

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, July 6, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment of the debate in favour of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm just at a loss for the moment. Which debate has been called?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Swan River for adjourning debate this morning. I was detained and I was unable to be present in time for the opening of the House. The motion is the acceptance of the Agricultural Committee's report by the House and I thought I'd mention a few points in connection with the committee's meeting and then also come to some other matters in connection with agriculture itself in this province.

I rather deplored the meeting of the committee the other night. I thought it certainly wasn't conducive to good legislation to have the meeting extended to all hours of the night, and then when members of the House, not necessarily members of the committee, raised points, there were objections raised from time to time and I certainly wanted to take exception at this time as to the proceedings that went on in the committee.

Then too in connection with the matter of agriculture, I feel that the government and the committee should have been charged with work dealing more directly with agriculture and the agricultural situation that we have in Manitoba. I feel that we're sadly lacking in bringing about a better program for the farmers of this province, and I especially want to refer to the matter of the situation in my riding - and I'm sure this must apply to one or the other ridings next to it. This has to do with the compensation of farmers who are in a very difficult situation because of flooding. Some of these were not only flooded once, they were flooded earlier in the spring, and as a result of some rains not too long ago, the farmers are in a very desperate situation.

I received a letter from one of the constituents the other day and I would like to place it on the record because I feel that it shows up just how serious the situation is, in particular with certain farmers, and I'm quoting now: "Enclosed are some pictures taken of our farm-yard during the flood that followed the 6 to 7 inch rainfall we had here in June" - and I have these pictures and I will make them available to honourable members so that they can view them themselves. I'm continuing: "These pictures were taken after the extra culverts had been put in and some of the water run out. We farm 80 acres and all of it was completely under deep water for days. I had already seeded 37 acres of this to registered barley June 8th. Last year I had seeded the same 37 acres to registered barley and the total yield was about \$1,700." That is in money. "The remaining acres were not yet seeded, but the fertilizer had already been spread. Altogether I had bought about 15,000 pounds of fertilizer. All this of course was washed away and the barley rotted in the ground. After it was finally dry enough to work the land again, it was impossible to purchase any seed grain of this kind, so on July 4th I finally seeded it to flax.

"The other 36 acres I usually seeded to mixed grain which I use for feed for the 50-odd pigs I own. Last year this yielded approximately 1,800 bushels. On July 2nd I sowed a mixed grain here, but if the frost comes too soon for it to mature, I don't know what I'll do for feed. The few acres of pasture I have was covered with several feet of water for days, and when the water finally ran off the grass was dry and black. Luckily, we were able to bring our cattle, we own six head, to a neighbor two miles away, as we had a lot of water in the barn and the animals were unable to lie down. The hogs were deep in water and just before the rains came I had two tons of chop delivered. This was totally ruined as the water came into the bin.

"Our basement was flooded and the furnace under water. We had planted a large vegetable garden, a big patch of strawberries and some fruit trees. All of this was completely drowned and there is nothing left at all. For days at a time our whole yard was so deep under water that

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . we filled our boots just by stepping off the porch. We're a family of nine, my wife and I and seven children, and so far we have always managed to make our living without any outside help, but unless we have a long frost-free summer we won't be getting any crops.

"In early spring we were flooded too, not as deep as now, but our farm was completely under water and I asked them to do something about this culvert before it happened again. They said it wasn't about to happen during the summer." This was the Highways Department, because it's a provincial road running past their property. "Well, it did and I pleaded with a man from the Highways Department and others to do something to help the water run off, but they refused, until finally when we had to move the livestock, they came and put in an extra culvert. Don't you think something should be done about this?" And the writer is Mr. Frank Krahn.

This is not - and I'm finished quoting the letter - this is not the only case and the only farmer that is in a serious situation. We have many of them and I feel that I've drawn this to the attention of the Minister before and I want to appeal once again to the government to bring about some program of relief for these people. I know it has been done for other areas in this province and I see no reason why this should not be made available to these particular people.

True, so often it is said that all this is an act of God. Even the unbelievers say so. They might not believe in God, but when a situation like this comes about, they say it was an act of God. It's the third time the owner - I called him by telephone later on - he said it's the third time that his property was flooded this year and this time it was so late in the spring season that, as you've heard from the letter, they're doing their utmost but it looks pretty bad for them to get any crop. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I will. The land is not subject to flooding as such, it is well drained. Once the water comes it drains well, but then too there is a large bridge through which the water comes on to the property. There's only a small culvert going through Highway 201 through which the water leaves the property, and so the water sits there for quite some time and this makes it worse than it normally would be.

The Minister had a question?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the honourable member this question. He indicated that it's his understanding that people in similar circumstances, suffering similar circumstances and damage, were able to take advantage of programs of provincial assistance. I'm wondering if he could explain just a little what cases or circumstances he was thinking of.

MR. FROESE: I was thinking of the matter that was raised earlier this session by the Member for Gladstone, in that area. I understand they were accepted under the relief program, and I feel that cases of this type certainly should warrant acceptance too.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): I wonder if the member would submit to a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. USKIW: Is it not true though that the Gladstone area was affected by river flooding wherein there was a policy dealing with rivers and streams throughout Manitoba?

MR. FROESE: It's a good question because quite a bit of this water is not only local rain water that he had on his property; this was drained off by way of a creek and then ditches, road ditches on to his property, so that it wasn't just local water that contributed to this flooding.

MR. USKIW: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Is the member not aware that there has been a policy for a number of years, and is one, dealing specifically with spring breakup and the flooding that arises from such conditions?

MR. FROESE: Well, I would say that this certainly is part of spring because here we're seeding, and I do hope that -- it's not a different problem because the spring floods is water, it's identical, it's accumulated water the same as this thing is.

MR. USKIW: Can the honourable member then illustrate to the House when such a policy that he is suggesting be followed now, when it was followed in the past with respect to damage from over-abundance of rain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The seconder of the resolution that's before the House at the moment, Mr. Speaker, and the matter of whether we can accept the report of the committee or not, I think it's only fair that I stand in support of the Honourable Member for Rhineland at this time. I wonder how this government or this Minister can solve the problems of this province in agriculture when they call the committee at a quarter

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . . to twelve on a Friday night. I think it's only in fairness to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House - and I'm one of the members of this House who has consistently over this session asked this Minister to call the committee, and I think the record would document itself that I'm one of the real ones that zeroed in on the Minister and asked him to call the committee - so he finally got his courage up, Mr. Speaker, he got his group there and they called it last Friday night at a quarter to twelve. Well, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the House, I ask you, is that fair to the House or is it fair to the farmers of this province for a Minister of Agriculture, who the House had consistently asked day after day after day to call the Committee on Agriculture, he finally calls it at a quarter to twelve on a Friday night - on a Friday night. Are the problems of agriculture in this province, Mr. Speaker, not more serious than those that the Minister recognizes, or the matters that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has brought to your attention today, Mr. Speaker - serious problems? How can the people from the Member for Rhineland's constituency come in and appear before a committee at a quarter to twelve on Friday night?

MR. USKIW: Nonsense.

MR. McKENZIE: No way - no way, Mr. Speaker, and this is the type of Minister of Agriculture we have in this province today, who finally wakes up at a quarter to twelve on a Friday night and says, my gosh, we've got some problems.

MR. USKIW: Nonsense.

MR. McKENZIE: We've got some problems in this province. I say to this Minister, he had the privilege last week, we had the both Ministers from Ottawa right in this city where he lives - Olson and Lang were both here - and there's a thousand questions that the farmers of this . . .

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . province want to ask of that Minister. And what did he ask? He asked nothing. He likely was in Rome again, where he goes on these . . .

MR. USKIW: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. McKENZIE: . . . great juntas, or calls a committee at a quarter to twelve on a Friday night to deal with the serious problems of agriculture in this province. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a fair and a just . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

MR. McKENZIE: . . . Minister of Agriculture and he should be removed.

MR. USKIW: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member made a statement which is untrue. He suggested that the public was asked to make representation around midnight to the Committee on Agriculture. Now I want to inform my honourable friend that the public made representation on bills dealing with my department in the morning of the same day.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . in the debate. I was there in the morning and I submit to you that many of the farmers of this province, the people that are involved in agriculture, were not told, you know, the municipal people were there, but they're not all the people that deal with agriculture in this province.

But I again say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not fair and it's not fair of this government to call a Committee on Agriculture at a quarter to twelve at night, on a Friday night. And I'll give you my reasons, I'll give you many reasons where the problem is serious today. Olson and Lang were both in this province last week, and I ask the Minister today, how many points in this province are going to get a four-bushel quota? How many points in this province are going to be able to deliver their ten-bushel supplement in this province? Do you know? -- (Interjection) -- No, he doesn't know, and the reason he doesn't know is because he called the Committee at twelve o'clock at night. That's the kind of a Minister we have.

I asked him about crop insurance today, what's the problem. He doesn't even know, because the only place he goes is to Rome. He doesn't know the problems of this province. I ask him, go out and circulate yourself around this province and deal with some of the problems of crop insurance today - and you're going to hear more on this later on in our debate today, because the Minister, Mr. Speaker, should be removed as quickly as possible and I ask the First Minister to find ourselves another Minister of Agriculture. I really do.

I asked him about the problems of egg marketing in this province today - egg marketing. Do you know what the price of eggs is in Manitoba today? I should make you go back to your office and take a look. It never was as bad as it is today, Mr. Speaker - never. Well, he says

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . "Oh". Let them have their day over there because they haven't got an agricultural expert. They give the Honourable Member of The Pas the privilege of carrying, you know, the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. What that man knows about farming - my grandchild knows more than he does about agriculture - but nevertheless he's carrying the committee and he brings in a report today. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that I can support this report and I don't think there's any way that our group on this side of the House can support that report because I think it's a farce. I think it's a farce that a Minister of Agriculture would call a Committee on Agriculture at a quarter to twelve at night on a Friday night - on a Friday night. I asked him about the future. What's the future of agriculture in this province under this Minister? Nil. He hasn't been even out to my constituency. How can I tell my farmers that we have a policy, that we have a Minister in fact, because he's never been there. Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is in for some dull days. Manitoba is in problems. I know, they're seriously considering elections today. I can see them smiling there, they're going out to the hustings and they're going to give us all this big malarkey about this new government with all this brand new legislation that they brought into the House and they're going to tell the people of Manitoba. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that any Minister of Agriculture that calls a committee at a quarter to twelve at night is a farce and he should be removed from his seat, and let us get the Member from The Pas who was chairing the committee, now come down and occupy the Minister's seat and maybe we'll get some place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think I should make it very plain to you, Sir, and indeed to the other members of the House, that we intend to speak at some length on this particular subject, because while the Honourable Member for Roblin indicated in a most eloquent and impressive way just how ridiculous the situation is, to treat a serious subject matter such as agriculture, which contrary to the thoughts and views and opinions of most members now forming the government benches . . .

MR. GREEN: I rise on a point of order. I think that the honourable members certainly can have their fun, but the fact is that the Committee on Agriculture is submitting a report on bills which were referred to it. The bills referred are now being reported and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether that opens a discussion on whether the committee is dealing with the whole problem of agriculture, which is what my honourable friends appear to want to deal with.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, if I may. It's what's contained in that report with respect to agriculture and what's not contained within that report with respect to agriculture and what has been promised would be or could be contained in that report to the Committee of Agriculture that concerns us, and that's what we're going to be talking about.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I know that my honourable friends are quite capable of talking about this issue and we've had quite a bit of this during the session and that's to their credit, and I believe that the government has answered to its credit. What we are talking about now is a point of order as to whether a committee report, which deals with Bills referred, opens up a discussion on the entire agricultural problems in the Province of Manitoba and in Canada. I would submit, with greatest respect to my honourable friend, that it doesn't, and even placing the widest interpretation on the debate in this House, that this is a perversion of the debate and it's not to the issue. We are dealing with bills that have been referred such as the Credit Unions Act, the Bee Act, some of the others - I can't remember them. Maybe the honourable members don't want this legislation passed and they of course can deal with that on third reading as they dealt with it on second reading, but I really believe that it is not part of this debate to start opening up the agricultural issue. We're talking about the reporting of bills which were referred. The motion was that the Committee of Agriculture be called to discuss bills that were referred; they've discussed them and they're referring them back.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): On the point of order that has been raised by the House Leader, may I refer you to the number of bills and the name of those bills that were referred to the Committee, and then I ask you, if the discussion that is now being carried on does not relate to those bills that were dealt with by the Agriculture Committee.

