

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 13, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MATTERS OF URGENCE AND GRIEVANCES

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I find that I must once again rise on the matter of the privileges of the House; and I'm referring to the Orders of the Day of today and of the Votes and Proceedings. The Orders of the Day do not carry the motion that I moved yesterday in this House and the Votes and Proceedings report simply that before routine proceedings I rose on a matter of privilege and stated the matter to be. Mr. Speaker, following the Beauchesne rules, or recommendations, I made a statement of what the matter was, but I also, following on their rule, proposed a specific motion, and Hansard will bear that out, that I moved, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside a specific motion calling for the remedy. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Votes and Proceedings and the Orders of the Day are not in keeping with what the proceedings were yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for bringing that important matter to the attention of the House. I don't have an opinion of it at this time, but I'm sure there's been an oversight in one direction or the other. Dealing with that matter . . .

MR. MOLGAT: You'll take the matter under advisement, is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: Dealing with that matter I've given careful consideration to the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition which was submitted yesterday afternoon at this time and in part referred to the violation of privileges of the House. References to practices and procedures make it quite clear that refusal of the government to submit a report to Parliament cannot be considered, as a matter claimed by the honourable members to effect privileges. The House is referred to May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th edition, Page 379, which lists instances of refusal by the Speaker to give precedence to matters claimed by members to effect their privileges.

The Honourable Leader did not in his motion state that a certain newspaper had received photostatic material at the hand or on the authority of the government. He did not in fact make a direct accusation in the motion referred to. From all this I can only conclude that there does not appear to be a breach of privilege.

Alluding to the second part of the motion pertaining to the immediate tabling of all studies, reports, dealing with the proposed flooding of Southern Indian Lake, reference is made to an Address for Papers in this regard of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie; I need do no more than refer to the House Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Friday, March 21st, when the House decided against the subject in the production of certain papers. To carry the matter a point further, reference must also be made to Resolution 19, submitted by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie on the same subject matter, which was dealt with as indicated in Votes and Proceedings of this House No. 31, dated Friday the 11th, 1969. The ruling of the Chair at that time was not challenged. I'm sorry I cannot accept the motion. The publication of the report which has been a matter constantly referred to in this House is a question for the government, which the government have a responsibility, and for which they are open to possible criticism on the proper occasion; but I cannot accept it as furnishing adequate grounds as a motion under our rules, 24 and 40, respectively.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, am I permitted to say something?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe if it is to my ruling, it is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Well then, Mr. Speaker, I must regretfully challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A COUNTED STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Borowski, Carroll, Cherniack, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Evans, Fox, Graham, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnson, Jorgenson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masnuk, Miller, Paulley, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 39; Nays, 12.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the ruling of the Chair sustained.

Presenting petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: If I may take a moment to introduce our students we have with us today. We have 100 students of Grade 8 standing from the John Pritchard School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kroeker, Mr. Enns and Miss Pauls. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

We also have with us today 60 students of Grade 11 standing from the Shilo Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Misses Simmons and MacDonald. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

We also have 65 students from across the border, Grade 12 standing, from the Cavalier High School in North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lewis. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Service.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, just to keep the records straight, yesterday in closing my estimates, near the end of them we talked about the average length of stay in the hospitals across the country in connection with a question asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The figures I read at that time concerned the average length of stay for newborns across the country. I just want to point out that the average length of stay as recorded in the statistical supplement which was presented to the honourable members early in the House; the average length of stay in Manitoba last year being 9.3 days, the Canadian average from '61 to '66 varies from 10.0 to 10.2, which shows how close these figures are across the country. I just wanted to correct that before the Orders of the Day to keep the records straight.

With respect to another matter which I thought should be brought to the attention of the House is because I have received a telegram from the Honourable Mitchell Sharpe indicating that yesterday at noon a simultaneous announcement was made in Washington and Ottawa concerning the agreement on water quality objectives for the Red River at the International Boundary. I think the House may be aware that Manitoba initiated this study before the International Water Control Commission and the governments of United States and Canada have reached agreement on water quality objectives for the Red River as it crosses the International Border. Members will know that this follows an intensive pollution survey of the river by Red River Pollution Board with members representing the United States, Canada, Minnesota, North Dakota and Manitoba.

The Board reported to the International Joint Commission, an organization set up jointly between Canada and the United States to make recommendations to the two governments with respect to boundary waters, and the two governments have agreed to accept the water quality objectives recommended by the Commission. This report should be a matter of public information and I will look into that and see what may be made available to the members to give them the full story; but I thought in view of this joint announcement and the telegram from the Federal Minister that I should bring it to the attention of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Recreation. The Federal Task Force on Sports presented its report to the House of Commons, I believe, yesterday and many of the proposals in the report I'm sure many members in here would agree with and I wish to congratulate the members of that group. My question to the Minister is, No. 1: Would it be possible for him to secure copies of the report for all the members of the House? and 2: Will he be making any recommendations on the proposals in the report to the Federal Government, as far as Manitoba is concerned?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I haven't any advice that I can offer to the honourable member at the moment, but I'll take the question as notice.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions I would like to direct to the Ministry that involves, as I understand it, three departments of government dealing with the question of Fish Marketing Boards in the province of Manitoba. May I be granted the privilege of saying to the House, Mr. Speaker, in asking these questions I do not want it being construed as opposition insofar as our group is concerned with the establishment of a Fish Marketing Board, that is a fresh water marketing board, covering the three prairie provinces.

My first question would be, I think properly directed to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is he aware of the fact that B. C. Packers Limited of Gimli who are engaged in fish processing has been declared redundant, immediately, with the loss of employment in Gimli of some 25 members of a union, and that at the present time negotiations have not been concluded between B. C. Packers and the Union, the retail-wholesale department store's union.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour) (Flin Flon): I will take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: A subsequent then to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Will he look into the matter insofar as the loss of employment at Gimli is concerned with this decision of the Fish Marketing Board in accordance with the information related to me this noon?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to ascertain the fact of the matter.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . question would be, Mr. Speaker, addressed to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is he aware of the possibility of similar action being taken in declaring Booth Fisheries in Selkirk as being redundant in fish processing which will affect approximately 100 people who belong to the Trade Union that I referred to a moment ago?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party that it serves no purpose to mention individual concerns and the possibility of redundancy. There is no question, and it is clear in the setup and organization of the fish marketing boards that there are redundancies that will be taken care of and that there will be operations in this province that were going to be altered and changed.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Minister has evaded my question. I will discuss the matter further under his estimates. I think that it is important to this House to know what is going on in the question of redundancy - and my chirping little friend I see has started.

I would like now to address a question . . . unfortunately is not here and maybe the First Minister may answer a question or two on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources under whose jurisdiction comes a question of fisheries. Who are the members of the Fresh Fish Marketing Board, is question No. 1; and what are the plans of the board to provide alternative facilities if the likes of B. C. Packers at Gimli and Booth Fisheries at Selkirk are declared redundant; will the Board be requested to conduct negotiations with the Union that have contracts with these two firms?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice on behalf of my colleague.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the meeting of the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee. I'm in a position to advise him and the House today that the Committee will meet at 9:30 on Thursday morning in room 254.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Health answered some questions to finish his estimate. May I remind him though that he was supposed to get some information for me, that is the breakdown of the grants under hospitals from the province. I hope this will be forthcoming.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Education. When he was asked to comment on the unrest and the protest of teachers in regard to proposed legislation from this government, re bargaining, amongst other things, the Minister made the following remark "that the action of the St. Boniface teachers was not entirely unexpected because after all St. Boniface has had a bit of a furore lately." My questions are these Mr. Speaker: What relationship does the Minister think there is between the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . uproar and the protest for proposed legislation and something that is not related to this at all? My second question: Does he think that comments such as this will improve the co-operation between his department, himself and the teachers of the St. Boniface School Unit - School Board.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the honourable member's source but I did not make that remark that he quoted.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister wishes to correct it, I'll quote then from the Tribune of May 12, 1969, "The education minister said Sunday it would be premature to comment on the teachers' action to date. The Minister said the action by the St. Boniface teachers was not entirely unexpected. In St. Boniface they have had a bit of an uproar lately, he said. It's hard to say at this point what will happen" and then the rest of the article. So maybe the Minister will want to make a correction in this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked a question that was taken by the Attorney-General which I would now like to redirect to the Premier. There is supposed to be a provincial-municipal conference regarding taxation that the provincial government is planning. I wonder if the Minister could give us some more information on this, and in particular, as to when he intends to hold this conference.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further that I'd care to add at this time. It will be after the Session has risen, I expect.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the First Minister says he has nothing further to add, are we to take the news reports as being correct or does he care to clarify those reports?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the news reports but certainly I indicated during the throne speech debate - as a matter of fact, I indicated I think as early as last fall, what our thoughts were in this regard and I have no real change to make on those statements at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. I'm happy to hear that the pollution problem is being arrived at to some extent. He did mention a standard of quality had been achieved by the International Joint Commission. My question is, in the last report of the International Commission, it indicated that there was some pollution farther north of the border which was not in keeping with the standards that had been designed by the Commission. Can the Minister inform us a target date when these pollutions will be cleaned up?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe the recommendations setting out the general objectives of water control, pollution and other factors, is in the report of the joint study and I'll see about the availability of that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Several weeks ago I asked a question whether or not there had been a freeze on school building grants and I was assured by the Minister at that time that there was none, and that the application for intent to construct the elementary school at Grandview had been approved. It is now my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there is further procrastination. The people of the area had contemplated that the school would be erected this year and apparently that is not the case now. Would the Minister care to explain why?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting that the school has not been approved?

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that there has been procrastination by the Department of Education which has prohibited the Intermountain School Division to let tenders for the construction of this school.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to remind the honourable members once again that these questions seem to be developing into small scale debates and I wondered if we could keep within the accepted rules of the House and handle this matter. The Minister has the floor if he wishes to reply.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there have been, as I understand it, some negotiations regarding some detailed aspects of the school. I would like the honourable member to define

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . what he means by "procrastination," because this is certainly not the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains - a supplementary question?

