson Bay alive and economically sound. Manitoba's regional air carrier, Transair, would be used more and more to fly freight and passengers north and provide a regular Air service link between more and more points in the Arctic and Winnipeg. Our smaller air carriers in Northern Manitoba would benefit from the flow of materials.

While the boundaries may change in respect to Churchill, the growth of Port Churchill would certainly provide new industry and more revenue for the Province of Manitoba at no cost to Manitoba. Certainly the port must be the focal point around which Churchill will have to build a permanent future. No longer can it hope to cope with expanding costs for shipments of grain only. The direction for the use of Port Churchill must be oriented to those products that will make the port expansion a viable economic identity. If Port Churchill expands, the farmer in western Canada will profit through lower freight and marine rates. Better facilities will command almost year round use of the port, and a busy port is going to build a bigger and better future for not only Churchill but Manitoba and western and northern Canada.

I cannot see Manitoba actually losing a port but rather profiting from a new business. Today, Manitobans tell us that the wishes of the Port of Churchill are too rich for their budget and that Manitoba has no power to persuade the Federal Government to move. Can we conscientiously hold back the expansion of Port Churchill for selfish reasons?

You will ask: What guarantee would Churchill have that it would be better off if it did join the North West Territories? From past performance it appears that the Port of Churchill is guaranteed not to grow. There's only one way to go when you're at the bottom. Churchill's

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . . guarantee is the faith and interest that our Federal Government have placed in the North West Territories. The association of its location dictates sound reasoning, the feeling of the people of the North West Territories, but more than anything there's a closeness both in distance and mutual problems between Churchill and the North West Territories.

The North West Territories have isolated community road programs. There are programs to connect communities with other provincial road programs. There's a Road to Resources program. School children have opportunities to attend the university of their choice in Canada, all expense paid. They have equal assistance for public and private schools. There is no seven percent provincial income tax. There is only one percent corporation tax instead of three percent in this province. There is a \$74 million budget for 32,000 people, of which half are under 21 years of age and half of those are in school. There is no cigarette tax; there is no five percent sales tax. There is a rich, wonderful future in what amounts to one-third of Canada, an area larger than B. C., Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and part of Northern Ontario, and it is said that the North West Territories resources are unexcelled in the world today.

It seems that the North West Territories is the western Canada of yesterday, only it will not be tied to the selfish, narrow-mindedness of the dictatorial eastern financial world that destroys or absorbs any attempt to build a sound western economic base to challenge the monopoly of the eastern golden belt that have had their pound of flesh from any western expansion. And Churchill will not be held back by Manitoba -- only curtain that operates in much the same manner. In fact, lifting the northern curtain for Churchill to enjoy the luxury of joining the North West Territories should assure the Port of Churchill the greatest step forward since the CNR was completed to give Port Churchill its first hope. And practically speaking, Port Churchill is that part of Northern Manitoba that has everything in common with the development of the Arctic and little or nothing in common with Manitoba that lies outside of the Churchill area.

Perhaps at another time I would like to speak on the advantages of Churchill becoming a free city. It has its possibilities. Perhaps the Federal Government should be asked to accept the Port of Churchill as a National Park area if it would overcome the problem of getting federal money.

And finally, one lady's comment was: Why should Churchill want to move to the North West Territories? It's so much colder up there. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is as good a point as any to make in completing the case for the Port of Churchill. I would like at this time to ask the page boys if they'd send round an annual report of the Commissioner of the North West Territories that may assist members to help us. There's one for the Liberal Democrat and there's one for the Leader of the Social Credit Party and the other three parties in the House. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as a northerner, I feel that I would be remiss in my duties if I allowed some of the statements that were made by the Member for Churchill to go unchallenged.

It's the type of resolution that I would expect to emanate from some place in Quebec - Separatist. That's what it is.

I listened to him talk about the North West Territories and you'd swear he was talking about some Utopia. Well, I've been in the North West Territories as I've been in the Yukon and most of this country and I've seen as degrading poverty in the North West Territories as you'll find anywhere in Canada, although I appreciate the fact that the Member for Churchill is in his constituency and it's incumbent upon him to come into the House and complain - and he has legitimate complaints. Churchill has lived, Mr. Speaker, from crisis to crisis for many many years. In fact Churchill is the oldest community in Canada and they have never had it good and never had it easy, and I don't know as you could blame a provincial government, any particular government. When you're that far north, just how much money can you spend? We have difficulty getting people to a place like Thompson and Lynn Lake and they have the highest wages in Manitoba.

It's fine to get up here and say, let's give everything to Churchill - and dammit, I've been fighting for Churchill long before I got into this Legislature and I will continue to fight - but, Mr. Speaker, when I see a middle-class inspired Separatist resolution like this it makes my

(MR. BOROWSKI con t'd.) . . . . blood boil, because who are these people that are talking about Separatism? This certainly isn't the people. It's certainly not the Indians that are living on a garbage dump and have been for years, and the Member for Churchill who used to be in the previous administration bloody well knows it. They have been going there, they are going there and they'll continue to go until something is done, but this type of resolution, Mr. Speaker, isn't going to make the food any more edible on the garbage pile, and that's where a good portion of them live during the course of the day.

We have the Chamber of Commerce, and I'm not bringing them into this because I have a particular bone to pick, but the fact is the Chamber of Commerce had a meeting and they passed a resolution - and I believe this is where the whole thing started - they passed a resolution to ask the Provincial and Federal Government to initiate discussions to separate. It wasn't the people. As a matter of fact, the Chamber of Commerce don't give a damn about the people. We've had these problems for decades and I never heard them talk about the poor people and conditions, the lack of employment and the high food prices, the gas prices, the lack of roads - all of which are correct - I've never heard this said by the Chamber. Suddenly, now that they've been booted in the tail and are feeling the pinch financially, they're starting to make noises.

And who are these people? Anybody who's been up in Churchill knows, some of them will find out that they are frustrated Liberals and Conservatives and they can't stand the idea that they've been kicked out of the North completely. The four Northern constituencies have gone New Democrat and the last one, the biggest one has gone - I shouldn't say "Separatist" -- independent. They don't dare come out and say we want this done or this done as a Liberal or Conservative party, they hide under the cloak of the Chamber of Commerce and they've got the gall - they've got the gall to pretend that they're the spokesmen for the people. I can understand the Member for Churchill, although I disagree completely with what he said, but at least he's the elected representative and he has the right to come in here and make these suggestions, but for the Chamber of Commerce to get on the band wagon, the Chamber band wagon, and pretend they're the spokesmen is an insult of the rest of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I see it's 5:30. I'll continue my remarks some other time.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the Honourable Minister and he'll be able to continue when this matter next appears on the Order Paper.

It is now 5:30. I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.