The Bee Act - you can talk for days about bees and that covers a very wide subject because if you are going to discuss bees it involves the crop that the bees feed on, which is clover and alfalfa, and that opens up quite a discussion. The Animal Diseases Act - your entire animal agricultural industry is opened up, you can talk about the diseases of all the animals and I don't know how you're going to limit the discussion when you start on that subject. An Act to amend

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) . . . the Veterinarian Science Scholarship Fund Act - I submit, Sir, that there is somewhat a narrow scope here but nonetheless considerable. An Act to amend the Veterinary Services Act - again you can get into a discussion of all the various animals that are raised on a farm. The Credit Union Act certainly is a very wide one and should embrace almost every facet of agriculture. The Resource Conservation Districts Act deals with the drainage problems that were referred to by my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland and there is a very wide scope for discussion. The Act to amend the Agricultural Societies Act, and the Agricultural Societies Act comprises all of the facets of agriculture. An Act to amend the Milk Control Act, which takes in the entire dairy industry, and again you've got a very wide discussion that is capable of being carried on under that subject.

So I submit, Sir, that the Honourable the House Leader has pretty well defeated his own arguments when he said that the subject matter of the debate now before us must be confined to the bills that were referred to that committee on Friday night.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I believe I should be permitted to reply to my honourable friend the Member from Morris because I think that what he has just demonstrated is that I was perfectly right. He indicated that there is wide scope for discussion on the Bee Act and there's wide scope for discussion on the Credit Association Act or the other Act that were delivered. Each of those Act, Mr. Speaker, will be before this House in Committee on third reading; they will be before the House, if they go through the Committee, for the kind of discussion that my honourable friend refers to, which is the proper place for discussion of them, and what I was referring to is that the report of the Committee be received on those bills. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends can certainly have their fun if they want to, but I suggest . . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, in agriculture there's no fun in this province and I challenge the House Leader . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. GREEN: The Member for Roblin is a joke in himself.

MR. McKENZIE: I'm not joking. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the House Leader that the remark that I said was fun. I'm dead serious as the Member for the Roblin constituency and I resent that remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. McKENZIE: I think it's unfair for the . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the House has no right to refer to my honourable friend as a joke.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Will the Honourable Minister continue with his point of order.

MR. BILTON: I've got another name for him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are rules . . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Who's joking? -- (Interjection) -- I am like fun.

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

MR. McKENZIE: I'm representing my constituency here and I'm not joking I assure you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): You'll get the Academy Award, it's all right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to make a point relative to the procedure of debates. I believe that the proper place for discussing the Bee Act and its ramifications is on either second or third reading of the Bee Act. If that is such an astounding proposition to my honourable friends, then I put it to them to be astounded, that the proper time for debating all of the ramifications of the Credit Union Act are on first and second reading of that bill -- or second and third reading of that bill or during the committee stages. I'm suggesting that it is not appropriate in a motion that the report of the committee be received to bring in matters which are entirely irrelevant to the receipt of that report. This committee was set up and heard certain bills sent to it; those bills are now being reported. The fact that in my honourable friends' views we have not properly dealt with, in their minds, with the consideration of agriculture, has had certainly very many opportunities to be debated here; there are many other opportunities which they can create for debate by resolutions of their own or at other

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . stages; and that all we are discussing now is the receipt of the report of the committee on those bills. Mr. Speaker, if I defined the relevance of the debate too strictly then I'm sorry, but I believe that that's how it should be defined.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the same point of order, I think the Honourable Member from Morris has indicated to us that if we want to be technical about it we can certainly devise ways and means of discussing at great length the Bee Act, the Animal Diseases Act and other things. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we can. If we want to be sensible about it, what we are talking about is precisely what the Honourable the House Leader said, the manner in which the receipt of this report of the Committee of Agriculture should be dealt, the manner in which the Agricultural Committee was called, and its own behaviour, its own action in this general regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we have -- I seem to recall a considerable discussion earlier, early in the session with respect to the committee, whether it was the Law Amendments Committee that was dealing with the receipt of the report on whether the report of the Committee should be received with respect to power and other things, and we had a wide-ranging discussion at that time on the full range of subjects relative to possibly that could have been of interest to the committee's work, and I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have unlimited opportunity to point out to the House the shortcomings, the failures and particularly, Mr. Speaker, the indications that were given by the Minister of Agriculture that certain specific things were going to be dealt with by this committee.

I refer specifically to the possible revisions of the Manitoba Farm Implement Act. We have concerns about the artificial insemination problems that we have in the livestock industry and we were led to believe -- we didn't know whether this special committee would be struck on agriculture or whether it wouldn't. All through the session they indicated that it would be their intention to do something like this -- it didn't indicate to us why -- and then as my honourable friend from Roblin says, at 11:45 on Friday a fast little convenient meeting of the Agricultural Committee where I understand we had a great deal of difficulty in finding a quorum. The Honourable Minister first suggested that ten should be a quorum and then he had to reduce his own estimates because he could only find seven -- and that's here nor there -- but the question is at a quarter to 12 after the kind of sittings that we've been having, and you can . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . . a point of order now or is he . . . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . . but, Mr. Speaker, I leave it in your hands.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, if I may on the same point of order, I'd just like to say a word or two, because it seems to me that the question before the House is whether or not report should be received. I would think that any argument that is either for the receipt of the report or against the receipt of the report and the reasons for it is in order. May I suggest, Sir, that our rule, Page 18, 34 (1) (b) says that "The following motions are debatable". -- that is to say -- "every motion" and (b) says "for the receiving of a report of a Standing or Special Committee or a Committee of the Whole House." May I suggest, Sir, that as long as the debate is relevant to whether or not the report of the Committee should be received, the argument related to yes we should or no we shouldn't and specifically the report of the Agricultural Committee, then I, Sir, submit to you that the debate would be in order.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to two sections of Beauchesne, two citations and read them. I think it's necessary and vital, particularly for the edification of the Honourable House Leader. One is 119, and I'll read the first portion of the citation. "One of the main functions of the House consists in debating public issues, a function which can only be filled by complete freedom of speech. There will always be contests between groups and parties, minority and majority, and in the debates that follow the rules of procedure are all important. Delays, multiplicity of amendments and even obstructions must not always be regarded as illegitimate political 'weapons'."

And Citation 3 of 119: "Relevancy is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious effect on the freedom of speech. Members are often deprived of their right to speak on the pretext that their remarks are irrelevant, when as a matter of fact they refer to matters perhaps remote but yet related even indirectly to the question under debate. In borderline cases the member should be given the benefit of the doubt." Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. "In borderline cases the member should be given the benefit of the doubt. A great deal of latitude must be allowed in the House of Commons which is a forum where every phase of public affairs can be discussed and every member has a right to be heard, even if in doing so he sometimes disregards the rigidity of the procedure."

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering whether practically 20 minutes is not sufficient time for debate of the point of order. I think that there is general agreement on both sides that debate must be related to the motion before us and I haven't heard any one on either side denying that. There might be a difference of opinion as to the extent to which relevancy ought to extend, but I'm sure that the point has been impressed upon both sides that the debate must be related to the motion before us and I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Lakeside may proceed.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to assure you that everything I have to say will be pertinent to the agricultural industry and the fact of the consideration before us, and that is the motion of the receipt of the Committee on Agriculture that dealt with it so lightly and so superficially at such a late hour of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to chastise most seriously the government, the Minister of Agriculture, for the manner and way in which they called the committee meeting at a time when we have probably faced a greater complex numbers of problems in agriculture than ever before. We had had an opportunity -- we'd looked for an opportunity to hear from our farm organizations at the committee hearings to discuss just what are the ramifications or the situations of the Federal Government LIFT Program which has such far-reaching implications throughout the Province of Manitoba. We would have hoped to have had an opportunity to discuss with members, individuals, representatives of the agricultural community, the new renewed government credit program with respect to livestock and the general over-all credit program. We could have hoped to have had some indication from the government with respect to the specific problems already mentioned.

And, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting in this note, because we had agreed earlier on that this special committee that was set up dealing specifically with the problems concerning farm equipment, farm implements, with a hope of modifying and reviewing the Farm Implements Act, we had arrived at a decision that we would do nothing until the federal report, the Royal Commission Report, the Barber Commission Report on Farm machinery would be issued.

Now it seems to me that the previous government took a similar approach to another report. In this case it was the Wootton Report on Automobile Insurance in B. C. Generally speaking, we said we would not duplicate the additional cost, the high cost, that we would await that report and then possibly give us some time to discover or discuss what kind of changes we might consider. And we have been severely chastised for that, for sitting on our hands, sitting on everything else, for not moving boldly and not moving immediately and not moving much more quickly instead of wasting two or three years time of the members of this House with respect to the other automobile insurance committee, that is the Legislative Committee that sat, but decided among themselves in a democratic way that we would not bring in any specific action until we had the full opportunity to look at the current report that was under way in B. C.

Now that was precisely the same position that the special committee on agriculture took with respect to farm implements. We met, we heard several briefs, we compiled a fair amount of information data, and then we arrived at the decision that we would not proceed further until the coinciding federal report in this same area would be completed and we would have the benefit of having that report in our hands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that report has been in our hands, has been in our hands for a year just about. It was the beginning of the year that it came out. This government which has expressed such a keen desire, such a tremendous concern to be Johnny-on-the-spot and there with the action when called for, has allowed a full year, a full summer, a full season to go by without even having the courage to suggest to us, at least in a manly way, and say look, we can't do everything in one year, we're going to shelve it for a year, we're going to wait till next year.

I asked the House Leader, I asked the Minister of Agriculture - I don't know whether to ask the First Minister - specifically the question relating to what, if any, actions were being contemplated with respect to modifications to the Farm Implement Act, and in a nice political way they indicated to me that this was certainly under consideration and that a committee would be struck shortly. When I asked when, of course it got a little hazy. But we were certainly under the assumption, following the precedent set by the manner and way in which the other committee sat, that it would be during the session. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may well be during this session because we may be here till Christmas, but I think normally, normally we had hoped that we would have had time to have struck this committee, that we would have had time to have had expert farm advice and individual farmers giving us their views on this subject early on in April or in May, the time that our farming community is used to coming into this building, meeting with their legislators and discussing the difficulties they had with us.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

So, Mr. Speaker, I find it, you know, very very indicative of this government's general attitude towards the farming community to have allowed themselves to treat these important areas so lightly. I think the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has shown a complete and utter disregard for the specific and individual problems that we face - and they are always unique in agriculture. They're not necessarily precedent setting in any way. He challenged the Member for Rhineland to indicate a situation where any compensation was paid with respect to crop loss or crop damage because of undue rain and not just from the already long-established policies of spring flooding or late flooding.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't so long ago that I understand that some of his potato growers got considerable consideration. And what for? Simply because they had too much rain and simply because too much of the crop was damaged - and you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame him because the Conservative Government did that about eight or nine years ago, I think the Honourable Minister will acknowledge, and there's nothing wrong with that.

I'm trying to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, what so few of these people on this side understand, that farming is one of those kind of industries that you can't tie up in neat little packages and have ready-made answers for all the problems. The problems are different every year; the responses may have to be different every year. Just as the Honourable Minister saw fit to respond to an admittedly severe situation with respect to the potato growers of a year ago, for him to callously forget that and suggest to my friend the Honourable Member for Rhineland that unless his particular problem falls on the stools and not in between the stools of set policies of river flooding or lake flooding, that he can simply sit back and relax on those laurels. I find it a little heartless from the Minister to even suggest that.