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm just not so sure what the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education means by procrastination. The people in that area had contemplated the school would be constructed in the fall of 1970, and we are now just about on the verge of entering the fall of 1969. There is still no school evident and there will not be one unless the tenders are let shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the explanation is given. Shall we move onto the next item? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. When will the Capital Supply estimates be tabled?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance) (Fort Rouge): I imagine it will be within a few days. I have no change to make in the remarks I made when my honourable friend asked me that question last time; that is, shortly after the completion of the current estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of - I believe it's Industry and Commerce. In any event, relating to the Fish Marketing Board. I've just been on the telephone with a wholesaler, fish wholesaler, who complains that he has not had any adequate information or notice regarding his own future, which has already been affected as of the first of this month. I wonder if the Minister could clarify, not only for me, but for others who may be in his position, what opportunities are being made for them to meet with the people involved in the Marketing Board, in order to plan for themselves what their future is. I say that in support of the principle of Fish Marketing Board and lest it suffer because of poor relationship with the people who are personally affected by it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think the question would be more appropriately asked on the discussion of my estimates and I'll answer it on that occasion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Honourable Minister. I must apologize to him, in advance, that I'm not feeling well and I expect not to be here during his estimates. But the answer doesn't have to be given to me, as much as to the people involved, and hopefully it will be done today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is he aware of two advertisements having appeared in the Saturday, May 10th issue of the Winnipeg Free Press by two dry cleaning agencies, apparently independent of each other, Perth's and Quinton's, advertising identical prices for various types of cleaning of garments?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) (The Pas): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the answer.

MR. CARROLL: No.

MR. HANUSCHAK: May I direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. To what extent is it the responsibility of his department insofar as the Combines Investigation Act is concerned, insofar as policing it and enforcing it?

MR. LYON: It's not the responsibility of our department. If my honourable friend has a complaint, he should refer it directly to Ottawa.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs. Would he enquire into the matter on behalf of the consumers of Manitoba?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, the lines of jurisdiction are quite clear here. There is a Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa that have undertaken responsibility for investigations of this kind under The Combines Act. I would suggest that my honourable friend refer it to their local office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. If the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs was aware of a situation which he thought required investigation, would he do something about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I did a little more mining and checking at the Norquay Building this morning and I find that the area in question that the Minister announced an ore find was withdrawn from staking last summer, last December, has been reopened on January 4th, and in view of the fact that the government has made the decision, obviously, to flood the area, why was this area opened up for staking?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can he inform the House if he will be bringing in any amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Board Act?

MR. WITNEY: Yes I will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to file a Return to an Address for Papers No. 41.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. I received a telephone call today from a man who says that he had some X-rays taken from a doctor who had opted out. He was billed \$38.25 which he paid. He applied for a refund from Medicare approximately on the 13th of April; he called their office today and he was told it would take another two to three months before he receives his money. The question is, Mr. Speaker, will it in fact be that much of a delay for people to receive payments back from Medicare when they have paid the doctors for their services, when opted out, and as well are paying their premiums?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker, because the exact time lag between service and payment is something I'd have to check into. I thought that cheques to doctors and clients for services rendered during April would be mailed out about mid-May. This was the plan as I understood it but I'd be happy to check into the question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I want to point out though, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a cheque to a doctor. This is where a private individual goes to a doctor who has opted out, pays the doctor, then goes to get his refund and he's been told two or three months. This man says that he's on very low wages and cannot afford to wait.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has he anything to report on the proposed statue of Louis Riel for the Centennial?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Osborne): No, Mr. Speaker. And while I'm on my feet I would like to reply to a question of the Honourable Member from Elmwood yesterday who inquired as to the number of centennial plates that had been sold. I can tell my honourable friend that I've been advised that 38,000 plates have been distributed to date. And yesterday I said that we were not soliciting, or had not asked municipalities to make any contributions to the Centennial Centre. I wish to advise members of the House that following that suggestion and with the consideration of practises in the past that I would like to suggest to the press that we invite donations through the Centennial Corporation for the Centennial Centre from anyone, municipalities included, who would care to contribute to it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a question to the same minister, who has just invited contributions. Could he tell us then when there will be an announcement on the Riel statue; or is that a dead issue?

MR. BAIZLEY: Don't tempt me. Mr. Speaker, a decision will be made in due course.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wish to tell the Minister that Mr. Steinkopf yesterday suggested that I ask the question of the Minister; he said that he was in complete charge.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll express my appreciation to Mr. Steinkopf for that suggestion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would you like names to replace Mr. Steinkopf now?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend from St. Boniface agree that perhaps the Minister left the question hanging in mid-air?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address a question to the - I believe it's the Honourable First Minister who could answer this. Who is the Member of the Executive

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) Council appointed to administer the Trades Practices Enquiry Act?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Honourable Member of the Executive Council would volunteer the information. Other than that, I'll take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Transportation.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Transportation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and with leave, I should like to inform the Members of the House that Jack Peacock has been appointed Chief Engineer, Highways Branch, Department of Transportation. His position takes the place of the former position of Assistant Deputy Minister. Mr. Peacock has been in the employ of the Province of Manitoba for 21 years and currently holds the position of Director of Operations from which he is being promoted to the position of Chief Engineer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Will the Department make grants under the Centennial program to municipalities regardless whether they are matching them?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, if a municipality has an approved Centennial project they do not have to match the unconditional grants by the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, is the Acting Minister of Mines and Natural Resources going to answer the question I put a few minutes ago?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think this was the same question that you directed to the Minister yesterday regarding the staking, was it not?

MR. BOROWSKI: It's a little different. I didn't have the information yesterday. I've received the information since that the area was open for staking January 4th this year, and in view of the fact that you've made a decision to flood the area why was this allowed open for staking? Why are prospectors allowed to go in there and stake claims? And as a matter of fact, 43 were staked this morning - 43 claims.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, there may be other specific reasons, but I imagine one of them would likely be that since the area will not be flooded for some time to come that it's quite conceivable that exploration and mining work may in fact be done on the property.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's incorrect what the Minister has said. However, I'm not going to argue with him. There's another question I have to ask him. Because of the flooding of South Indian Lake, there's a bridge that they're going to be building — Thompson-Lynn Lake Highway is under construction, they're going to build a bridge across it — as a result of the flooding they are going to have to build a larger and much more expensive bridge. Now in view of this who is going to pay for this bridge?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba.

MR. BOROWSKI: Would you be more specific, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Minister doesn't have to be facetious . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order.

MR. BOROWSKI: They have stated on many occasions that certain things will be paid for by Hydro . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order, order please. It appears to the Chair that the honourable gentleman asked a question and the Honourable the Minister answered the question. I wonder if the matter might not settle there. If the honourable gentleman has a supplementary question, of course, he's at liberty to ask it.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have many questions, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to sit down until I get the answers from the Minister. He has stated time and time again that certain expenditures will be paid for and made by Manitoba Hydro and others will be made by the government, whether it has to do with the Department of Highways, whether it has to do with the Tourist Department or other departments. Now would he indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may before the Orders of the Day direct a question to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . the Honourable the House Leader. I understand he made an announcement as to the committee that will be held to consider Bill 15. My question to my honourable friend would be: Is there to be any publicity as to the fact of the meeting being held at the time in order that representations of people who may be desirous of making representations will be aware of the same?

MR. LYON: There's nothing we can do Mr. Speaker, other than prevail upon the goodwill of the Fourth Estate to publicize it in their usual capable fashion, which I'm sure they'll do.

MR. PAULLEY: I could make a comment about the effectiveness of the Information Department of the Minister in charge, but I won't - who could achieve the same. A second question addressed then to the Honourable House Leader. Will there be available, or will there be put into use for the benefit of the members of the Assembly and others, recording equipment at the hearings in order that we may properly assess representations that are made before the committee on Bill 15?

MR. LYON: It would be presumptuous of me to suggest what the committee would do, although that practice is not a common practice at all; but I would imagine it would be a question for the committee to decide themselves.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question then - I think it's my right. May I remind my honourable friend that without prior consultation with the Committee on Public Utilities that equipment was provided prior to the meeting, or decided prior - (Chirper, quiet) - prior to the meeting of the committee. Is this not so? I can tell my friend that it was so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, further to the questions that have been asked by my Honourable Leader. If the committee is to decide the question would it not save time if somehow the equipment was there, so that if the committee did decide to question it could proceed with transcription equipment available rather than deciding that they want it and then waiting until the time is spent to set it up.

MR. LYON: The Committee has a number of items of business to consider - South Indian Lake Bill is one, the other utility business and so on. I'm sure that the committee can accommodate itself to any reasonable requests and deal with any motions that may be made without infringing upon anybody's rights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday when the Member for Inkster and myself expressed concern about the flooding of certain claims the Minister indicated that there has been no complaints from the companies involved, and since there was none he couldn't see why we should complain . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must insist that the honourable gentleman ask his question. He's now on this subject a third time, which of course is his privilege; but at the same time must he make a preamble in every case? Could he not ask his question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker. within the limits of my limited vocabulary I must do this. I can't just simply say were you drunk last night or were you sober. You have to give some background. So the Minister knows what I'm saying, I want to remind him what he said yesterday. I have been in contact with these companies. They tell me that the reason they have not complained is because Bill 15 has not gone through therefore, it's impossible for them to complain because it's not an accomplished fact. They're waiting for the bill to go through before they put claims against the government.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable member is referring to the announcement of the mine, when this was made several weeks ago I said at the time that the mine in question was not located under any water. If that is a specific enough answer I can assure you that this is the information that is given to me by the head of the mining company involved and he was a bit aghast at what he heard yesterday - because I was talking to him about other matters in his location - he was aghast to have heard what went on in the House yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Transport. Is there any changes in the proposed inner-perimeter beltway? And if there is I wish the Minister would give us that information.

MR. McLEAN: Any changes in which?

MR. PATRICK: The proposed inner-perimeter beltway.

MR. McLEAN: None that I am aware of although that's a matter that's under the

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) jurisdiction of the Council of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg.