MR. USKIW: I never said it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to underline once again that in a year where agriculture has probably faced more individual problems, a greater number of problems than at any time in the last decade - and we've had many problems in the last decade - but some of them have been heaped on in such confusion that it must surely bewilder the most reasonable and the hardest working and thinking farmers of this country. We grow surpluses and we don't know what to do with it. We announce government programs to cut back on acreages and at the same time we find out that this presents problems within other crop areas. With little direction or little chance - perhaps the government wishes to give direction, perhaps the government has the answers - but, Mr. Speaker, it's beginning to appear to us, and it may be unfair to suggest it, but it's beginning to appear to us that this government and this particular Minister of Agriculture has some concern about meeting with the agricultural community formally, that is at committee levels, at committee stage, to ascertain formally from the agricultural community their real concerns, their briefs, to be exposed to that kind of scrutiny of his policies and the policies of his government, because I find it difficult to comprehend or to grasp that at the same time that we're taking on one of the longest sessions ever experienced in this House, we've had about 40 minutes time to call the Agricultural Committee and that was around the hour of midnight. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we can in any way allow this opportunity to go by - and I don't wish to prolong this debate any further - but to let this opportunity go by and not chastise the government. ....

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I must rise on a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is speaking as though members of the agricultural community did not have an opportunity to appear before a committee of the House to make presentations relative to certain bills. This is what the Member for Lakeside has said and I must regard that as outright deception because I recall clearly - and I believe it is on Hansard therefore either he will be borne out or I will be, but one of us will be wrong, that's for sure - because Hansard I believe will show that by agreement of both sides of this House it was decided that all those who had representations to make relative to certain bills, including agricultural bills, would be enabled to appear before committees of the House meeting in full as Law Amendments Committee during the morning, during the afternoon, during the early evening. Therefore, somebody is being deceptive in a very crude and unforgivable way when they suggest that it was only until approaching midnight that they had opportunity to make presentations relative to these bills. Now, Sir, I say, and I say in a very deliberate way, somebody here is acting very stupid. Now who is it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will not rise to the bait. ...

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I want determination of this. I don't want. ...

MR. ENNS: Well, I'll tell you whose acting damn arrogant.



MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Either it is true or it is not true.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order....

MR. SCHREYER: There is a point of privilege here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order.....

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister is speaking on a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: And if I am shown to be wrong I'll certainly apologize to the Member for Lakeside. But I recall so clearly that there was agreement reached by consent, both sides, that all those who had representations to make relative to all bills, including the agricultural bills, could do so during the morning and the afternoon and the evening.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let me then accept the Minister's request for a situation here. Certainly. No. (1) It is, I assume, principally the responsibility of the House Leader to organize the manner and method in which committee meetings will be called, and when he, or he sends an emissary over to this side to reach consensus of any given situation, we as reasonable people will certainly attempt, particularly at this late sitting of the session, to accommodate whatever the situation, the position of the House Leader is. (3) I would ask that that doesn't, in my judgment, make me deceptive or stupid or anything else. I suggest to you, as I tried to suggest in the tenor of my speech, that No. (1), while we may well have had to agree with it because of seeing the necessity of proceeding with the House, we do not necessarily have to accept the responsibility of it. The responsibility of it lies directly with the House Leader or with the government of the day in proposing it to us, and if we see no other way of getting out of this Chamber other than agreeing to unreasonable propositions - and I consider them unreasonable, unreasonable to lump Municipal Affairs, Agriculture and a few other things in one omnibus Law Amendment bill -- (Interjection) -- All right, fine, I'm taking my prerogative to saying it right now.

And then secondly -- thirdly, I ask the member -- (Interjection) -- fine, that may have been agreement here, but when did the invitation, when was the opportunity given to the Manitoba Farmers Bureau, the Farmers Union, the individual commodity groups and so forth. I saw a few civil servants who may have had some concern about bills or maybe perhaps were there to help the Minister out in case of something like that, but I ask when was the invitation set out to the Farm Bureau, to the farm organization people, to the average farmer to attend that meeting.

Then I finally ask the final question. In all seriousness, is anybody - and I wish they want to accept this challenge - is anybody on that side seriously suggesting that the farm community deserves no better than to sit in abeyance from 9:30 to midnight in the hope that maybe somebody will discuss their problem. Have we arrived at that stage with our concern about agriculture that we lump it all together and then maybe at midnight you'll get heard about? Mr. Chairman, I think we have arrived at that stage. It's been suggested to us by the House Leader - and that's understandable, his concern is to get the business of the House done with, but it's my job, speaking as a representative of the farm community, to voice my objections and to chastise the government for it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of privilege. I want him to know that the suggestion that we break up into Law Amendments Committee on Thursday and the other committees on Friday was, I believe, as much arrived at by the Leader of the Opposition as it was by myself, that this was a discussion that we had which seemed to be able to handle the situation.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything further to say on the matter.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that I do know what bothers my friends opposite. I think.....

MR. SPIVAK: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture....

MR. USKIW: I'm speaking to the motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, but I believe you're closing the debate on the motion.

MR. USKIW: No, I can't close the debate. Mr. Speaker, I think I know what bothers my friends opposite, and that is the fact that members opposite indeed were not there to listen to representation or to consider the matters referred, and therefore to throw a smokescreen in order to offset their own embarrassment, they are trying to embarrass the government of the day.

MR. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I could indicate to the Minister that I'm not a member of that committee but certainly preserve my prerogative of speaking about it.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, let me illustrate how interested the members which represent rural communities of this province are. Where was the Member for Lakeside - where was the Member for Lakeside when representations were being made to the committee when we were going through clause by clause study of the bill? Where was the Member for Birtle-Russell? Where was the Member for Gladstone? Where was the Member for Emerson? Where was the Member for Swan River? We had to reduce the size of the quorum three times because members opposite weren't present in the committee.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in answer to the Minister, I am not a member of that committee, and I would ask him, in all sincerity, did he see to it, or did the Leader of the House see to it, that the members that the Minister of Agriculture has named, that that meeting was going to be called at 11:45 Friday evening?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, all of the members of the House knew that the membership of the committee would be sitting all day, and that once we finished with the delegations that the committees would be called.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, to clarify that one point further, I remember quite distinctly that at a quarter to twelve the House Leader said that the members for the Law Amendments Committee, to use it in general terms, could go home, we were going into Agriculture, and I suggest to him that the country members had gone on Friday night, as they normally do, to get back to their constituencies for Saturday and Sunday.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the Committee on Agriculture started to meet at possibly around 11:00 o'clock - I can't remember, but I think it was approximately 11:00. At one time I thought that they would go through fairly rapidly and that we would then go into another committee. At a quarter to twelve it became quite apparent that there would be a longer discussion on agriculture and, with concurrence of other members, I suggested that since non-agricultural committee members would probably not have anything further to do that evening, that we go home - and I did go home.

MR. BILTON: . . . Leader of the House that he said to me earlier in the evening that we would be going on until morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you speaking to a point of order?

MR. BILTON: I feel that I am, Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify this situation, because the blame is not on this side which is being indicated by the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to record in the record that I am not on the Agricultural Committee, as much as I would like to be, and that is why I was not at the meeting that the Minister is talking about.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to retract the statement he made inferring that I was not there. I am not a member of the Agricultural Committee, but I was there for all of the Law Amendments and part of the agricultural debate, even though I was not a member of the committee.

MR. USKIW: There's nothing to retract, Mr. Speaker, because I'm naming the members that are representing rural constituencies that seem to express a great deal of interest as to what happens to the bills that have something to do with agriculture, and I want to say that if members opposite were interested in these pieces of legislation that they would have availed themselves of the opportunity to make their views known in committee, regardless of when that committee was sitting, and members opposite were all given due notice as to when that would be. I want to point out, I want to point out that there were only two members of the official opposition sitting through the proceedings while the bills were proceeded with clause by clause - only two.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, I have the records in front of me - and it's not a question of attempting to correct some of the earlier statements that were made - but the records do not show that. As a matter of fact the records show - and I have the records in front of me - that there were three members of the four members of the committee, of the Conservative Party, who were present when they were considered.

MR. USKIW: They may have been there for a very small portion of the time.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, at the time that the bills were considered and at the time the committee was called to consider the bills, of the four members who form that committee from this side, from the Conservative Party, three of them were present -- (Interjection) -- three out of four. I must say for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that I think the percentage is higher than the percentage of the government members who are on the committee.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on a point of privilege too. I've been sitting in here for practically four months; I would also like to point out that for the first six weeks we sat in here we had no bills to work on, we're now getting about 60 bills down in two weeks, we're....

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. I do not believe that that is a point of privilege at this time. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it does demonstrate in fact that I have touched on a very touchy point, and that is that members opposite did not exercise a responsibility which was given to them....

MR. BILTON: On a point of privilege, if you're going to allow the Minister of Agriculture to chastise this side of the House, surely you're going to allow the honourable members to have their say in rebuttal.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I may, Sir, appeal to the Chair to consider the following. The Member for Swan River would make it an argument that because the Minister of Agriculture is chastising certain members opposite that they should have an opportunity to respond, which seems logical enough, but I believe that the Minister of Agriculture is responding to some chastisement that has already been put forward by the Member for Lakeside, so in other words this is running into the normal course of debate.

MR. BILTON: I accept the opinion of the Honourable the First Minister, but my honourable friend from Gladstone only said a word or two and he was called to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Honourable members will have ample opportunity to participate in this debate, and short of a matter of privilege, or a point of order, there's absolutely no reason for interjection or interruption. The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it has been drawn to my attention that during the course of part of the hearings, the clause by clause study of the bill, that there were three members, but that at about midnight it was reduced to two members of the opposition in that committee. Now, apart from that, I want to point out one important fact....

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): On a point of privilege, was the Minister referring to the opposition or the official opposition.

MR. USKIW: The official opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to register that I was there well after midnight and I would have been there for the full length of the session if I had not been unduly interrupted by certain members of the government side.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it is surprising that members opposite raised the question at all, because they know full well that the purpose of the committee was specifically to deal with the legislation that was referred. They also know that the traditional way in which this is done is notice is given, the people in the industry are given ample opportunity to present their views. My understanding, at least it was my instruction and I'm sure it was carried out, that the farm organizations were notified about two days in advance. There was one organization at the hearings but did not have a brief to present. Members opposite are completely on weak ground when they suggest that the people in the agricultural community did not have an opportunity to make their views known on any particular piece of legislation that was before that committee.

MR. MCKENZIE: On a point of privilege, I challenge the Minister's statement. I again ask the Minister, is this the traditional way to call a committee on agriculture at 11:45 on a Friday night?

MR. SPEAKER: I do not believe the honourable member has a point of privilege. Order.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend the Member for Roblin seems to think that he is the one that determines the terms of reference of a committee. I want to say that it is beyond the power of the Member for Roblin, and indeed it was this Legislature that decided what the committee was going to do, and that was mainly to consider legislation that was referred to it. My honourable friend is trying to convey the message that the committee had instructions to go beyond that, well then he's in a world of his own because the same committee will be called at some future point, as my honourable friend ought to know if he would read the Order Paper, to deal with much broader issues involving matters in the agricultural area.

The Member for Lakeside - I'm rather surprised that he has left, I suppose he doesn't want to accept what is coming - he should be the last one to make views known about the activities of this particular committee because I would suggest that he was about the most inactive person so far as anything to do with the bills on agriculture were concerned.

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)

The Member for Morris made a lot of ado about how broad one should interpret the motion to receive the bills from committee, but I don't know about one single contribution that the Member for Morris made during the committee hearings, during the clause by clause. -- (Interjection) -- The committee will meet again, yes that's right, and that's the time that ample opportunity will be provided for members opposite and everyone that is concerned.

But really the point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the members of the opposition did not at all play ball with the government, did not wish to consider the legislation that was referred to them; they wanted to go home and have some fun, I suppose, on a Friday night or a Saturday night, I don't know, I don't know what their intention was. . . .

MR. BILTON: I trust you're going to allow us the opportunity to rebut that statement.

MR. USKIW: The fact of the matter is that when the rules of the House are waived, members opposite know full well that they do not know when the adjournment hour will -- (Interjection) -- that's right. We know that after a certain period -- (Interjection) -- That's right. I gave a clear indication to the committee that it was our intention to proceed until all the bills were completed, and members opposite knew full well. The fact that they didn't want to sit there and go through the legislation is not my fault, but it was clearly within the rules and members opposite simply fell down on the job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Agriculture one question. When was it formally announced that the committee would meet at 11:45 on a Friday night?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I believe that question has been answered several times during the course of this afternoon's debate. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, well I'm certainly glad that apparently the Minister of Agriculture feels that he has woken some of us up on this side. We've been waiting a considerable length of time for this committee to meet, and unfortunately there are some commitments that you have to go out to. I wasn't able to attend and it certainly wasn't through shirking my duties as a representative from Gladstone. But there's one thing I am glad to see, that finally he has wakened up. This is the first sign of any action we've had yet from this Minister of Agriculture. It was quite all right to say the LIFT program was a step in the right direction; it's quite all right to go through the business of flooding with a shilly-shally manner the way he's done. He's certainly been no credit to Manitoba as a Minister of Agriculture, and I would expect rather than calling on the members that were not there, to start calling his committees at half decent hours and start making a few moves for the agriculture industry in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I rise just to make a comment or two. I am satisfied that the Honourable Member for River Heights is one that always wants to be very accurate about what things are, and I hope that what he said is not typical of the kind of accuracy that he's given to this House, because he says, Mr. Speaker, that three out of four of the Conservative members of the committee were present and he said he had the records before him, but the fact of the matter is that there were only three of the six members of the Conservative Party who are on the committee that were present at the meeting to begin with, and obviously some of them left earlier.

MR. McKENZIE: What time was the committee called?

MR. MACKLING: And the bull-horn voice from the far side knows that an arrangement was made, to which his leader consented, that all representations would be made -- (Interjection) -- all representations would be made, which the Honourable Member from Swan River with the bull horn was certainly available to hear it. -- (Interjection) -- If you want to address someone, you may do so.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I ask you one question.

MR. MACKLING: Sit down. I have the floor. Sit down, please.

MR. McKENZIE: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. McKENZIE: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this a policy of this government?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of privilege. The Honourable Attorney-General may proceed.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I choose to ignore those interjections, but the fact of the matter is that there was an accord reached -- and the Premier has outlined that -- and it was by

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.). . . . consensus, and now to suggest that the members of that committee who were available and are members of Law Amendments Committee, and I am not a member of the Agricultural Committee but I was there when we were looking for other members of the Conservative caucus so that we could establish a reasonable quorum, but those members were not present, and for the Honourable Member for River Heights now to err on such a significant detail is most astonishing and regrettable. The fact of the matter is that there were only three. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Haven't you ever made a mistake?

MR. MACKLING: . . . that there were only three -- (Interjection) -- The records speak for themselves, and you said three out of four. -- (Interjection) -- Yeah, you've made a very serious mistake and it is a very serious charge, and I hope that you'll apologize to the House.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Attorney-General rose before I did, and I think I indicated that I was attempting to rise on my feet, and I was as a matter of fact going to indicate this, because the information was brought to the attention to me by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek who came down and made reference to the fact that the arithmetic that I used based on the information that was supplied by the Clerk was incorrect. Having said that, I don't think that's too significant. I made an error. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if the Honourable Attorney-General thinks that as a result of this whole debate this is the most significant thing, then that's up to him, that's his judgment. But, Mr. Speaker, the reason for mentioning this was because of the fact that there were certain statements made by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that were not correct.

Now having said this, Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to deal with the motion, and I would now like to deal specifically with the motion. Mr. Speaker, as it happens, because of my concerning interest in farm matters, I was present for a good portion -- (Interjection) -- No, this is because it's in my wife's interest and my father-in-law's interest for me to be present on agricultural matters because he happens to be a farmer. So, Mr. Speaker, I was present during a great portion of the clause by clause review by the committee of the various bills in front of it.

Now there are a couple of observations that have to be made, Mr. Speaker, and this is probably an appropriate time to make them, and they're made not just in connection with this item before us but just generally with what has happened in the manner and the attempt on the part of the government, and on the part of this side as well, to try and deal with those matters that come before us in the House. The session has been a long one; that's already been stated. We know that there were going to be days in which we were going to have many representations and we did. It was a rather unusual procedure to have Law Amendments and Municipal Affairs and Agriculture together so that representations by the public could be made at one and the same time, and the people and all the members of the House who were involved in those committees could be together and there was a great deal of cooperation given on this side.

MR. USKIW: Would the member submit to a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I will at the end; I certainly have no objection to that. But, Mr. Speaker, the point that must come out in this debate is that if we intelligently are going to deal with the vast number of items before us, and the number of bills, in any significant and meaningful way so that we are going to make a contribution on this side to alter and amend the legislation so that it will be more progressive and to be able to assist the government in handling their function, then surely it must be recognized that there has to be some reasonable degree of understanding on their part of the immense difficulty -- and they were in Opposition, they should realize this -- of having to sit day by day by day in committee and deal with the number of bills that we have before us.

Now I'm aware, and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture has suggested when there was a motion to adjourn, suggested this is not unusual to be able to proceed for another hour or hour and a half. I'm aware that this has been the practice in the past and it has occurred, but never has this come at a time when we had so many bills before so many committees as we have now. Now I know that the government is interested in trying to deal with the matters before us expeditiously, but the conduct of the affairs in this House has been their responsibility and the fact of the matter is that we have such a number of bills presented to us dealing with such a wide variety of different matters, that they cannot expect and they should not expect that the members on this side have got to assume that we're in the last two days of the session, or three days of the session and therefore we are going to go from early morning until the middle of the next morning to be able to accommodate everybody. It's just impossible for anyone to seriously think about this.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

The reason I bring this up is that the motion to adjourn of this committee came at a time when we were considering the Credit Union Act. This Act involves I think, if I'm correct, seven pages; I'm not sure how many sections. It is really a significant Act and is a basic change from the legislation that's now in force in Canada and other jurisdictions with respect to credit unions and it warrants a clause by clause analysis by the members of the committee. There's no question, and although I was not a member of the committee, I had a particular interest and was concerned to deal with the items clause by clause. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture brought in I don't know how many amendments - and I don't want in any way to raise the anger of the Attorney-General by suggesting a figure that's inaccurate - but I would say that there were at least two or three dozen amendments that were introduced by the Minister of Agriculture dealing with this one bill alone and several of them were on individual pages, yet in order to expedite the thing we were asked to be able to deal with this - and we agreed - page by page. At least the members of the committee agreed and all I can say is that I agreed although I wasn't a voting member.

We know that the Credit Union Act is a particularly important Act to the Member from Rhineland. Now there wasn't any member of the other side who did not say this to me and the members of the press, as a matter of fact, said it to me. This was of a particular significance and importance to the Member from Rhineland who has been associated, as some of the other members have been, in connection with credit unions in this province. Therefore, what should have been allowed - and I recognize the difficulty and the fact that this would have meant that the session may not finish as early - but this is an important piece of legislation, and what should have been recognized is that it's impossible to expect members to sit from 9:30 in the morning and to start to deal clause by clause with Bills at 12:00 o'clock.

If we were in the last few days and it was a matter of rushing to try and finish and to be able to at one time say, now we're finished and the House would end - this is a procedure we've followed in the past - but, Mr. Speaker, we face 140 briefs yet to hear in Public Utilities; I don't know how many bills, whether there are 50 or 60 that have to be dealt with yet clause by clause in Law Amendments and the Municipal Committee; we have not finished the procedures in this House and it's not likely that we're going to for some time, and it would be just foolish to expect the members on this side to be able to fulfill their proper function, with the great number of bills that have been introduced at the end, if we're going to have the affairs conducted in the way it has in the past. The motion to adjourn, the motion to adjourn that came up at that time was moved, I believe, by the Member from Arthur, and I'm not sure who seconded it, and the government decided to use its majority, and has the prerogative to use this majority, to allow the thing to continue so that they would finish that committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, therefore in my opinion, in terms of this particular debate - I've listened to the others and the others have particular points of view and I'm not going to enter in that respect - but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there was a precedent set that evening, which was a precedent that's been followed in the past but not under the particular circumstances of so many bills before the committee, that should not be followed in the future. I think there has to be some reasonable expectation that if we on this side are going to fulfill our function and if we're going to really allow the legislative and democratic process to work so that in fact there can be meaningful discussion, it's just impossible to suggest that we are going to start dealing clause by clause at 11:00 o'clock or 11:30 at night when it's become apparent that the members have been sitting in Municipal Committee, in Law Amendments Committee and Agricultural Committee at the same time. I would suggest now that probably the procedure was an incorrect one in terms of really accommodating everyone and I would suggest that in the future it should not be done again. But that's irrelevant to the point that has to be raised now.

There was not the kind of due consideration that should have been given in committee, and I would suggest as well that the government will recognize this when we get into Committee of the Whole and deal clause by clause with the bills again, because it would seem to me that the debate on the bills in Committee of the Whole are going to be very extensive as a result of the lack and ability of being able to deal in a much freer forum than the committee would have been in terms of the matters themselves, and I would urge the government to consider using their majority in a way that would allow the members on this side to have some expectation of the time limits in which they are going to be able to deal with the matters before them day by day so that they are in effect in a position to make their plans and accommodation and to allow a reasonable time so that there can very well be a real contribution made in connection with the debate by the members on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I know of course that in the concluding week or two, concluding few weeks of a session, sometimes some pretty bizarre and enraging things happen and that the mood and temper of the House deteriorates, unfortunately, and I think today we have an example of that because what we were subjected to, I think, is in large part arising from a misunderstanding. That's about the kindest thing I can say about it, is that there was a genuine misunderstanding between the two sides of the House as to what happened or should have happened on Friday.

The Member for Lakeside, I'm sure if he checks over the record and consults with his own Leader, will find that the arrangement made whereby on Friday last we went into committee of all members to hear presentations on bills that were to be later dealt with in respective Standing Committees like Municipal Affairs and Agriculture, that this was something that was done by agreement - and I confess that I must agree with those who argue that the experiment, the new procedure we tried on Friday, by agreement, didn't really work, doesn't really work that well and I'm not sure that we should ever do it again. However, as honourable members know, that what is done by consent or by leave, anything relative to House business can be done as long as it's by leave or by consent, and that's really the way it was done on Friday last.

Now, the Member for Roblin who started this exercise in misunderstanding, perhaps he didn't check with his Leader, but I invite him to do so now. The thinking was that if both sides agreed, and they did, that we would have all members meet in the Law Amendments Committee room and that all those people representing different organizations who wished to make representation on bills respecting municipal affairs, they could do so; respecting agricultural, they could do so; respecting any other bills that were to be referred to different standing committees, that they could all make their presentations to all members who were there in the morning, in the afternoon and in the evening. Having received the presentations, then it was a case of honourable members alone meeting subsequently starting not at a quarter to midnight as the member from Roblin would make out, but somewhere around a quarter to eleven. Now that is only slightly better, I must say, because I do think that on a Friday evening, having come through a long day and with the week-end and the need to travel to constituencies some distance from the city, that maybe a better arrangement could have been made. I'm not suggesting that. But then other things, lest there be any continuing rancor about it, I just want to say again that the arrangement made last Friday by mutual consent maybe does not work that well and we should certainly have second thoughts about trying it again - both sides.