MR. PATRICK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would find out and let the House know because most of the money will have to come from the government in this respect. It's a very expensive project and I think members would be interested to know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Attorney-General. Mr. Speaker, this is something new here. I'm debating a motion, and we've already received the Order for Return. So I would like to take this opportunity to say that yesterday was indeed a red letter day and I would like to congratulate the Minister of Health who is, as was stated by members from all sides of the House, is probably the — well there's no question about it, he is the man that's loaded with more work than any one of his colleagues, and he anticipated. This shows the co-operation that you have between the government at times, what you can do with co-operation, the government and the members of the House, members of the Opposition. He didn't — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon? — (Interjection) — Well maybe this is why Joe doesn't want to ask the questions. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should congratulate the Minister. He didn't try to evade the question; he had this Order for Return ready, and as I say, we received it although we're still debating the motion. It is unfortunate though, it would appear that the Minister hasn't too much control or influence with the rest of the members on the front bench because I'm sure that the way he did this, the way he gave us this information, it's obvious that he wants to co-operate and I'm sure that if they would have listened to him the members of the Cabinet would have given us all that we wanted on this Bill 15; it would have been a lot easier to be able to make a decision. So I think that we have an example now of a Minister wanting to co-operate; he didn't wait until the motion was passed; he wanted to co-operate with the House, he anticipated, and he went out and got the information, and he could give us the information, the Order for Return, before we even finished debating the resolution. I think this is terrific. It is unfortunate though that he is not running the show on the other side because I'm sure we wouldn't have had all this trouble on Bill 15 and we'd be very happy now to have all the information in front of us.

I don't know what the mover of this resolution wants to do. Maybe you could help us, you could assist us, Mr. Speaker. Should we proceed with this resolution, to make sure the Minister is not in trouble for giving us this information, or should we just drop the resolution now that we have the required information?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, we could have it withdrawn by permission of the House. I didn't know that the material would be coming forth and if it is agreed with the House I will withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed.) The Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, do I reread the . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Not necessarily.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It's on my desk here.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, not necessarily.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, when I read the Order for Return yesterday I thought the Minister of Finance was about to inform the House that certain information that I asked for was not readily available. Now maybe he did not make that comment but I thought that it was inferred. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House now that the Order for Return is an exact duplicate word for word of an Order for Return put in by the official opposition in Saskatchewan a month or so ago, and as I understand it the Order was accepted and the information tabled later on. A great deal of the content contained in the Throne Speech and a great deal more of the content contained in the Budget Speech dealt with the fact that this government was unable to do much of their program by reason of the fact that the Federal Government had cutback on a lot of their contributions to the Province of Manitoba, and as such that this government had to introduce a policy of restraint both last year and this year, they had cutback substantially on the original budget submitted by several of the Ministers. And so, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . it was because of the reason that I as one member of the House, and I'm sure most members of the House, would like to know the exact figures that we are talking about that has prompted me to put in this Order for Return.

I recall about three weeks ago viewing a "Broadway Beat" program in which the Minister of Finance took part and the Member for Lakeside and the other member, for Inkster I believe -- was it not? -- (Interjection) -- St. John's. And as I recall the program, the Minister of Finance talked on this very subject matter and he used figures at that time to support his stand. And so far as I am concerned, if he uses exactly the same figures as he used on Broadway Beat -- he must have had figures available for him to use on that program -- that if he would support the figures that he used then, by some means that he must have, then I will be quite satisfied. And certainly as regards question No. 2, the government must know the amount of money that they received -- the provincial government -- from the federal government under federal-provincial agreements; they know that. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Minister of Finance will accept the Order for Return and table it as quickly as possible.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I just make the comment to my honourable friend that if he would wait until he is hurt before he yelps it might save time. He will have all the information that I have on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, the other day when I introduced this resolution I ended up my remarks saying that I didn't think the farmers of Manitoba should be left with the proposition that they purchase their hail insurance from the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, as has been suggested on one or two occasions by that honourable member in the last year or two during debates on similar resolutions. I tried to emphasize the need for the government to move into the field completely, the field of crop insurance, and to provide for the farmers of Manitoba a package type of insurance policy whereby they could buy either part of the coverage or all of the coverage that is available; and that the hail section be an optional section and that the farmers have the opportunity of buying any amount of protection on the hail section; namely if they want to buy hail insurance that would cover them to the extent of \$40.00 an acre, that they can do so; or \$30 an acre or \$50 an acre, whatever they may wish within a certain scope, as is now done by the private insurance carriers; and that this section be completely optional so that we don't tie the entire farm population into an insurance program in consideration of the fact that in some areas there is no record of a hail disaster and that there are areas that may not want to participate in that broad a coverage. So for that reason I suggest it must be an optional program.

The importance of my proposal, Mr. Speaker, simply is that we ought to increase the efficiency for the producer and reduce the cost wherever we can. This is the area that we can do something about costs and I simply want to say to the Minister of Agriculture that I would appreciate learning from him just what his views are on this particular subject. He has indicated to the House on a number of occasions in this session that he is fully aware of the income problem, of the farming community in Manitoba and that action must be taken, although he has always pointed his finger in other directions; he has always suggested that Ottawa is ultimately responsible to deal with the problems in agriculture and that his department was really not that involved in dealing with the crisis as we have it today.

I want to point out to the Minister that this is an area of his jurisdiction; this is an area in which he can contribute, as Minister of Agriculture, to the well-being of the farmers of this province, and I -- if you like, Mr. Speaker -- plead with the Minister to give this the kind of consideration that it deserves and hopefully that we will have a unanimous endorsement of this resolution at this session of the Legislature. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: I was going to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the honourable member was closing the debate but I see he's just introduced it, so I, of course, haven't spoken on it.

Mr. Speaker, this is one subject matter on which I speak at every session of the

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . Legislature. I think the first time that I spoke on this particular subject matter was the session at which the Manitoba Crop Insurance program was introduced to the province; and as I recall it, I said at that time that it would never be effective until it did provide hail coverage. I recall on that occasion that the Honourable Member for Hamiota at that time, now deceased, and several other members opposite, who on a part-time basis sell hail insurance, predicted that it would be the end of my business and I'd probably end up in the poor house if they went along with my recommendations. -- (Interjection) -- I would now qualify for a pension. And I still hold the same view. So I'm willing to take the chances on that; in fact, I have continued to say for several years that I will gladly consider the loss of commission on hail insurance my contribution to the cost-price squeeze if I can only convince my honourable friends opposite to endorse this resolution. And that's a lot more than my honourable friends are apparently willing to contribute to alleviate the cost-price squeeze.

Now, this is a very simply worded resolution and straightforward and to the point, because all it asks in the resolution is that two types of contracts be offered to the farmer; one that provides full cover hail as an option with your present contract that is being offered to the farmers; and that so far as hail is concerned that it provide coverage comparable to present private insurers. Now, presently the private insurers have three types of contracts: one that they call full cover; one that's ten percent deductible, and the other one is 25 percent deductible. Quite frankly, in our own office 99.9 percent of the contracts are for full coverage, and that's the kind that we advocate. I must admit that in the Gladstone constituency if we fail to get a crop it's generally because of hail; that is, hail is probably the No. 1 peril in the Gladstone constituency. And I think that applies to about 50 percent of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, you understand Mr. Speaker, that under the present Manitoba Crop Insurance contract that guarantees that you will harvest a specific number of bushels that that kind of a contract is not much good when your crop is hailed out, because in my own area, for instance, in the better parts of our own area, and certainly in your area, Mr. Speaker, where it is not uncommon for the farmers to produce 40 bushels to the acre, and more around the Kendall area, more than that; 40 bushels to the acre in the Swan River Valley is a common ordinary kind of a crop, and yet in that same area under the Manitoba Crop Insurance program, I don't think you can insure for more than 20 bushel to the acre. So that if a hail storm comes along and wipes out half of your crop and you have Manitoba Crop Insurance coverage you won't get a five cent piece from the government, not a nickel; but if you had hail insurance you would -- 40 bushel to the acre, my honourable friend has suggested over there as a maximum -- if you had hail insurance coverage, you would at least collect under the one contract that would probably be more than sufficient revenue to pay the premium on both. And if there's one thing that the farmer does not like - no one else likes it as a matter of fact - is having paid a premium for coverage and then have a loss and find out that you're not covered. Nobody likes that kind of a contract.

Mr. Speaker, it's not a difficult thing to adjust. I fully realize that under the present Manitoba Crop Insurance program that nearly anybody can qualify as an adjuster because it's a simple problem of determining the amount of bushels that you actually got in your granary. So that's pretty simple. Now under the crop insurance program, of course, it is a little more difficult to assess the loss, but it is not that all-fired difficult or I wouldn't have been able to do it for 14 years. So Mr. Speaker, I can see no problem at all in the government implementing the program that is called for in this resolution and I look forward to the Minister of Agriculture getting up and informing the House that he thinks it's a good resolution and that he intends to implement what is recommended therein.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture) (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I have but a few thoughts to share with the members of the House on this particular matter. First of all, I think that there's one very appealing feature in the body of the resolution that I like and I'm sure that all my colleagues in this House also appreciate, and that is that when a conference is being contemplated

(MR. STEEN cont'd) . . . by any such a resolution as this or by the government, on any matter whatsoever, all the members of the Legislature should be invited, especially when that conference is usually of a public nature and dealing with matters or bodies outside of the government itself. In the past the government has extended similar invitations, I believe, to all members of the House to various conferences they've had, and I think particularly the conference that the then Minister of Labour convened a year or two ago on the question of efficiency in management and labour relations. But I think this is a good rule of thumb for the government to follow on all occasions and I wish that the Public Utilities in this province, like the Hydro and the Telephones, would also consider this a good rule to follow and extend a similar invitation to all members of the House when they have further public gatherings, at which the business of the people of the province will be under discussion.

The preamble to the resolution includes a few thoughts and it says: Whereas the Manitoba government at federal-provincial conferences has taken the position that the provincial government has insufficient taxing powers relative to its responsibilities. I think this is a position that has been taken by every provincial government, certainly in the period of time that I have followed the activities of politics in this country, and probably all during the career of the Member from Lakeside, which as most people know, spans nearly half a century. But it's certainly never truer than it is at present that provincial governments have very little elbow room to carry on the responsibilities that they were assigned in the British North America Act. Because at the time of the growing up of the BNA Act various matters that were assigned to provincial responsibilities were not that important at that time and had not assumed the importance that they have today; whereas I think you would say that more than 70 percent of the budget of this government goes to three particular sources - I mean education, health and welfare - and these were matters, or at least education and welfare, which were not given extremely great weight at the time of the constitution of our country. Education has always been considered the major responsibility of provinces, and provincial governments, has always been treated as so, and in many occasions in the past has been considered the only responsibility of provincial governments by those who did not know better.

But there is one factor that is mentioned in the second part of the preamble that I can't agree with and I can't disagree with; and that is to say that it is even more correct to say that municipalities in Manitoba have even less elbow room in taxation, being limited to property and business taxes. There's a lot of truth in that. I'm not going to try and estimate and judge and calculate the exact amount of elbow room that municipalities have as compared to provincial governments; but I would leave one particular thought with the members of the House: municipalities are entirely the creatures of provincial governments. If there were no municipalities the provincial government would be executing the exact responsibilities that are now executed by municipalities, be they cities or villages or towns or rural municipalities or what the governments themselves have created in the absence of organized municipalities, and that is either direct unorganized territory government or local government districts.

So when the government of this province, or any other province, sits down at the same table with their colleagues from across the country in the other nine provinces and from their counterparts in the federal government to discuss matters of fiscal arrangements between them, the province and the provincial delegation and the leader of that delegation is talking not only for his government and for the responsibilities that his government has seen fit to accept, but also responsibilities that that government has in effect assigned to the municipalities through the various municipal legislation that is on the books of all provinces. So really when a province, as I would see it, sits down at the federal table to discuss with their counterparts, they are talking not only for provincial responsibilities but those provincial responsibilities naturally include all the municipal responsibilities; so it's one and the same.

Now I think that the main factor that we must realize is that the previous Prime Minister, Lester Pearson, and his successor have initiated and carried on discussions with the provinces on formulating or revising the Constitution which has served this country so well for the last century; but moving it up to 100 years from before, moving it up to more current times. But I think that the point that was made by the First Minister of this province and the delegation that he headed to the conference in February - which I admit I didn't follow on the television because I was out of the country at the time - but the point that they made was you cannot discuss any part of the constitution without discussing the whole, without discussing the very fundamental point, who taxes for what, and who is responsible for paying for what. I think before we ever get down to what is the difference between the provinces and the municipalities in respect of

(MR. STEEN cont'd) . . . taxation powers and responsibilities, we've got to solve the larger problem between the provinces on one hand and the federal government on the other hand.

I cannot support as it stands right now the resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition because I think it is somewhat presumptive of the results that we are all anticipating from the complicated and lengthy constitutional discussions which are taking place between this government, other provincial governments and the government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate the other day in order to make a few comments on Resolution No. 20. It's an interesting resolution and I feel the resolution has merit, although I question some of the conclusions arrived at in the resolved part. It starts off with a deep feeling of resentment among northern people because of not returning to the north a reasonable share of the wealth produced. I haven't been up to the northern part of the province sufficiently enough to learn of this resentment because I am not aware, of the people that I have been associating with, that there is such deep resentment.

The first Whereas, too, the way I read it, leaves an implication as though the minerals belong to the people of the north, and I for one, do not concur in that. The minerals are owned by the Crown and all the people of Manitoba should share in the wealth of these minerals; and as a result of the development of those minerals I feel that we should have a much greater production and much more development taking place in the north so that the people would benefit and then make it in such a way so that the people of the province would get a benefit out of the development.

The other Whereases that are contained in the resolution - I think the second one is a good one, that the residents are justly resentful over having to pay more for transportation. We know that transportation if they do want to communicate is naturally higher, but because they are in greater isolation they probably do much less travelling than the people in southern Manitoba, and that therefore the expenditures in total might not be any more than the people in the south or probably much less, because some of these communities do not have access to the south by way of motoring and so on.

The other items in that same Whereas, such as food, clothing and fuel - no doubt these have to be imported in many cases and the freight item will be added on, so that the costs no doubt are higher for the people living in the north. And, too, because of the longer and more severe winter up in the northern part of the province, they will require more fuel for heating purposes; they will require better and warmer clothing during the harsh winters that we experience in Manitoba, and especially so in the northern part of the province.

Then the next Whereas deals with the threshold of a great northern development - that they feel more permanent staff or residents will be required to live up in the northern part of the province. No doubt if we have expansion this is certainly a must and we will require these people up in the north, and I certainly have no quarrel with that at all. The matter of electricity, I think this is completely in the hands of the provincial government at the present time and this can be corrected right here in this house. I, for one, would certainly not object if the rates were lowered. I know from previous committee meetings of the Utilities Committee that we have had that this matter was fully discussed and that these people were paying more for power than we are in southern Manitoba; and I for one certainly would not object to giving these people in the northern part of the province the same rates.

However, when he comes to the Resolve part, it is mentioned here that consideration should be given to a special income tax credit for residents of northern Manitoba. I am not so sure that I would be for this, because once we start to give special concessions to certain groups, we are creating divisions; and when he's speaking of resentment here, I think we would just be furthering resentment rather than eliminating resentment in this province. I don't feel that that is the answer. I feel that the answer is in higher wages for these people. I understand from the Member for Churchill and others from the northern part of the province, and also from reports that we have, that this is the case; that higher wages are being paid in northern Manitoba. I think if there is still an inequity here, that to correct the situation, I feel that the wages should be raised in the northern part and do it this way. I think it would be

(MR. FROESE cont'd) much better that way, much less troublesome and much easier to correct. It's by far the simplest way of dealing with the case. Then because they are living more in isolation, probably these people do save more than the people in the south, because we are apt to spend it here. Many people in southern Manitoba spend their money going up north on vacations and so on.

The matter of establishing a Ministry of Northern Affairs - I would have no particular objection. I don't know whether I'm so strong for it. Again I point out that we are just creating divisions when we start dealing with matters of this kind in this way; and as I have already mentioned, I think the matter can be corrected in a much simpler way. I feel that a special income tax credit is unwise and would create further division. The other matter of equitable return of tax monies and royalties by way of a speed up in road construction. Again you're doing the same thing. I don't know how you can speed up road construction just by more equitable tax return. I believe fully in the Further Resolved part where he goes on to speak of the Roads to Resources. I feel this was a good program and this is what we should certainly ask the Federal Government to reinstate and give support to that part of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, or Deputy Speaker, and the Chair, I do not agree with the conclusions reached in the first Resolve; I'm all in favour of the second Resolve. I feel that certainly I'm all for development in Northern Manitoba; that the people should get proper recompense for their work, and we know that the expenses are higher in connection with certain matters such as food, clothing and fuel, that they should have their just reward for their labour and that this matter could be corrected in this way.

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

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism that the debate be adjourned.

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

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is a very important one. I have to commend my honourable friend the Member for Turtle Mountain for bringing the subject matter to the fore. I think it's something that we are all concerned about and all of us, at least on the opposition side of the House, as I can recall, have introduced resolutions on questions of assessment over the years. Hopefully, we are getting through to some of our members to my left. The Minister made an announcement sometime during the session that he was prepared to consider changes, although he didn't elaborate beyond that point. But hopefully, Mr. Speaker, the government is going to take a serious look at this particular problem and come up with some kind of a solution.

I find that although I agree with the Member for Turtle Mountain that the problem is serious, it does not necessarily follow that he is quite right in everything that he has stated in his resolution, because Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of interpretation. I think that if one spoke to ten or twenty different people, and asked them whether they could define productivity, you might come up with a dozen different answers, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that this resolution in effect will solve the problem, although I appreciate the intent behind the resolution. I'm not critical of my honourable friend the Member for Turtle Mountain, I'm just pointing out that there can be many interpretations placed on the word "productivity".

Within the Resolution there is mention made of the fact that market prices are the criteria of the assessors and that this is not productivity. You may talk to some people and they will say that market price is productivity: that productivity is defined as being the value that can be extracted from a piece of property, but that that piece of property may have an apartment block built on it, or it may have a recreational facility built on it or that it may be used for agricultural purposes, but that the market value quite often is based on productivity to that extent of the argument. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is a shade of grey and that if we look at the Resolve part of this motion - and I want to read it into the record. The resolve part suggests as follows: "Therefore Be It Resolved that the basis of agricultural assessment be productivity rather than market value of land". Now in this connection, Mr. Speaker, if the motion or the Resolve part of this motion stated that the assessment be based on productivity of the soil, as it relates to agricultural lands, then I could see a very definite definition of the word "productivity", because

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . if you say of the soil, you would, I assume, interpret that to mean the amount of production from an acre of land of any type of agricultural produce; but when you simply leave the word "productivity" without qualification, I think we're in a dilemma Mr. Speaker, and that even if we adopted this resolution we may not really change the basis of assessment. My concern is that there must be a change in the basis of assessment and I'm fearful in adopting this kind of a proposal that we are skirting the issue, we are not really going to do anything to make a major adjustment in the system of assessment of real property in Manitoba.

So I hope the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne bears with me, when I suggest that it is pretty difficult to define productivity and - (did I say Turtle Mountain? Oh I'm sorry - the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain) - I hope that he bears with me that I'm not critical of his resolution. I know that his intention is good but that in it I don't see the answer, that his resolution can be misinterpreted by the assessors, by any number of people in trying to implement this kind of a system of assessment and that we will end up back into the same situation that we are trying to escape from through this resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the Resolution be amended by deleting all words following the word "and" in the second paragraph and substituting the following: "WHEREAS there is a great deal of disagreement on the method of assessment of real property in Manitoba, Therefore Be it Resolved that the government consider the advisability of referring for study, an equitable system of assessment of real property, to a tax structure committee composed of representatives of the Legislature and of Municipal governments."

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): . . . read the motion, I wonder if we could have a clarification from the honourable member. Do you mean, delete everything after the second paragraph of the preamble?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my comments on this resolution will be brief, not that I do not consider it important, but because it has already had a considerable amount of debate from this side of the House this year, and considerable debate last year when it was introduced.

I must say though, Mr. Speaker, that I was most surprised that the government appears not to be interested in the resolution, because not a single government member has spoken on this resolution. The Minister originally adjourned it and subsequently did not speak and lost his right to speak by allowing it to stand twice, and it has not since that time been taken up by any other member on the government side. On Friday last, when it virtually came to a vote, had I not arisen at that time, in fact you had already obtained part of the voice vote, Mr. Speaker, when I actually proceeded with the adjournment. It seems to me most surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the government does not either indicate its position, that it will be supporting the resolution - which I think is a sensible position to take, although they have in the past opposed it - or if they are going to persist in opposing it as they have in the past, at least give the House the benefit of their reasons for opposing it.