Other things have been said in this debate raised by the Member from Roblin which I am not sure is proper under the rules for me to pursue at this time, and I refer to debate on the substance of economic policy - or agricultural policy being pursued in this province. Perhaps the only thing I should say at this time, Mr. Speaker, is that the nature of the problems being faced by the agricultural industry far manifests -- they have been evident for many years, for at least twenty years - almost twenty years, put it that way - and that the prosperity of the agricultural sector in Manitoba, as elsewhere in Western Canada, has been subject to many many factors and that the prosperity of agriculture in the western part of our country has fluctuated. In each decade we have had, I suppose, relatively good years in the farming industry in the late 40's and very early 50's; not so good in the mid-50's and late 50's, early 60's; improvement between '63 and '67-68; and then again a return to the same set of circumstances, adverse problems, adverse as agriculture experienced in the late 50's. For the Member for Roblin to suggest that all of the problems of the agricultural sector must be laid at the doorstep of the Minister of Agriculture is something that really merits no serious attention on our part. What can be done, what has prospect of being practicable is being pursued by the Minister of Agriculture and others of his colleagues.

For the Member for Lakeside to suggest that nothing was done in the committee of last Friday relative to the problem of farm machinery sales and the services that are to be expected by farmers from farm implement dealers and the like, farm machinery prices and allied matters, lo and behold on Page 3 of the Order Paper there is a resolution standing in the name of our Minister of Agriculture which resolves to convene a special committee of this House, a Standing Committee of this House on Agriculture to deal with that very matter. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly not over 10 years but within the next 12-month period. Having had 10 years, honourable members opposite having had 10 years as a government to cope with certain of the problems of the agricultural industry, some of which they did, some of which they

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . didn't, some of which they couldn't because of the nature of Dominion-Provincial division of powers and fiscal capability, they can hardly expect us to be not subject to the same constraints and restrictions that faced them as a government trying to cope with agricultural problems. We certainly are not immune to the same set of constraints that they faced.

In any case, we have already demonstrated that we are capable of striking out in new directions on farm policy which they were not prepared to set out on, and I refer to the increase of 20 percent in the budget of the Department of Agriculture over the budget that they set for Agriculture last year, and a 20 percent increase in one year is something to remark on and to note, Mr. Speaker. In addition to that, we have revived the Farm Credit, Agricultural Credit Corporation and provided substantial amounts of funds to it just two years after they saw fit to put it away, to put it under wraps.

So, Mr. Speaker, I really find it difficult to follow the arguments of the Member for Roblin, and in fact see no reason at all why anyone occupying my position should want to entertain seriously any thought that the present Minister of Agriculture is performing his duties in an unsatisfactory way. I certainly regard him as one who understands the nature of the industry and who has already brought forward some innovations in agricultural policy. Some of them I know cost money and it's difficult always in the Budget process to find enough money to meet Ministers' requests, but I want it to be clearly known that the Minister of Agriculture has succeeded, this government has succeeded in allocating 20 percent more money this year for the Department of Agriculture's work than was the case a year ago, and no other department has had an increase of that magnitude. None. And that is something that is worth noting in itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come back now to the question of procedure. I don't want to be repetitive but there is one point which I did not make relative to House procedure which I should like to make in conclusion, and that is that perhaps it is true, perhaps the Member for River Heights is correct when he suggests that the way in which public business is conducted in the closing days or weeks of a session leaves something to be desired. I can agree with him. The question however of following somewhat the procedure and practice in previous years with respect to House business and procedure, it is I suppose expecting a bit much to have the House convene at 9:30 a. m. and then again in the afternoon and in the evening and to expect honourable members to meet up to midnight. But I seem to recall a number of cases in the past 11 years, certainly between 1958 and 1965 while I was here, when exactly that kind of procedure was adopted and followed, and while I don't recall personally ever being required to sit here till 3:00 a. m., the Member for Kildonan advises me that this did happen on occasion. I suppose that would be between '66 and '69. That being so, and inasmuch as we have not made that requirement, I really find it difficult to understand why the Member for River Heights now should find cause for criticism when they went even beyond that - 3:00 a. m. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I certainly don't anticipate, Mr. Speaker, I don't anticipate that we have anything like that to go either. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that before that kind of time passes, other events will have come to pass.

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

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take issue with a few of the things that were said in this debate this afternoon. First of all, I would like to take issue with the statement that the Premier has indicated. He seems to think that it's justifiable to have committees sit till morning because it has been done in the past, and I hardly think that is a good enough reason to say it's a justifiable thing. If we are under a new regime with new rules and new procedures and so on, let's not use the old ones as excuses but let's bear the responsibility the way we should. I can't agree with him either that this debate this afternoon is due to tired politicians at the end of a session. Neither is it due, Mr. Speaker, to a misunderstanding caused by my friend from Roblin or my friend from Lakeside or others. I suggest to you that it's caused because those members representing rural areas understand full well that we are facing a serious crisis in agriculture and we are not getting the kind of response from the government that is reasonable to expect.

I, like other representatives from the rural areas, have been told in the last week by more than one member of that industry that there is no way this year but to fail and to suffer losses that will be lasting. To avoid bankruptcy in some cases will be impossible without subsidization or assistance of some kind.

I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the course of debate and in the course of this session, the Minister of Agriculture has seemed to indicate an attitude that he really is



(MR. GIRARD cont'd.). . . . not concerned with that problem. I am not sure whether he is not concerned because it's politically wise not to be concerned or whether it is that he feels it's a federal responsibility only or whether he feels that it's just not existing or whether he's not even informed that it does exist, concerns me as a rural member. I would like to feel that my Minister is aware and concerned about the problems that do exist in that area and I can't say that that is the case. I am wondering at times, Mr. Speaker, whether it's not just a bit of arrogance on the part of the Minister and he just wishes to ignore this side, he wishes rather to play politics with the Department of Agriculture, and I suggest to you that this is not very healthy. I would go further and suggest to you that by the very fact that we had to wait as long as we did to get the Agricultural Committee to meet, is not a sign that the Minister of Agriculture is very concerned about the problems in connection with agriculture.

MR. USKIW: . . . submit a question?

MR. GIRARD: Right after I'm finished, Sir. He is not showing, in my view he is not showing that he is concerned about the real problems in agriculture. Now not only did he wait many months before he called the committee, but he called it at a time that was really not convenient, especially when you consider that it was a Friday night, and here we have criticism from the other side because the members that live 100 or 200 miles away were not here or were irresponsible in that they weren't right there when the committee was called at that particular time in spite of not even being on that committee, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Minister is being a little political and unreasonable and the real smokescreen that he was talking about is not ours but his. By these political arguments he wishes to camouflage the fact that he really has not yet assumed the responsibilities that he should have in that portfolio.

It's fine for the Premier to say, you know, we've increased that portfolio by some 20 per cent and this is historical and so on, and I really have no criticism with that, but the fact is that most of the money that was increased is increased because of the Farm Credit Corporation and not really new programs other than that one. I'm not knocking the corporation, but I'm saying that this is not really a big plan, it's simply making more money available to the farmers, and granted it is a needed thing.

I would suggest even further, Mr. Speaker, that it is understandable that the Minister has some difficulty in really sinking his teeth into the real problem because he and the Minister from St. George are really the only ones, apart from the Premier, who understand the problems of agriculture on that side of the House.

I think it even appeared more clearly today when the House Leader attempted to restrict the debate to the matters that were involved in that debate in the committee only. You know, Mr. Speaker, we don't have to be agricultural experts to realize that the bees are functioning almost as well this year as they have in the past and that the Bee Act is really not that important to the present farm problem. — (Interjection) — Some birds that are functioning that well, Mr. Speaker, are still functioning very well; I can hear them chirp almost daily.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that narrowing the scope of the debate simply avoids bringing out the real problems in agriculture, those that we're facing today, those caused by weather conditions and people who are unable to plant their crops. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, and doubt really the source of information that guides the present Minister. I would like to suggest to him that I would feel much better if I, in some way, could be convinced that he listens to this side of the House, that he listens to the farm organizations across the country, that he listens to people with problems and not only the one organization in which he seems to want to associate very closely.

MR. USKIW: What is that, Mr. Speaker, if I may?

MR. GIRARD: Three guesses!

MR. USKIW: Well, I don't know. I would like to know which organization my honourable friend is referring to.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, this is so typical of the Minister's innocence and his complete misunderstanding. There is absolutely no way he could tell that my suggestion was the Farm Union.

MR. USKIW: Would the honourable member now submit to a question?

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I will.

MR. USKIW: Is the honourable member not aware for which purpose the committee was called on Friday?

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I am aware, Sir.

MR. USKIW: Well then how could he interpret the broad position which he has taken in debate on the report of that committee to this House?

MR. GIRARD: I didn't hear you. Would you repeat that?

MR. USKIW: I said how could you give it the broadest interpretation and report to the House?

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, my purpose in giving it a broad interpretation is not simply that I want to spend hours debating the Bee Act, but I want an opportunity to bring to your attention the real problems that face the farmers of today, and if you restrict the debate to the Bee Act, you're not wanting to hear about the real problems and I suggest you're not assuming the responsibility that you should.

MR. USKIW: Is the member not aware that that is not the traditional way in which legislation is processed through the House?

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I might be aware, but in the Throne Speech we were told that we're not following tradition and we've made a lot of changes throughout the year; only some changes apply but not others. Is that so?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JORGENSON: I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

#### MATTERS OF URGENCY

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that leave be granted to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the crisis caused in the agricultural industry throughout the Province of Manitoba, whereby the policies of the Provincial Government with respect to the Crop Insurance Plan appear to contradict the intentions of the Federal Government and the LIFT program; and further, that those farmers that have subscribed to the LIFT program in its fullest sense may now be denied the use of the Crop Insurance Plan, thereby losing all privileges of that program and the discount premiums that result from continued participation therein; and further, that those farmers will have to pay, in addition to their crop insurance premiums already paid, a further amount to the Federal Government PFAA Plan, effective August 1st, on all grain delivered during the period that they are not members of the Crop Insurance Plan.

MR. SPEAKER: I have considered the contents of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Beauchesne, 4th Edition, Citation 100 (2) states that "A definite matter of urgent public importance must be so pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention." The same citation goes on to state that "There must be a prima facie case of urgency." Subsection (3) of the aforementioned citation defines "urgency" as meaning "urgency of debate". My information is that the LIFT program was announced on February 27, 1970. If it did create an urgency for debate, it would seem to me that the time for it expired practically four months ago, on the opening day of this session of our Legislature, or at latest the following day, but certainly the period of urgency cannot be allowed to continue to this date, and particularly over a period of time wherein the rules provided for many ordinary opportunities for debate of all aspects of this issue.

The honourable member indicates that the proposed motion to adjourn is to discuss, and I quote, "a definite matter". However, he goes on to say, "that those farmers who have subscribed to the LIFT program in its fullest sense may now be denied the use of the Crop Insurance Plan." By the honourable member's own words indicating that an event may happen, lifts it out of the definite and places it within the realm of the indefinite. Therefore, I must rule the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell out of order.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, with all deference, I feel I must challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the Speaker's ruling sustained.

MR. GRAHAM: Yeas and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 21.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Speaker's ruling sustained.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Minister of Youth and Education. Had I voted, I would have voted "nay".

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. Had I voted, I would have voted in the negative.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, my question is for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he could indicate whether the government or he will be attending the proposed meeting of the Attorney-Generals by the Justice Minister to deal with the LeDain Report?

MR. MACKLING: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the government will be in a position to indicate its position with respect to the LeDain Report in this Legislature prior to the meeting of the Attorney-Generals on July 15 to 17th?

MR. MACKLING: I can't give the Minister any affirmative answer to that question -- the honourable member, I'm sorry.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate to the House whether the government has now formulated an opinion or a recommendation in connection with this report?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of policy.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Has there been any significant drop in sales tax revenues in the last one or two months as compared to previous patterns?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): I'm not aware of it, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any drop.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister or possibly for the Leader of the House. I wonder could he tell us what committees would be meeting during the next few days and, if he could, when we might recess.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I announced that this morning, that Law Amendments Committee will meet on Wednesday at 9:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask my question of the First Minister. I wonder could the Minister advise the House of whether the new Deputy Returning Officer of Roblin Constituency has been appointed as of now?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the First Minister or the Minister of Government Services be kind enough to give me his name when he is appointed?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is aware that that question is contrary to the rules. That information is available in a public document, the Manitoba Gazette. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, I guess to the Minister of Government Services as opposed to the First Minister in connection with this matter. I wonder whether either one of them could indicate whether the Returning Officers have either been revised and reappointed or new ones have been appointed as of this date?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Government Services)(Transcona): May I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend, who is learned in the law, that appointees are documented in the Manitoba Gazette, and those whose offices have been revoked and those that have been appointed were in the Manitoba Gazette of about a month ago.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that his question is out of order for the same reason as that of the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether he had a chance to read a front page story on Saturday's Tribune under the by-line of Mr. Val Werier which had glowing estimates to make of the agricultural situation in Manitoba and the prairies at the present time, and if he has any comment on that report? -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, may I direct another question then to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether he agrees that this may be one of the best years on record for export of grain from the prairies?

MR. USKIW: I think the honourable member is asking for an opinion. I might point out one significant. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member says he is asking for an opinion, and I'm sure he well knows that that type of question is out of order.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Agriculture for a reasoned assessment of the situation.

MR. USKIW: Well, I don't want to sound too pessimistic but it's true that there is a substantial movement of grain taking place at the moment and that things are looking a little brighter than they have for some time, although I want to point out to members opposite that we shouldn't kid ourselves; we're not likely to end up with more than four bushels per acre this crop year and therefore in balance it is the poorest year we've ever had.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Having established that report may not be all that good or accurate, has the Minister any information to indicate to the House that this same journalist was responsible for a recent major article in Time Magazine?

MR. USKIW: Well, I don't know. My honourable friend may have more time to read "Time" than I have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister who is answering questions for the Minister of Youth and Education who is absent. I was informed by a student from the University of Manitoba that bursary notification, those who successfully received them, are not being given out until September which is regarded as somewhat late. I wonder if the Minister responsible can inform us at what date these successful bursary recipients are notified, what the earliest date is?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister, I'm not aware that there is a problem here. If notice should be given earlier, I will certainly consider the matter and bring it to the attention of the Deputy Minister to see what remedy might be employed.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister then find out whether any students are being notified now?

MR. MACKLING: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'm wondering as an agent and having a vested interest, would I be able to present a Brief to the Committee on Automobile Insurance?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there's no more briefs. If you would have been present at the last meeting, you'd know the cutoff date.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, could I clarify the point that is raised by the Chairman, that. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member asked his question.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not on the Committee. I ask of the Minister of Municipal Affairs again.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member did. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. McKENZIE: Well could I ask the House Leader. . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: In other words, sit down.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he would be willing to investigate an alleged act of police brutality committed against a young man July 1st at Manisphere. His name is Nick Ternette.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any complaint that has been received by my office, however, I will make further enquiry to see if there has been any complaint. I'm not aware of any.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce and ask him if the \$6 million that he announced earlier this year which was to be loaned to Versatile has been loaned to that company?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the details of that particular transaction were tabled in the House and they are there for you and every other member to read. It's available for that company.

MR. JORGENSEN: My question was has the money actually been received by Versatile Manufacturing?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the company has not yet taken the monies but the guarantees and the point of view of the government still stands, the agreement still stands.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker - supplementary question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is he suggesting that the company has not taken the money or is it that the government has not offered the money?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it's the first alternative. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker...

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Bill No. 138.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering while I was on my feet if I could answer a question that was put this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave - I've already ... (Agreed) The Honourable Minister may answer the question.

MR. EVANS: Well this morning the Honourable Member from Crescent... from River Heights - I think they're adjoining constituencies aren't they, geographically. The Honourable Member from River Heights was asking a question with respect to the tabling of the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund.

Section 30 and Section 45 are pertinent in this case and they say in effect that not later than the 30th day of June in each the Chairman shall make a report to the Board, not to the Legislature but to the Board, on the operations of the Fund during the fiscal year ending March 31st in that year, and the Board shall then forward the report to the Minister who will in turn lay it before the Assembly, if it is in session, and of course if it's not in session, at the next ensuing session thereof. I understand that the Chairman or the acting Chairman has submitted a report to the Board, however, the Board of the Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund have not yet forwarded the report to me. I believe it's in the printing stage or close to it and as soon as I receive it that report shall be tabled in accordance with the legislation.

One other reply. A question was asked with respect to the hiring of public relations personnel by the Manitoba Development Fund. The Manitoba Development Fund has not hired or retained the services of anyone or any company with respect to public relations.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. The proposed motion of... The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 139, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill 139. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was making the point before we adjourned at noon that the new Landlord and Tenant Act is likely to be something that will attract people to this province. There are over 100,000 tenants in the Metro area and a lesser number in the rural areas of the province who are now given some rights under this new bill and who had virtually no rights under the old Act. We must remember that every year there's an increasing number of tenants. This trend is accelerating as urbanization proceeds, and therefore this Act is going to become more and more important as the years pass.

Perhaps Mr. Speaker, I overrate the importance of this bill because I've been very much involved in the process of its inception because I was fortunate enough to Chair the Committee which produced the report, the recommendations of which are pretty largely implemented by this Act. I realize that some members even in the government do not share my opinion regarding the importance of this bill. Their position is that changing the law will not substantially increase the right of the tenants; only an increase in the supply of housing through a massive

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.) . . . . public housing program will increase the bargaining power of the tenant in the market place. I would disagree with them to this extent. In the past when we've had period and areas of surplus rental units, the only consequence for tenants has been a month's free rent upon the beginning of a tenancy and some restraint on rent increase. This is largely the position in central Winnipeg today in the area of higher income rental units. The legal position of the tenant has never been improved in areas and periods of excess rental units. The tenant in law has remained virtually a medieval serf under the control of a medieval lord. He had no rights. He was still subject to abuse by distress by retaliatory eviction by violation of his privacy.

I believe that this bill is essential to guarantee a tenant some dignity and some legal rights. However, I would concede that a massive public housing program must accompany the bill. The Attorney-General made this point, too. Otherwise its provisions would have to be ignored in times or areas of housing shortage as happens with provisions of municipal health and safety by-laws today in Manitoba where extreme housing shortages prevail - and I'm thinking of areas like Thompson, The Pas, low income rental units in Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, this legislation unlike the British Columbia Act is not a carbon copy of the Ontario Act. The Honourable Member for River Heights this morning was implying that this government is in a number of Acts simply copying provisions of other Acts. Well this Act does incorporate the major features of the Ontario Bill but it goes well beyond the Ontario Bill or the Ontario Act. Under this Act, the new Manitoba bill, which will become an Act, the office of Rentalsman assumes a central position, a position of real importance and this makes it fundamentally different from the Ontario situation where Landlord and Tenant Advisory bureaus are optional and toothless, in fact, only two have so far been set up. None have been set up in the City of Toronto where there are two million people and where perhaps most dissatisfaction is to be found. The office of Rentalsman then established by this bill is the central feature of the bill.

I'd like to comment on the criticisms of the Acts made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. I'm a little intrigued by her rather morbid suspicion of the government which she expressed as she commented on the various provisions of this Act. First of all she criticized the committee procedure saying that we should have followed the same procedure as was followed with the Municipal Act. I might point out that the Municipal Act or the Municipal Bill took years and years to prepare. Our committee which examined the Landlord and Tenant Act produced a report after two months of hearings and meetings. Its recommendations no doubt were not perfect. The bill which is before you no doubt is not perfect. However, I believe, I'm convinced that it's still the best Landlord and Tenant Act, or it will produce the best Landlord and Tenant Act in North America. The Ontario Law Reform Commission had already done an exhaustive study on the Landlord and Tenant Act which is virtually the same in Manitoba as it is in Ontario. Our committee made hearings in the major centres of the province and had transcripts available of the City of Winnipeg hearings on the same subject. So I would suggest that we had a great deal of material available, both on the theory of the law and on its practice in the major parts of the province.

Second criticism of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was that the Rentalsman may be little more than a shoulder to cry on. I'm assuming that she is implying that the Rentalsman will have little effect, will be a - shall we say a toothless organization. I'm a little puzzled about what the position of the Conservative Party is on this question. Does it want the Rentalsman to have binding power to settle disputes even where there's no agreement between landlord and tenant? I'd like to find out. In establishing the office of Rentalsman, we've gone at least five steps beyond what the Government of Ontario did in passing its Act. (1) We have made the establishment of the office obligatory, not permissive. (2) The Province Assumes responsibility for setting up the office, whereas in Ontario it's an optional matter up to the municipality. (3) Binding arbitration of disputes is possible by agreement in writing between landlord and tenant, and since most disputes could be settled cheaply and quickly by binding arbitration of disputes I would think that a good many disputes would be settled by this method. (4) The Rentalsman in this bill has the power to hold security deposits. This gives the tenant an additional guarantee that his deposit will be returned. (5) The Rentalsman has a rent review function to stabilize rents. One of the major grievances of tenants is rapid increases in rent.

Third criticism of the honourable member was made with regard to security deposits. She felt that this was increasing the Minister of Finance's authority too much because he was given the power to hold deposits. However I would point out to her the fact that this is only one

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.). . . . of two options. The Rentalsman, the office of Rentalsman can according to the bill set up a special trust fund or a special trust fund can be set up within the consolidated fund. So I find her suspicion rather ludicrous. I don't. . . .

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, would the member entertain a question?

MR. JOHANNSON: Certainly.

MRS. TRUEMAN: The member stated that there were 100,000 tenants in the province -- (Interjection) -- in Winnipeg? If the security deposits - just as an arbitrary figure, half a month's rent was \$50.00 that would bring in \$5 million to be held in trust, wouldn't it? Now the interest on that would run to something like \$425,000 assuming you could get 8 1/2 percent. I would like to ask the Minister whether he feels that that sum would be necessary to run the Rentalsman's Department or is this then going to become a discriminatory task on renters only who will be putting money into the Consolidated Fund?

MR. JOHANNSON: You're directing that question to me are you? Or the Minister? There are, according to the Metro figures about 60,000 rental units in the Metro area. I frankly doubt that that much money will come into the hands of the office each year. I very very much doubt that this will happen because the percentage of people who are required to have security deposits right now would probably be less than 50 percent and - well we don't really know what will happen yet. However, the Minister can deal later with that question. I'm certain, or almost certain that not nearly that kind of money will be coming into the office in the form of security deposits.

On that same point, the member previously stated that withholding interest on security deposits is a new tax on the tenants, a discrimination against the tenant and the honourable member repeated that point just now. I really don't think it is because the Office of Rentalsman in establishing or in enforcing the provisions of the Act is going to be doing a great deal of service for the tenants of the province. He's going to be, in effect, providing rights to the tenant that the tenant at present doesn't have. So I think it is fair for the tenant to help pay for the running of this office through the interest on his security deposits. Now if the honourable member feels this is discriminatory against the tenant perhaps she or the members of her party could propose an amendment in committee to charge a fee for landlords too. This is up to the honourable member. I don't think the tenants will object a great deal to this provision, to the fact that they will not receive interest on their security deposits, because the major grievance so far has been centered on the fact that there's been difficulty experienced on the part of many tenants - and here I would disagree with the Honourable Member for Assinibola - there has been difficulty in getting deposits returned; the main concern of tenants is not so much getting interest on their deposits as a guarantee of the fact that they're going to get the deposits back at the end of a tenancy period.

The honourable member also said that there was a continuation of a trend, increasing ministerial power, hidden taxes, discrimination. This is the theme that runs throughout her speech, a very morbid suspicion of this government about the fact that we might abuse our power.

Fourth criticism: no eviction during the school year is a license for a school child to destroy. A landlord may have to provide welfare if a father deserts. It's unfair to the landlord. It's not the intention of this clause in the bill to protect a tenant who can be evicted for cause. This is not the intention of that clause at all. In committee I would think that we could amend that clause to exclude from protection a tenant who violates his responsibility for cleanliness and damage. The tenant in another clause in the bill is made responsible for cleanliness and damage and certainly not our intention to protect a tenant from eviction who violates this particular clause.