When you look at the committees that presently exist in this House, the list of committees being the Privileges and Elections, the Public Accounts, the Public Utilities and Natural Resources, Agriculture, Municipal Affairs, Law Amendments, Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library, Industrial Relations and Statutory Regulations and Orders, some of these committees rarely, if ever, sit. Now they may still have a good reason for existing, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not necessarily suggesting we should remove any of them; but when you look at the estimates of expenditure of the Province of Manitoba and you see that in the coming year the government is proposing, out of a total expenditure of \$377 million, \$149 1/2 million of that total is for Youth and Education, a total of \$377 and virtually \$150 million on Youth and Education, I think it is clear that from a pure expenditure standpoint the purpose of a Committee on Education is self-evident. When you consider as well that the government is saying to us constantly that this is an area which has their priority, then I think that once again there is every reason to have a standing committee of this House on Education.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

Now this committee would permit people on the outside to appear before us and give us their views on education matters. In the course of the past few days, I'm sure that all of the members of the House have received a large number of letters on education matters, ever since the government has given some indication that they may be moving in the direction of regional bargaining and the control of school budgets and so on. My office has been deluged by letters indicating, on the part of school trustees on the one side and school teachers on the other, a very keen interest on the decisions to be taken by this House and its desire to be heard. And I think this is all to the good, Mr. Speaker, because if there's one thing that we need in our present day society it is a greater involvement of people in the political process, and so by having a standing committee of the House dealing with what the government states is its top priority, dealing with the one area of government where we are spending the largest amount of money, I think is an eminently intelligent and useful proposition. I know the government in the past has opposed it. I would hope that they've changed their minds since that time, Mr. Speaker, because I think that this type of a committee can perform a very useful function in giving us an annual review of education in the Province of Manitoba.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and I am no specialist in education by any means, I was only a recipient of the education process, I was never one who participated in the giving out of education, but I must say that being a recipient of it I wasn't always happy with the system, and when I see my children presently in the system I'm still unhappy with the system. It seems to me there's something basically wrong with a system that takes in children at ages five and six and seven, full of enthusiasm and desire to go to school - and I don't know one yet, one family or one parent who can't say that the year before the kids were ready for school they were begging to go to school - and within three years we've transformed them into little people who hate to go to school. Now something's wrong with the kind of an education process that does this. Something's wrong when we have young people full of enthusiasm and somehow or other we lose that enthusiasm. It's either not channeled in the right way or the system is improperly set up. I don't know what the answer is and I don't claim to know what the answer is. But there must be an answer to it. When we see, for example last Sunday, young people prepared to go out on a very hard physical test but doing it willingly with no compulsion of any kind, we know that the enthusiasm is there even in the later years, but the system seems to fail to channel it.

Now wouldn't a Committee of the House, where we would have an opportunity of getting people with some different and new ideas coming before us and telling us how they think we ought to spend the 149 million that we're passing. I think the people could give us a great deal of valuable information. I think it would be an opportunity for some of those who have new ideas in education to come forward and be heard in a public forum where their voice can lead to improvement, and they can do it before a group of men and women who have to make the final decision as to the amount of money to be spent.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the government not to take a closed position on this, and because they've voted against it in the past, not to simply say: Ah, it's an opposition resolution, let's vote against it, or let's wait for two years and we'll bring it in ourselves, or let's wait for eight years, as in the case of the ombudsman and the auditor-general, we'll bring it in after voting against it for eight years. Let's forget about that. The resolution I think has a practical purpose to it. It deals, as I have said, with the most important area that we deal with in this House in terms of dollars; it deals with the future of our country. Because I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that in today's society, as we're becoming ever more industrialized, the future of the nation will depend on the quality of its education. It's true that we're fortunate in this country to have tremendous natural resources, but those natural resources will never be exploited without an educated citizenry, and even without natural resources nations can be strong and prosperous with an educated and trained body of people within those nations. One need only look at some of the other nations in the world, such as Switzerland, having no natural resources like ours and yet having developed a successful and very mature society.

Now this is the future of our nation, the development of an educated body of people in Canada, and so I appeal to the government not to take a closed eye on this, to forget the way they voted in the past and support a resolution which will be for the improvement of education in Manitoba.

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

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Inkster. We're dealing with Resolution 25 on Page 4.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was holding this resolution for my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone who doesn't appear to be here now, and maybe one of -- I don't think I can hold it again, but if one of the members of his group stands up and adjourns it then it will still be held. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, if he's ready to speak today perhaps I could occupy the floor until they get him into the Chamber. The member was ready to close debate when I took the floor on this resolution and I merely adjourned it at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Inkster is not at a loss for words today.

MR. GREEN: It merely proves the point, Mr. Speaker, that when I have something to say I'm able to say it, but at this point and on this particular resolution I just have nothing to say, so perhaps one of the honourable members of his Party would -- oh, here he is now. Here he is now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Honourable Member for Gladstone has the floor. -- (Interjection) -- I just want to make positively sure.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words in support of the resolution. The Resolved part reads that this House urge the government to consider the advisability of extending this policy to these multi-purpose granaries which were expressly built for the present grain crisis. Mr. Speaker, we all know the situation as it is today, that storage space is at a premium and that granaries are still plugged, and as has been pointed out on previous occasions, that within a few months a new crop will be in and that further storage facilities will be required. With the farmers' cash income being at a very low ebb, certainly this resolution is quite in order, and I feel that we should go much further than what is being asked for in this resolution and I have on repeated occasions mentioned my proposition - I don't want to go into it in detail again - but I know that this program is worthy and that we should support it and that it should be extended.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should thank you and certain members of the House for giving me the opportunity to close the debate this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I received two letters, and at the moment I can't find either one of them, but I can tell you the content of them. One of them was from Arden, Manitoba, from one of the best farmers in the Gladstone constituency, and he pointed up in this letter that he had not sold any grain since July, 1968, that presently there was a drastic shortage of boxcars - and I think he said that there had not been a boxcar allotted to Arden since March of this year - and as expressed by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, he is wondering now what he should sow. His granaries are filled and overflowing, and he is only one of thousands and thousands of farmers in this same plight. The other letter was from a farmer in the Plumas area, and again a very very exceptionally good farmer who finds himself in exactly the same position.

Now there is no question about it; the farmer does need additional storage space. This has been pointed up by every member that has spoken on this particular debate. The farmers by and large do not like to be told that in order to obtain the rebate that they must build a portable granary. I think that this is absolutely ridiculous, that you can, according to regulations under the Sales Tax Act or Revenue Tax Act or Education Tax Act or call it what you like, you can obtain the sales tax rebate if you build ten portable granaries. That's permissible; but if you build a quonset type granary that will hold exactly the same number of bushels of grain as the ten portable granaries then you don't qualify for a tax rebate. In the eyes of the farmers this makes no sense at all and it certainly makes no sense to myself.

Furthermore, if the seriousness of the grain situation is only temporary - and we surely hope that it is a temporary situation - then why should a farmer be obligated to build ten portable

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . granaries that can only serve as granaries, when he could in fact build a multi-purpose granary or a building that would serve, after the present crisis is over, as a suitable place to store his valuable machinery. And this is exactly what we are calling for in this resolution.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that a combine in this day and age costs in the neighbourhood of \$15,000.00. That combine is used for probably two weeks out of 52 weeks, and certainly when you have a machine of that value you want to protect it and keep it inside from the elements. If you build a multi-purpose building and store your combine in the one end and fill the rest of it up with grain, you don't qualify for the sales tax. And so I know that the sales tax rebate -- my honourable friend the Minister of Government Services has already indicated that she personally is not interested in small potatoes of this kind, but I know that most of the farmers are not in the financial position that she is and they do appreciate the -- (Interjection) -- Sure.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services)(Cypress): You don't know anything about it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I don't want to get into a debate on Ministers' salaries because we resolved that some months ago.

MRS. FORBES: You couldn't stay on the topic if you tried, so you might as well go on with what you're saying.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well if my honourable friend is interested in receiving some assistance, then all she has to do is vote for the resolution. If she opposes it, then I take it for granted that she is not interested in the content of the resolution at all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think nothing else needs to be said on this particular resolution. It's clearcut and to the point, and I look forward to all members of the House, particularly the Deputy Speaker, voting with us on this particular resolution.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members please. For the benefit of the honourable members that were not in the House during the discussion, we're dealing with Resolution 25, Page 4.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Borowski, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hamschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. LYON: My honourable friend was attempting to rise on a point of order. I believe the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon was called in the vote and he is not present in the House. It was called in error; I don't know whether it was counted.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

. . . . continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, at the present time, with the rapid shift of population towards urban areas, I do believe that this is one of the most important resolutions facing this legislative session. There is need, Mr. Speaker, for a program for a planned and an orderly development of, and provision of, services to the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg, and I do believe that the most effective way of providing for that is, as the resolution suggests, to adopt such measures as are necessary for the establishment of one municipal government responsible for the administration of services in Greater Winnipeg. This, I would suggest if that were done, would eliminate the tax concession wars that we're presently faced with amongst municipalities to attract industry, to attract housing; and it would simplify the dealing with the matter of urban renewal, because after all any problems facing any one municipality within Metropolitan Winnipeg are not unique to it but they are the problems of all municipalities. There are other problems that are common to all municipalities - the problem of transportation, the problem of parking, and the tremendous amount of land in the down town area of the City of Winnipeg that's presently used for single level on ground parking. And this is a problem concerning not only the City of Winnipeg but the surrounding municipalities, because they probably are much greater users of that area and have a greater need for parking facilities down town than a large percentage of the City of Winnipeg residents themselves.

And of course when we talk about urban renewal there is the matter of relocation, because there's no guarantee that any area that presently is residential will remain so. Some of the areas that are now residential may lend themselves more to other purposes, to other functions, and there's the matter of dealing with relocating those people. It's rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, that just browsing through the urban renewal and low income housing magazine which the members received in the mail this morning, which is published I believe by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in one of the articles there they state that forced relocation as encountered in urban renewal can be a difficult and upsetting experience for families and individuals. The way people react to the experience, however, varies a great deal depending on their involvement with the community and the institutions within it, their financial and emotional resources, and the kind of relocation help they receive.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a problem that can be handled by a number of municipalities, even though a corporation may be set up to deal with urban renewal for all municipalities, but after all is said and done you still have to negotiate with each separate municipality. So the time has come when we can no longer avoid this issue. We must come to grips with it, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time to act upon it and pave the way for a one central administration of municipal services in Greater Winnipeg.