I would remind the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, however, that the bill does exclude from protection a tenant whose rents are in arrears. This tenant doesn't receive protection under the clause that we're talking about, so she need not worry about a landlord having to pay welfare to a family whose father has deserted. The bill simply prohibits eviction without cause of a tenant who has school children, during the school year. The purpose of the clause simply is to prevent an irrational disruption of the education of the children who happen to belong to the families of tenants.

A fifth criticism made by the honourable member: "In the discrimination clause of the bill no proof is required. All that is needed is allegation." This statement or this criticism is nonsense. This clause would be enforced in court where proof would be required. In fact the

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.). . . Act provides for penalty upon summary conviction which could only occur after an offence is proved in court.

A sixth criticism: "The right to sublet is withheld from those in low income housing. This is discrimination against those on welfare or on low income." Again, nonsense. A person who wishes to enter public housing according to the regulations of CMHC right now has to prove need and then pays a rent according to a percentage scale which rises as the income rises, and the housing authorities, whether the housing authority is municipal or provincial, must have control of the rentals of the public housing units; otherwise the housing authority would wind up subsidizing the rents of those who can afford to pay market rental. In other words, somebody who doesn't need public housing would otherwise be subsidized.

A seventh criticism made by the honourable member, and this criticism was also echoed by the Member for Assiniboia: "The notice for increase in rent means that a landlord may have to carry a rent increase for three months." I don't think this is really a serious criticism. The same sort of situation prevails today where a landlord may have to carry a rent increase for some time or until the tenancy period expires or until it's renewed. All this means is that the landlord simply adds on however many months property tax increase he's had to carry and he adds this on to the rent for the coming rental period which is usually a year.

An eighth criticism made by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge: "It does nothing to protect the good tenant from the bad tenant" - and I believe she mentioned protecting the good tenant against noise, against aggressive behaviour, damaging common facilities and harassment. However, these are still grounds for the eviction of a tenant and the landlord has both the power and the responsibility under this bill to protect his good tenants. In other words if a tenant is guilty of behaviour which is grounds for eviction the landlord still can evict him.

Ninth criticism: "The Cabinet will prescribe the lease by regulation. This is interfering in private affairs, the government has no business in the bedrooms of the nation; arbitrary powers; no appeal to the Legislature; dictates to landlords and tenants, no other Cabinet in Canada has this power; no compensation, no chance for representation by the people being regulated." That's a large mouthful. Again, the honourable member expressed a morbid suspicion that this government would misuse its constitutional powers. Let me make it absolutely clear, although I cannot understand how the honourable member could harbour such suspicions on this point, that the lease form or forms will be based upon the Act. The lease forms will be based upon the Act. They will not contravene the provisions of the Act, they'll not go beyond the provisions of the Act. This is the traditional and this is the unchanged function of regulations. We have no intention of changing this. The simple reason for prescribing the lease form by regulation rather than appending it to the Act was the fact that the draftsmen simply did not have time at present to produce it, to append it to the Act. If they had had time it might have been appended to the Act. The simple fact is that the draftsmen have had a huge amount of work to do because of the large legislative program and there were limits on their time.

Now the honourable member's criticisms are rather wild - interfering in private affairs, government has no business in the bedrooms of the nation. How this bill or how prescribing lease forms by regulation affects the mores or the affairs of the nation is beyond me. I really can't quite connect the argument with the fact that the government is prescribing lease forms by regulation.

Arbitrary powers. Well I might point out to the honourable member that both the British Columbia Landlord and Tenant Act which was just passed this year and the Alberta Act passed in 1964 provide for the carrying out of the provisions of their Act or of their Acts through regulation by Lieutenant Governor in Council. B.C. in fact allows prescribing lease forms by regulation, and if the honourable member cares to have a look at the B.C. Act I have a copy here. The wording is very similar to the wording of our Act. And I'm sure the Honourable Member for Rhineland would appreciate that precedent - we have the precedent of a government that is definitely non-Socialist - it's done exactly the same thing as we're proposing to do. The lease form or the forms will simply embody certain provisions of the amended Landlord and Tenant Act and of course at committee stage there will be representation on every aspect of the bill. If anybody is concerned or is as concerned as the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge about some of these clauses we certainly welcome their representation in committee stage.

Fifth criticism made by the honourable member - "the Rentalsman will be open to bribery and corruption since he has the power to determine damage and receive withheld rents." Again there's a paranoiac quality emerging. At present the City of Winnipeg and Metro determine needed repairs and landlords must comply and I've heard nobody accusing the City Health



(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd.). . . . Department of corruption because of the fact that they investigate the facilities of landlords. Innumerable departments of government at municipal, provincial and federal levels receive and hold money and generally there's no implication that they're possibly corrupt. Why is this one department which we're proposing to set up suddenly suspect? In all probability some of the positions in this office will be filled by civil servants who served under the former government. Are these people who served apparently without suspicion under the former government suddenly suspect of corruption? I really fail to see the logic of this.

Number 11 - an eleventh criticism - "The rent review function sounds like rent control, we don't know the guidelines of the board. Cabinet's regulatory powers another blank cheque, another serious invasion into private areas of people's lives." The definition of rent review is well known. I would suggest that the honourable member read Page 70 of the Interim Report on Landlord and Tenant law applicable to residential tenancies published by the Ontario Law Reform Commission. This contains a definition which I would suggest that the honourable member read. This bill does not provide rent control, which does exist in the City of Montreal and which the City of Ottawa has been seeking to establish. This bill is permissive, it gives the Cabinet authority to set up a rent review process, which by the way is favoured by all provinces and by the Federal Government. This was agreed upon at the recent Finance Ministers' Conference, so there is national agreement on the necessity of a rent-review function at the provincial level. This is the beginning in the fight against inflation.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake expressed a fear that we were creating duplication, creating a bureaucracy, and he's partly right. We are creating another government office, but we are attempting to set it up in a way that will minimize bureaucracy. We, for example, will probably be appointing part-time people in areas which don't require the services of a full-time person; we will probably try to utilize present government personnel and offices as far as possible and this office will fulfill a need which is not met properly now.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia had several reservations about the bill. He hoped that the section regarding no evictions during the school year would not apply to short-term leases. As I understand the Act it does, but I don't really understand his concern because the landlord will certainly have the right to evict a tenant who gives cause for eviction, so the landlord is protected to this extent; and the tenant is protected against an irrational landlord who kicks him out during a school year and disrupts the education of his children.

The honourable member was also concerned about the 90-day notice of rent increase, said he would prefer a 60-day notice and I really don't share his concern. He felt that the Attorney-General should consult with the industry regarding the standard lease form. This is of course up to the Attorney-General and his department when they do the work on drafting the standard lease form but the industry will certainly get its chance in Law Amendments to make representation on this point.

The honourable member was very concerned about the paying of security deposit to the Rentalsman, he couldn't agree to this, and he said that this had never been a problem in this city -- there had never been a problem with the payment of security deposits to landlords. Perhaps he's never had experience of problems in this area but it certainly has been brought to my attention in a number of cases. There are a number of cases where tenants have had difficulty getting back their security deposits at the end of a tenancy period.

The Member for Assiniboia also objected to a tenant being given the right to withhold rent and said that a tenant may unreasonably want his apartment painted. Now if the member has read the Act, and I assume he has, I don't see how he can be concerned about this point, because before the tenant can withhold rent he must ask the landlord to repair. If the landlord does not repair he submits the dispute to the Rentalsman, the Rentalsman must mediate and decide that the tenant's request is reasonable before the tenant can withhold rent. So how on earth can a tenant unreasonably demand a paint job if he has to go through this process before he can withhold rent?

The honourable member was also concerned about the building up of a bureaucracy in the office of the Rentalsman because of the fact that the Rentalsman will have received security deposits. I think he's being unreasonably - or I think he's being unduly worried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

MR. JOHANNSSON: Fine. I think he's being unduly worried about this. An office certainly will be set up; it will certainly cost something to operate it; one reason why we have

(MR. JOHANSSON cont'd.), . . . embodied the provision that interest will not be returned is to cut down on the bookkeeping and accounting detail, to cut down in other words on red tape so that the office will be less costly to run, so that it will be simpler to run.

The honourable member asked what we were going to do about Rentalsmen in smaller centres; I think he mentioned Neepawa, Dauphin, areas like this. If there are any problems in an area like those mentioned obviously a part-time person could be used. In fact perhaps a provincial government employee who performs other functions could operate part-time as a Rentalsman, if the job in an area like this is not a very large one. The honourable member also said that we were saying to industry "sorry fellows, we can't trust you," regarding the Rentalsman holding security deposits. He would prefer the landlord to hold the deposit in trust account and he suggested that we try this for several years. I think he's being unduly sensitive on behalf of the industry. The Act in some ways restricts tenants and in quite a number of ways restricts landlords and the tenant could equally say that we're telling them we don't trust them because we limit them in some ways. Also I would point out to the member that there have been problems since the passage of the Ontario Act, there have been problems with regard to return of security deposit. One of the major complaints, in fact, of the tenants in Ontario since the passage of the Ontario bill is the fact that tenants in many cases are not being returned their security deposits by the landlord. So we're trying to adopt a preventive measure.

The member also said that we are creating an expense for renters, for developers through red tape and that this would curtail construction of residential premises. I don't accept the logic of that; in fact under the old Act - and this is documented in the TED Report, in the Metro housing study of 1967, under the old Landlord and Tenant Act the private housing industry failed to provide for the needs of a large percentage of the population in this province. According to the Metro study of 1967 over half, over one-half of the population of Metro Winnipeg could not afford housing at the market price and would have to have some form of subsidized housing. So under the old Act the industry failed to meet the housing needs of the province, particularly of the Metro area. So changing the Act I don't think will curtail construction of residential premises.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'm very interested in finding out the position of the Official Opposition and I'd like to know where they stand on this Act. Are they going to vote for it or against it?

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I would like to introduce to the House a former member of the House and one time member of the Executive Council and now of Turkey, Mr. George Hutton. On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS (cont'd.)

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

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak on this very briefly. I do not intend to deal with it in the detail on this occasion, the detail in which the last speaker who was Chairman of the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations which dealt with the hearings prior to the formal legislation being drafted and to the committee's recommendation which was responsible for the drafting of this legislation. I don't want to speak to it in that detail but I would like to make some general observations and I think it has to be made at this time because it would appear to me that in committee we are going to have the opportunity of hearing some representations by varied groups who have particular interest in connection with the various sections of the proposed changes and who will be interested in trying to impress upon the committee their point of view and I think it will be necessary and important that there be an opportunity for their presentation and for review at that time by the committee of Law Amendments - and I assume it will be Law Amendments - of the various sections of the Act so that the changes that are proposed can be dealt with and explored more fully.

The Honourable Minister said does anyone really know what's going to happen and he referred to some particular situation here on this side where someone may have made reference to that and he said does anyone know really what's going to happen. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the question that one must pose with respect to the suggested changes and reforms of the Landlord and Tenant Act is really, does anybody know what's really going to happen? Now I say this

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.). . . . because there is no question there was a recognition by everyone that there has to be reform in this Act, like many other acts had to be updated and new legislation had to be introduced and changes had to be made. I'm not sure that the pioneering that the honourable member who last spoke suggested, is necessarily going to be accomplished with this Act because only time is going to be able to tell us this. I do say though, Mr. Speaker, that we have to consider a number of things when we review what is being proposed and some of the changes that are being introduced which are new to the North American continent and which will in fact be applied for the first time. The objective of reforming the legislation was to provide the tenants with increased rights and for them to have, in a very explicit way, a degree of protection that did not exist before or if it had existed before had been eroded by the manner in which some landlords, but not necessarily all, had in fact affected them by the operation of the arrangements made between the landlord and the tenant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we had a committee hearing and we heard a number of submissions at various parts of the province by a number of people and they presented, I think, different points of view but there was certainly a general agreement that reform should take place. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that what impressed me at the time and I think it's important and relevant to what I'm going to say now, was that it was probably better to have had a draft Act in front of us so that that Act could have been dealt with by those who in fact would have been appearing before the committee than to have had the kind of discussion and presentation that we did have sort of in a general way, because I think with a draft Act in front of them the individuals who were concerned and interested could have had some specific things that they could have referred to, either accepted or rejected or altered or amended and in this way would have made a contribution to the general debate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to see whether in fact the various groups who are interested and others are going to in fact come before the committee to be able now to deal with the specific legislation and to give us their point of view. Frankly I was surprised - while they were certainly very good briefs that were presented - I was surprised that there were not as many briefs as I had suspected would have been presented, particularly in the rural areas. I am not questioning the quality of the briefs that were presented, nor the recommendations that were forthcoming but I think in terms of numbers they were surprisingly small. Now this does not necessarily mean that there's satisfaction with what was happening in the past but I think it deals with the whole general concern of communication between government and the people in terms of legislation and the attempt to try and develop the kind of legislation that the public desires and in which there is a great concern.