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

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that this debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for Lakeside,

WHEREAS tax reform is necessary in Manitoba, and

WHEREAS there is increasing concern over the ever increasing property taxes, and

WHEREAS such taxes do not properly take into account the ability to pay and weigh heaviest on those of low and fixed incomes, and

WHEREAS many other taxes in Manitoba, such as the sales tax on children's clothing, used clothing, soaps and cleaning supplies, are unfair, and

WHEREAS other taxes such as the sales tax on items of production may be detrimental to the development of Manitoba, and

WHEREAS other provinces have instituted thorough reviews of their taxes to ensure that they are fair and equitable,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba establish a Special Committee of this House to study all aspects of taxation in Manitoba, such Committee to be empowered to hear representations from all interested individuals or groups and to call for witnesses.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, this resolution in effect is a companion resolution to Resolution No. 18 asking for a conference between the provincial and the municipal governments in this province. The conference on provincial-municipal, dealing particularly with property taxes, is in my opinion the priority area because it is in the property tax field that there is probably the greatest hardship at the moment, but it is necessary in my view to have a thorough review of the whole taxation structure in Manitoba. One need only look at the various resolutions that appear in the House every year, some calling for a five percent rebate on building supplies, others calling for a five percent removal of the sales tax on children's clothing and on and on, and these are only actually representative of a few of the resolutions that could be introduced. I think what is required really is a thorough review of the whole of the tax structure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're not intending to fool anyone that this is going to mean a reduction in taxes. The only way that you can reduce taxes is either to reduce your expenditures or to find some new sources of revenue, and I have stated many times in this House before that the solution to the tax problem in Manitoba of course is to have major development in Manitoba, and it is only by having great development and more productivity in our province that the individual tax load on each person in Manitoba will be reduced.

Assuming that that part of it is another proposition, within the tax structure that we have, we have an obligation to make sure that it is as fair as we can possibly make it. It appears to me at this time there are a number of areas where our taxes are not fair. Certainly the tax on children's clothing as presently applied, while it's supposed to be helping out in a certain area by not imposing the tax on children, it is really a discrimination at this time because it still imposes a tax on certain children by virtue of the fact that it's based on size alone and not on the purpose for which the clothing will be used. Certainly taxes on basic necessities of life such as cleaning supplies, soaps and so on, are unfair taxes because they are not in any way related to ability to pay. This can go on and on, Mr. Speaker, into any number of areas. We're faced constantly with the problems of having our taxes applied in a way that will not discourage development, because if it does then it's really killing the goose that lays the golden egg. If the tax that we impose is going to retard further development in Manitoba, it simply means that for a temporary tax we are foregoing greater revenues in the future.

And so what is required, Mr. Speaker, is a thorough review of our tax structure in Manitoba. Now this has been done by a number of other provinces, and it's a major undertaking I will admit, but it must be started. This is the report, Mr. Speaker, of the Ontario Committee on Taxation produced in 1967. This was a very thorough study. It went into virtually all of the tax problems in Ontario, including in this case the municipal, and the results of this have meant some substantial changes in the Ontario tax laws. What I am proposing is that a committee of the House be established to do this. I think that a committee could take the preliminary steps at least, get before it some experts and have a complete review. It may turn out that the committee would want to take on some specialized staff. This could conceivably be done by using during the summer period some of our university people who are not then fully employed, but basically the Committee of the House would be in a position to have a look at this at least, get before it representations, and then decide whether specialists would need to be employed or not. But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, is to get this started. As it is now, we go on from year to year and new taxes are being added. There's no real consistent philosophy of taxation, there's no base; we simply apply the tax, see what money we can get out of it.

Now as I said at the outset, I recognize that governments require tax monies in order to operate, but we must see to it, as members of this House, that the taxes are levied in the fairest way possible, that they are not discouraging to development; and I think that this proposal, along with the other resolution calling for a provincial-municipal study by the provincial people and municipal elected men, would be major steps in making sure that we are fair to our people in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for Ethelbert-Plains, that

WHEREAS great problems have arisen in the relationship of Landlords and Tenants making it essential to clarify the rights of the respective parties;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House appoint a Special Committee of the House to review The Landlord and Tenants Act and related problems, and said Committee be instructed to report during this Session.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the problems as between landlords and tenants have been with us for a long time, and of course grow most acute when there is a housing shortage. The problem now is acute and has been acute for the last few years when the housing has not kept up with the requirements of the communities for housing.

There's been a great deal of publicity in connection with the need for proper housing and the resultant need for straightening out problems as between landlords and tenants, and you may recall, Mr. Speaker, that on March 13 - which coincidentally is two months ago today - a question was asked of the government as to what the intention of the government was in relation to the City of Winnipeg's resolution dealing with Landlord and Tenants Act, and the Honourable the Attorney-General informed the House that the matter of the resolution was referred to his department and they are, and I quote, "currently looking at the recommendations". Well, Mr. Speaker, time runs by, and currently looking at the recommendations is just not good enough.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman, but I must remind the House that there are far too many private conversations going on and I wonder if they may not be curbed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And that may be why I foresaw what would happen, and that two months after that question was asked I would be standing here speaking on this motion, just as I would have spoken two months and a day ago before the question was asked, and if you look at the wording of the resolution you can see that, based on this government's history of delay and prognostication, I found it advisable to put into this resolution that the House establish a Committee to review the Act and related problems, and that the committee be instructed to report during this session.

We started this session with a flurry of attacks on the government for its failure to deal with important measures, measures which were assigned to the House over the last few years, measures on which committees were appointed to review and to recommend, and measures which the government by its dilatory methods was able to forestall for no valid reason; no reason dealing with money, no reason dealing with political advantage, no reason dealing with principles, no reason dealing with anything but a general lethargy which seems to pervade the government and each and every one of its members, who are able to sit back and listen to this type of attack that has been taking place all this session and smile, and if not smile, ignore what is being said to it. But, unfortunately, that is the history of the government and one which we must cope with, and our only hope of course is that the public becomes aware of the inaction on the part of the government. Having said certain unkind things about the government, I want to suggest all the same, Mr. Speaker, that this matter merits the support of the majority of the members of this House as a recognition of a great need, a need that is, and should be, felt by all people in our society.

I had a phone call just a few days ago from a woman who was on social welfare, a mother and a daughter who have no other means of support than that of the province, and who in July of 1967, a bare two years ago, obtained an apartment at a sublet at \$60.00 a month. When October came around and the new lease had to be signed - October '67 - the rent was raised to \$65.00. A year later the lease ran out and the rent was raised to \$67.50. Now she discovers that a basement suite, which had been rented at \$67.50 and was vacated in the last month, has been rented at \$88.50, an increase of \$21.00 in rent from the former tenancy to the present. Another suite in that apartment block was raised from \$77.50 to \$92.50 just recently. And there is now an indication to her that there is every likelihood that in October of 1969 her rent, which is currently \$67.50, will be increased to \$88.50, an increase of \$21.00 which is probably 30 percent or thereabouts.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

As your Honour must know, the welfare have a certain formula through which it computes the amount payable. The basic formula is \$65.00 - I assume right now the extra \$2.50 is being paid out of separate earnings by this person who is permitted to earn some money in the month over and above what she receives from the government - but she has been in touch with her case worker who has informed her that this increase, if it came through, would be so high that she would not likely be able to receive support from the government to the extent of the rent that would be demanded, and she has received advice to start house hunting now, that is apartment hunting now, in preparation of the expected increase. This is a woman who is not very well capable of managing her own affairs, who now, if she is prudent, has to start looking for other housing, because if she waits too long she may find that her rent is being raised and she has little choice. So a woman on welfare has fears of action by her landlord which would be adverse to her.

But that need not apply only to a person on welfare, because I have before me a lease, a printed lease - that is a copy of a printed lease - it is signed and therefore I do not propose to file it, but I do propose to read from it as an example of leases that are being offered to prospective apartment dwellers, in this case one who is prepared to pay \$250-odd per month rent in an apartment block that is in one of the better established districts in the City of Winnipeg - a luxury apartment. And I want to read excerpts just to give an example of the type of leases that are being presented to prospective tenants, that they are expected to sign and which they would be reluctant not to sign because they want the accommodation; it is attractive; the rent is right for their pockets. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you live in an apartment and I wonder whether you read your lease, and I invite you to do so and I invite the Honourable Minister of Government Services who is not being allowed to vote on any money by-laws, even though she pays taxes through rent, but who has announced herself to be a tenant, I invite her to read her lease and see whether she can find anything in it that sounds a little out of line.

One of the clauses in this lease reads: "The lessor" - that's the landlord - "shall not be liable for any damage to property or person occasioned by failure to keep the premises in repair; shall not be liable for any damage to property or person done or occasioned by or from falling plaster, smoke, fire, any heating, gas, refrigeration, electrical or water plant service or system, or fire from any electric current or sewage or the bursting or leaking or running over of any cistern, tank, washstand, water closet, waste pipe; nor for damage occasioned to property or person by water, snow or ice being upon or coming through the roofs, skylight, trapdoor, stairways or any part or portion of the building or approaches thereto or otherwise; nor for any other damage to property or person howsoever occasioned; nor for any damages to property or person arising from acts or neglect of the lessor, servants of the lessor or other tenants, etc." A complete clearance in advance for negligence on the part of the lessor, the landlord.

Another clause "that the tenant will not sublet same" - that is the premises - "nor any part thereof, nor assign this lease without in each case the written consent of the lessor first had and obtained" - then I skip a few words, few lines - "and the lessor has and reserves the right to terminate this lease at any time without notice, whenever the lessor believes that the lessee has done or suffered any act which is a breach of any covenant herein contained, and the judgment of the lessor in this respect shall be and is hereby expressly accepted by the lessee as final and conclusive and binding upon the lease."

Mr. Speaker, other than the undertaking by the tenant to pay rent, this lease means nothing at all to the tenant because the landlord can bring into effect this clause and ignore all the rest of the print. All the rest of the print is completely unnecessary because the landlord under this clause can say - I construe the fact that you banged your door a little loudly as being in contravention of the rights of the other tenants' required enjoyment, and since my opinion is final and conclusive and binding upon you, I therefore deem that you have committed a breach of a covenant under this lease and I therefore terminate this lease at any time without notice and get out immediately - which I think is a fairly correct interpretation of the clause I just read.

The lease has other clauses. It says "that the tenant will not decorate walls or woodwork without the consent in writing of the lessor. He will not drive nails, tacks, screws, hooks or pins in any woodwork, hardwood floors or walls of said premises." Oh, here's another one. "He will not keep or allow to be kept within or about the apartment any bird, dog or other

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) "... animal." So even a canary in the premises is sufficient to be a breach under the lease — (Interjection) — that might disqualify the wife of the Minister, not the Minister.

Another clause: "If he shall abandon or leave said premises vacant for two days without the consent of the lessor, the same may be re-let by the lessor for such rent and on such terms as the lessor may see fit, and the lessee then becomes liable to the lessor for any deficiency." So the tenant goes away for two days, then that's sufficient for the landlord to rent the premises out at whatever rent and to whomever the landlord likes, and the tenant is liable for any deficiency in rent.

Another clause — and I'm just pulling these out from the full text — "If the lessee shall not observe, perform and keep all and every of the covenants, provisions, stipulations and conditions herein contained, or if the lessee or any other person shall remove or attempt to remove any goods or chattels from off the said demise premises without the consent in writing of the lessor first had and obtained" — any stick of furniture would be a chattel — "then a sum equivalent to three months rent hereunder shall immediately become due and payable as though due and payable by lapse of time."

Another clause: "It is further agreed between the parties that for the purpose of making any repairs or distress, the lessor may use force and may break open any door or window and enter the demise premises at any time. He may use such force as he may deem necessary for that purpose and for gaining admittance to such premises without being liable to any action in respect thereof or for any loss or damage occasioned thereby, and that he, the lessee, hereby expressly releases the lessor from all actions, proceedings, claims and demands whatsoever for or on account of or in respect of which of any such forcible entry or any loss or damage sustained by him the lessee in connection therewith." So if the lessor decides he wants to paint a wall or repair a plumbing fixture, he may break into the premises, could damage contents, and the lessee has in advance released him for any claim.

Further, "that he and those occupying under him will comply with and conform to all rules or regulations that the lessor may make for the protection of the building or the general welfare and comfort of the occupants thereof. That he will allow the lessor, his agent, janitor or servants, free access to the premises hereby leased for the purpose of examining and exhibiting the same." No reference as to any limitation of when he can come in, just any time.

Further, "that the lessor shall not be liable for the failure to deliver possession of the demise premises other than to the extent of abatement of rent on the rental." In other words, the date of the commencement of the lease is not binding on the lessor who may, for whatever reason, give possession at a later date and all he is liable to do is to give up the rent for that period of time, from the date of commencement until occupancy — give up that much rent.

Another clause: "In the event of the lessee wishing to sublet his apartment, the lessor shall have the sole right of approval or disapproval of the prospective tenant, and upon assignment of lease and acceptance the lessee shall pay to the lessor an assignment fee in the amount of \$10.00." The lessor has exclusive right to decide whether or not another sub-tenant can come in.

Further, "provided the lessee shall not be liable for any injury or damage arising from any cause or from any defect in or accident to any of the heating, gas, refrigeration, electric current or water plant or service in the said suite and building; nor be liable in damages for failure or delay in furnishing gas, electricity, refrigeration, hot and cold water, steam or steam heating or heat to the premises or any part thereof or light or janitor or other service." Further, "He will not be responsible for any inconvenience or loss or damages in respect thereof sustained by the lessee or any person claiming under him."

Finally, here's another clause: "Provided always, and the lessee hereby agrees, that the lessee and his servants shall use the elevator at his or her or their sole risk, and under no circumstances shall the lessor be held responsible for any damage or injury happening to any person whilst using such elevator or being occasioned to any person by such elevator or any of its appurtenances, no matter how such damage or injury may have happened or have been caused and whether through negligence of the servants of the lessor or otherwise."

So this is the type of lease that is being submitted to persons of affluence, persons who aren't concerned about being able to pay rent but still have to consider the type of lease that's being offered to them. I submit, Mr. Speaker — and I'll deal with that a little later as well — that just as no one expects to read all the clauses of an insurance policy when he takes out insurance, so does he not really expect to have to read all the clauses of a printed lease,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) of 3 and 4 pages long of a great deal of print. And knowing that, I think the lessors, the landlords over a long history of time, have taken advantage of the opportunity to insert all sorts of clauses into a lease which really make the lease a completely one-sided affair. So, as I say, I spoke about the person on welfare; I have also spoken about the person who is affluent, and yet subject to strictures placed on that person because of the lack of independence that one has when one finds a shortage of houses.

I'd like to refer to a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press dated January 21, 1969, which refers to a representation made before the committee established by the City of Winnipeg to review the Landlords and Tenants Act, and again I'll just take excerpts from the story. The story starts out quoting this man: "I'm not a lazy man. Please, don't you understand? I want to work but being an Indian doesn't help." He is described as a man of about 40 years old, he and his seven children and wife live in a house that may best be described as unfit for human habitation. The ceiling is falling in and during the summer months the rain comes through. There are no facilities to wash or dry clothes. He hasn't got enough beds so that one of his children has to sleep on the floor which consists of bare boards. The house is infested with bedbugs and mice. "Four of our children have been so badly" - the word is not clear - "that we have taken them to Children's Hospital several times." And he says: "I want to support my family." Wants work. Of course that's not the problem of the landlord, but the person this landlord deals with is the person who says he has three strikes against him. "I am an Indian; I am on welfare and I have a large family. No matter what you say, there is discrimination and I experience it every day. I don't want more money, I want work and I want to live in decent housing." And again I'm not speaking now about the problem, the welfare aspect of it, I'm talking about the kind of housing this person needs and what he can bargain for when he has no bargaining rights at all.

The same committee heard of course other complaints. I quote again from The Free Press clipping: "The troubles and hardships of the little man who is kicked around by landlords and harassed by bailiffs were brought to the doorstep of Winnipeg City Hall Monday night. Delegations were reluctant to come forth and make their plea for fear of reprisals, and only when the news media gave assurance that all names would be withheld did they lose their inhibitions." And they quote: "I'll be kicked out of my home tomorrow if my landlord sees my name in the paper. Then slowly one by one they told their story."

And there are a number of stories and I'm sure we're familiar with them. One refers to a woman who told the committee she was given three days' notice by her landlord when she had a spare heater repaired and tried to deduct the money from the rent. I said "spare heater" I think. I meant "space heater." "I was told by the repairman that the heater could have blown up any moment. The landlord was aware of the problem because he tried to repair it himself and ran out of the house to take cover when the heater got red hot." Now any lawyer would have confirmed the fact that this woman had no right to deduct from her rent the cost of repair of this space heater. But how can you blame a person under these circumstances, in winter months, who knows that the space heater is a danger and knows that she must have it repaired and the landlord does not repair it? She has no choice of course but to do so, and in this case she attempted to deduct the cost from the rent and was given three days' notice.

Another statement about another person who said he had paid \$70.00 for damages when he moved out of a house last year although he had spent more than \$200.00 for improvements on the premises. How come they can do this? "Why isn't the tenant protected?" was his question. Well, Mr. Speaker, this question is being asked and has been asked to such an extent that it's time that we had some concrete method of dealing with it.

We can be grateful to the Legislature and the Government of the Province of Ontario for many reports that have come out of there that are of great value, and one of the recent reports is the "Interim Report on Landlord and Tenant Law Applicable to Residential Tenancies," which was produced by the Ontario Law Reform Commission dated 1968. It's a lengthy report and covers a great deal of the problems and of course I recommend it as important reading to all members of the Legislature.

But I want only to refer to some of the recommendations which appear on Page 75 in the chapter "Summary of Recommendations." The first 74 pages of course deal with problems that are considered in depth by the committee. But on the recommendations - and I won't read all of them - the first one though is that "this interim report deals only with the most urgent problems in the law of landlord and tenant. It should be recognized there is need for further

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.): research and study." And as sure as I'm standing here at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I expect somebody on the government side to say, "Yes, we do have to study it. We'll wait to hear more from what they're doing in Ontario and we'll see what they're doing in British Columbia and we'll wait for reports from other provinces."

I'm quoting from Page 75 of the Interim Report entitled "Summary of Recommendations." I should point out to the honourable member who asked that there are two sections to the booklet, and I'm dealing — 75 of the first section; the second one is appendices. One of the recommendations is that the right to distrain should be abolished. Another recommendation is that it should be unlawful for a landlord to demand or receive a security deposit against damage. However, they do say that the landlord should be entitled to request payment of the last month's rent in advance, but this should be only used as security for payment of rent.

I skip to Recommendation No. 7 dealing with contracting out, and you will recall in the lease of which I've read excerpts that there is a fair amount of contracting out there and releases in advance of any actions for damages. "Every lease should be deemed to contain a provision that leave to assign, sublet or part with possession will not be arbitrarily or unreasonably withheld, that any agreement purporting to waive the requirement should be null and void, that any attempt on the part of the tenant to waive his rights with respect to exemptions for distress and other protective measures under the Landlord and Tenant Act of Ontario should be null and void. And this will have a strong effect in Ontario to prevent abuses by landlords in the leases themselves.

Under 81, there should be an obligation to repair. "The landlord should be under a duty at the beginning of the term to hand over possession of premises in good state of repair and fit for habitation." And I recall a case that took place in the city some years ago where a landlord rented premises to a rooming house operator and the rooming house operator discovered later that the premises were so infested with vermin that he couldn't operate the business, and the Court ruled, correctly in my opinion, that the law was that it was the tenant's lookout, that it was not up to the landlord to have warned the tenant of these vermin. But here is the provision — and this of course, this report deals with residential housing, as a rooming house would be. "The landlord should be under a duty to turn over the premises in good repair. He should be under a duty to maintain the premises in a good state of repair and fit for habitation, subject of course to an obligation on the tenant to repair damage caused by wilful or negligent conduct."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I deal with this matter I don't want for a moment to overlook or to brush aside the fact that there are unreasonable, obnoxious tenants who do damage to premises and who are occasion for great concern to landlords. I am not speaking on their behalf nor do I think anyone would want to speak on their behalf. I am really speaking on behalf of those people who don't have bargaining powers because of the housing shortage and because of the tradition that is drawn up in our law that weights the law in favour of the landlord. I believe that as you impose restrictions and obligations on landlords there must also be proper restrictions and obligations on tenants, but so far the law has looked after the landlords very well and that's why I am pointing out mostly abuses by landlords, but again I want to repeat that there are of course abuses by tenants which must be dealt with and which must be properly put in their perspective and the landlord protected from those abuses.

I go on with the recommendations of the Ontario Law Reform Commission. "Where a tenant abandons the premises, the rule whereby the landlord is not required to mitigate damages should be reversed." So the landlord is required to make his best effort to reduce his own damages so that he has a lesser claim against the tenant for the balance of the term of the lease.

They recommend under 14: "New rules should be enacted to govern the form of notices to quit, the time for giving such notices, the method of calculating time when notice has been given."

I skip to 19 where they deal with a Leasehold Advisory Bureau, and they want that municipalities should be authorized to have a Leasehold Advisory Bureau where people can seek advice as to the nature of their rights and how they might proceed to enforce them. I'm sure the Minister for Consumer Affairs should be very much interested in this and have something with which he could deal and take some pride in what his department can accomplish. "The functions of each Leasehold Advisory Bureau should be the provision of information, conciliation and rent review." But then the commission also deals with rent control, and it says that municipalities should be empowered to appoint Rent Review Officers who should be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) authorized to investigate complaints of unreasonable rent increases, to mediate between the parties and to recommend to the parties what increases in rent, if any, is justifiable in a given situation. "Rent Review Boards should be authorized to re-investigate a case where the Rent Review Officer's recommendations have not been followed or where any party is dissatisfied with the officer's disposition of the case, and after making its investigation the Rent Review Board should send a copy of its finding and its recommendations to all parties." And then, "when a landlord fails to act in accordance with the recommendations, the board should be under a duty to send a copy of its findings and recommendations, together with the landlord's response to them, to the local municipal council and the local council should be empowered to publish the report of the board or take other action as it deems proper." And the final recommendation under rent control: "If these measures do not prove sufficient to control improper increases in rent, the Legislature should consider the introduction of more stringent and compulsory system of control."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not at this stage proposing rent control and the Ontario Law Reform Commission did not propose rent control, but they have proposed review, recommendation, report, publicity attached to those occasions when the recommendation is not accepted and the council or the board deems that there is no good excuse for it, then they say: All right, let's expose the true facts as we see them for public review. And then the commission says if that doesn't work, then the Legislature should consider rent control. And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that at all times when we find social ills we try to cure them by education, by moral suasion, by exposure or threat of exposure, by exposure, and if that doesn't work you have to get down to the responsibility of saying this is an offence against society and therefore controls have to be brought in. Surely they are not to be looked for, but they must be faced as this commission does do so as a final step.

Under Recommendation 22: The Leasehold Advisory Bureau should be given specific responsibility to investigate and report upon cases where landlords are accused of retaliation against tenants who have resorted to their statutory rights.

And this is a summary of a summary. There is more in this report and I do hope that the committee, which no doubt will be set up as a result of the approval of this resolution before you by the majority of the members of this House, that it will study the report in greater detail.

I note the Winnipeg Free Press reported on February 24, 1969, on the editorial page, an article dealing with the Ontario report signed by Harold Greer. He points out that "by refusing to countenance such radical steps as a curb on land speculation or the subsidization of N. H. A. mortgage interest rates, the government forced more and more people away from home ownership and into the rental market. Inevitably the heightened demand for apartments had an inflationary effect on rent." Think of what he would say if he were writing this today in the light of what Mr. Hellyer had to report about his Prime Minister's attitude to the whole problem of housing. Think of what he would have to comment about the attitude of this government which is enthusiastic about the provision of - what is it? - 100 homes this year? — (Interjection) — In two years. I think in any event that they were inviting tenders for 100 home in Metropolitan Winnipeg.

And the article says: "It appears that many landlords have decided to hike rents in advance of the review boards they believe are coming, just as the doctors raised their fees in advance of the government's Medicare program." We commented about that about the Medicare program. One can well comment now about what may happen if this matter is allowed to linger in doubt all along without action on the part of this government, and maybe the Attorney-General, having had this matter under review for over two months, is in a position to say I am bringing in a bill tomorrow - and that'll be fine, but maybe not. He doesn't seem to be jumping to his feet at the moment to say that he is bringing a bill in very soon. Well, we hope to be able to help him along in making a decision.

The letter that I referred to which he has been studying now for some two months is dated March 11, so I guess it's only two months that he's been studying it, or his department has been. It's a letter from the City of Winnipeg and I presume we've all received it, because although I am a former alderman of the city and although I represent a city riding, I'm sure that the city has distributed it amongst other members of this Legislature, reporting on the recommendation of the Urban Renewal and Redevelopment Committee which was adopted by the city council. And they ask - and they represent one-quarter of the people of Manitoba and that should have some impact on the government I should hope - that the government take appropriate

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) action at the current Session of the Legislature to review and amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, I take some pride in the fact that a former leader of this Party was a person who was most active in bringing forward this matter in the City Council. Alderman Lloyd Stinson has indicated his interest, and I'm proud of the fact of course that our former leaders do not fade away but they are still actively engaged in the pursuit of the interests of the people whom the Party represents.

The letter goes on to speak of the Landlord and Tenant Act which should be amended to provide for a Landlord and Tenant Review Board which could be established under the Act, and they point out how it could be made up. That its purpose would be to mediate disputes between landlords and tenants, including complaints relating to responsibility for repairs, damage to premises by tenants, notice to vacate, offsetting repairs against rents, and that the board have some enforcement powers with provision for appeal to the county court in appropriate cases. Notice to vacate should be only for cause, to be specified in the Landlord and Tenant Act. And this is a real departure, cause being an important feature in the termination of a lease, and they give a list such as non payment of rent, damage, tenant causing a health hazard, actual sale of premises or requirement of use by the landlord and others, with a prohibition on retaliation. There should be no distress without court order, that the landlord should be obliged by the Landlord and Tenant Act to maintain the premises in a state fit for habitation, that locks should not be changed except where tenancies have been abandoned, that there should be mitigation of damages by the landlord, and a standard lease form should be authorized.

MR. SPEAKER: If I might interrupt the honourable gentleman, he has exceeded his 40 minutes by a moment or two, but I anticipate he's closing his remarks now.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, well I certainly will close, I was not aware of that. I appreciate it and if you'd just give me a few minutes I will certainly close.

The letter provides for certain privacy of the tenants with rights to the landlord to inspect being only at reasonable times, and again stresses that this board should be a conciliatory board which could mediate and thus help to carry out a more effective and healthy relationship between landlords and tenants which would give to tenants equal bargaining rights in connection with the housing which is such an essential part of our society's - essential part of their living, day to day living, and goodwill and good health and good spirits in being able to live their full lives in the community.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, WHEREAS marketing is the number one problem facing farmers today; and WHEREAS to enable farmers to have adequate control of their product in the market place, it may be necessary to establish producer owned processing plants;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba encourage and give leadership in the establishment of producer owned processing facilities.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the marketing of agricultural products has been one of the most important problems within the industry, and I think I don't have to remind my friends opposite that from the very first time that I was a member in this House that I took a very keen interest in the development of marketing of agricultural products within the Province of Manitoba and indeed beyond. I'm not going to let up that position or that type of pressure because I think that the producers of this province are rapidly losing any, if at all there was any advantage in the market place, and that to recoup if you like, Mr. Speaker, some of the powers which our producers had at one time in the market place, that we should be moving towards some sort of encouragement by way of the government and the Department of Agriculture to assist the producers in setting up marketing facilities which they themselves may own and operate.

Now to go back a few years, Mr. Speaker, we had the Simplot Plant established in

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) Carberry. It's still functioning under the name of Carnation Foods, but just prior to the establishment of this plant, Mr. Speaker, the various producers of the commodities which are processed in that plant wanted to set up a producer owned facility and they were delayed, the government procrastinated on their request, they had made approaches to the Manitoba Development Fund, consideration was long and the answer was not forthcoming until the time of the announcement of the Simplot Company moving into the Carberry area.

At that particular time, the department that was considering this request suggested that they weren't sure that this type of processing plant could be located in an area north of Winnipeg because of the soil conditions, that perhaps the conditions of the soil were such that the product grown would not process in the best form and that they had to await the return of - I think it was a chap by the name of Dr. Ethelbert who was holidaying, or I don't know whether it was holidaying or on a business trip in Europe, that they had to await his return to take a proper soil analysis before they could proceed with the kind of proposal that was being promoted by the people in the community of Selkirk.

Now it seemed to me that it was more than just coincidence that before Dr. Ethelbert arrived on the scene that the announcement of the Carberry plant came about, and that the government did not at all negotiate with the people in the Selkirk community. They led them along the garden path, if you like, Mr. Speaker, and they truly did not indicate to them that they were in the process of negotiating with the Carberry firm at that time, or with the Simplot firm. But I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the arrangements with the Simplot company were not made overnight, that the negotiations must have been taking place for a length of time - I'm sure a year or two - and that truthfully speaking, Mr. Speaker, the government was really playing around with the producers and the business community of the town of Selkirk that wanted to join together. The Chamber of Commerce of the town of Selkirk, with the producers in the area, wanted to join together in the pooling of their financial resources, and through the assistance of the development fund to establish a processing plant to process - and I'm going to say it this time - its potatoes that I'm referring to.

I took a very deep interest at that time, I was one of those that signed a - it wasn't a petition but a proposal - and there was something like \$100,000 pledged by the producers themselves to get the ball rolling on this project and the Chamber of Commerce was going to entice the business community to pledge certain sums of money, but first of all we wanted the encouragement of the government and indeed the Manitoba Development Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I rise at this point to remind the government that that is only one incident; there may have been others. I can see in Manitoba across the province many areas where in new processing facilities are being built, but they are by and large all foreign, in the sense that they are not Manitoba owned companies, and I, Mr. Speaker, feel that this is not a good step, it's not in the best interests of the people of Manitoba and indeed the producers of Manitoba. There is a great deal of room to set up co-operative groups, if you like, or companies oriented within the Province of Manitoba, so that we can become the type of business people in this province that we seem to think that other people are in other areas. I don't think we have to go beyond the borders of this province to find the type of people that we require to run our affairs, to be the managers of these type of companies. I think we have the training. As a matter of fact, a lot of our well trained people, according to the records that we have, Mr. Speaker, have been leaving the province every year because we weren't offering them the kind of opportunity that we should have been and this is why

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the honourable gentleman would hold the balance of his speech for when it appears next. It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.