There is nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, in indicating and showing leadership in the changes that have been proposed, but what we have to be concerned about is really what the over-all effect of what is going to be proposed is going to accomplish. Are we just accomplishing a better relationship between landlord and tenant? Are we just accomplishing a better result so that the landlord has a greater degree of protection or are we accomplishing an indirect result that the cost of housing and accommodation to many tenants is going to be increased by the very actions that are proposed in the legislation? And I defy anyone on the other side who can indicate to me that the cost to the tenant is not going to be increased if the proposals that are forthcoming are in fact introduced. It stands to reason by the very example, by the very example that the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge referred to in questioning the Honourable Member from St. Matthews - and assuming that her figures were correct and it is really as relative whether it was those figures or whether it was a smaller figure - that, in effect, if we are talking about deposits of two or three million dollars in the hands of - well he shakes his head but we have no statistical information on this - but if we talk in terms of deposits of a couple of million dollars or a couple of million dollars in the hands of landlords as security to them and protection for them of the investment that is now in the hands or has been placed in the hands of the tenant, one has to assume that if in fact there is going to be both difficulty, paper work and impossibility of handling the situation that is going to arise as a result of this, that the increased costs will be absorbed by the tenant. The landlord obviously, is going to have to insure that in the rental structure he receives that there is a great deal of protection for him to protect those eventualities which do occur because there should not be any assumption that landlords do not have problems, that investors, who are landlords and who operate in investment, who are interested in securing for themselves a return are not going to be interested and have not had problems in attempting to secure their investment and have attempted in the past to be able to measure and to be able to receive from the rent sufficient monies to cover

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . their costs. If one is familiar with the way in which a balance sheet of an investment portfolio in an apartment block is developed, one knows that you examine the income statements and you examine the expense statement, which include everything, and that you in fact assume the various costs of vacancies that must be borne into given situations because vacancy is a cost that is passed on - let there not be any misunderstanding on that - vacancy is a cost that landlords pass on to those tenants who are in fact remaining in their building and it's a competitive feature of the market that controls to a certain extent how they pass that on. It is a cost and we should accept that it is a cost.

Similarly if in fact there are going to be increased costs to the landlord as a result of his inability to protect himself fully for those situations that do arise, where in fact his accommodation can be altered or defaced or in any way lose its value or cause him an additional expense and he has not good protection because he does not have the security, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the landlords then will simply amortize the costs that they require for the monies that are necessary in the increased rentals. You are in fact going to have an increase in the over-all rental structure in this province as a result of what's being introduced. Mr. Speaker, if I'm incorrect I would hope that we'll have the opportunity to have some of those people who have been in the rental field for some time and allow them to make a presentation and allow them to have the opportunity to be able to indicate to us how rental structures are arrived at by investors and how costs are apportioned and how they're determined, what they're attempting to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there's another bill that has to be mentioned and it has to be understood in the Manitoba context, and I'm one who has some familiarity in this field because I've been involved as a developer for some time and I know the difficulties of being able to secure sufficient mortgage money to be able to carry out commercial projects in the housing field. There has always been great difficulty in Manitoba, greater difficulty than in eastern Canada, certainly much greater difficulty than in Ontario and probably with the exception of Saskatchewan in terms of the prairies Manitoba is the most difficult place. There are a number of reasons for it, Mr. Speaker. It had to do with the state of the economy; it had to do to a large extent with the lack of planning undertaken by the city during its earlier years and even with the unsure position for investors at the time that Metro was introduced and in addition, I would say in recent years to a certain extent because of no real definitive policy with respect to the urban renewal programs that have been proposed, which I recognize cost a great deal of money but nevertheless have, I think, had its effect on many investors who have examined Manitoba and have found that it would probably be wiser that their portfolio be limited rather than expanded here.

When I talk in terms of investors I am not now talking about the commercial investor who builds the apartment block, I am talking about the mortgage company who in fact finance it. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what their position will be on this because they did not make any representation before the committee when we appeared and I'm not even sure that they'll necessarily come forward when we have this in committee. I do not know this but I suggest that for those who have some experience in this field and for those who may come forward who represent these companies that we have to scrutinize very carefully what they will say with respect to what we're proposing. I'm not suggesting that reform in itself will frighten investors away; that's ridiculous, it will not. I am suggesting that we are pioneering a couple of things here - the objectives of which I'm not quarreling with, but I'm not so sure necessarily that the proposed structure is correct or the proposed formula is correct. It would seem to me that we would have to look very carefully and be in a position to examine with caution the statements of those that will come forward, because, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is this, that mortgage money has not always been available for investors in this province. It is not readily available and I would suggest that anything that is going to make it difficult for the continued investment by private individuals and private corporations in the housing field will be to our disadvantage. There's just no way that government can enter into the public housing field and meet the needs and requirements of accommodation for our people or for better accommodation. There is certainly a need for public accommodation and I'm not quarreling with that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, probably the greatest need is for a major change in the mortgage policy of the Federal Government in connection with housing and probably what is really required is a greater revision there than has been contemplated so far or even been proposed and so far this has not been forthcoming. As a result we have to be in a position to encourage private investment and investment by the mortgage and financial institutions in the continued development

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . of housing accommodation for our people and encourage investors to be in a position for profit, to be able to develop the housing and apartments and accommodation which will be available for those people who are not in a position or who desire to become tenants rather than have ownership or the pride of ownership.

This again, Mr. Speaker, does not suggest that there does not have to be reform. This does not suggest that the opposite to what I suggest is no reform; I'm not suggesting that at all. I think that the Act was long overdue, is being corrected and amended and added to and I think that this is a proper action on the part of government but I'm not so sure and I'm not sure that the government can be really sure that the proposals that they're bringing forward today are going to, at the same time, accomplish the result without having the indirect effect -- this I'm sure about the indirect effect -- this indirect effect that rental structure in Manitoba will probably go up with higher increased costs simply because of the paper work and the provisions that have been made and secondly that we may put ourselves in the position that the investment companies will not be prepared to invest in Manitoba. Now I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in addition to my experience in developing in Manitoba I have had the opportunity of developing in apartment buildings in Saskatchewan and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the members on the other side may be very unhappy about what I'm saying and I'm not saying this in terms of a political harangue at this time but I think they should know that the investment community side-stepped Saskatchewan for a great deal of time and were very concerned about much of the legislation that existed with respect to the problems of landlords on the basis that their security, that is the security of the financial companies who are involved, the mortgage companies, was in jeopardy or could be in jeopardy as a result of the legislation. Now I'm not suggesting at this point that we have it here but I am saying Mr. Speaker, that there's a relevancy to this if in fact we have the representations forthcoming at the time that we have the bill before committee and I would think and I would hope that at that time if people are forthcoming, or people come forward, that we'll have an opportunity of being able to examine it because the truth of the matter is for many years, Mr. Speaker, it was impossible, it was impossible to be able to get private funds to build apartment blocks and housing accommodation, that is rental housing accommodation in Saskatchewan to a certain extent because of the concern of the investment companies as to what was going to happen next, and in addition to the laws as they then existed and the procedures followed at the time by the Saskatchewan Government. I don't think that it's the intent here on the part of the government, I don't think that they would want this and as I suggest Mr. Speaker, there's just no way in which public monies are going to be in a position or sufficient position, at least, to be able to be invested to develop housing to be able to meet our requirements.

So Mr. Speaker, in terms of the principles of the bill, that is in terms of general agreement that the bill itself is entitled to be heard and in turn that there is agreement that we are entitled to go to committee so that in fact we can adequately deal clause by clause with the sections that we are in a position to then deal specifically with any proposed amendments that we may introduce and to also deal with the representations of the people who may appear before us, that may very well be the answer that the Member from St. Matthews wants. In any case it would appear to me that this bill should be supported on that basis. But there are danger signals and anyone who suggests that there are not in this would be rather foolish.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Call Bill 115, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. Bill No. 115. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to take part in the debate on Bill 115, An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act not because I represent a constituency that's concerned primarily with the mining industry but rather because I'm convinced that the mining industry is likely to be the industry which produces a great part of the wealth of our province in the future, and as such is an industry which should be of great concern to all of the members of this Assembly. I feel that this bill is a very significant one in that it provides for an important increase in taxation, provides a significant amount of additional revenue to the province. The Minister has indicated that he would estimate it to be perhaps \$2 1/2 million and it may be that before January 1, 1973 is reached that the amount of additional

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . revenue which will accrue to the province will be in excess of \$2 1/2 million and perhaps more in the nature of \$4 million.

I'm rather interested to know, Mr. Speaker, why a bill of this importance, a tax change of this amount should be introduced at this stage of the legislative process. It seems to me that the importance of the tax change should have indicated and perhaps given it somewhat higher priority on the list of bills that have come before the House and it might have been quite reasonable to expect that this tax change would have been part of the budget as presented earlier in the session by the Minister. I'm wondering if it is a decision reached rather recently that such a change should be made, that it is occasioned by some change in the amount of revenue that the Minister is now budgeting to receive throughout the balance of the fiscal year and whether the revenues are in fact falling somewhat short of the projections as they were made at the start of the period.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question? Are you not aware that I said that the effect of this would not be until next fiscal year?

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do recall the Minister making this reply to the Honourable Member from Riel. However, I wasn't able to check the remarks in Hansard and I will hope that they will be available before the beginning of the next session tonight. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, there is some reason to question why at this period in the discussion of legislation, there should be a bill introduced which would have a significant effect upon the total revenues for the future of the province and I'm wondering if the indications from the experience again to date would suggest that perhaps the projected increase in revenue from corporation and personal income taxes in the province and from other sources, that there might be reason now to make some adjustments of these forecasts. There's no way really of making this decision or to say definitely whether or not this is a factor in the introduction of the increase in the royalty taxation for the mining industry. But it does, Mr. Speaker, suggest that not only will the tax produce an effect upon the revenues but it may have an effect upon the broadening or otherwise of the tax base in the mining industry and for this reason I think that it's one that deserves very careful consideration. There are two really basic effects. One is to increase the present royalty tax scale from the present 6 percent on the first million and 9 percent on 1 million to 5 million and 11 percent over 5 million to 6 percent on the first 50 thousand and 15 percent on the balance of mining income. I'm sorry - the Minister is shaking his head.

MR. CHERNIACK: If you'll permit it, I can do it in the form of a question. Are you aware that 15 percent would be applicable on the total income if it exceeds 50 thousand?

MR. MCGILL: The Minister explains that the 15 percent will apply on the total mining income if it does in fact exceed 50,000. These increases, Mr. Speaker, are of interest to the whole Province of Manitoba because of their effect on the broadening of the tax base and I think the Minister will agree that where an industry indicates that it has potentials for greatly increased revenues to the province then it would be important to provide some kind of incentives for the area in which the industry is located and also for the industry itself because of the possible expanded future tax that . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . draw to the honourable member's attention that it's 5:30. He may be able to continue at the next sitting. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Monday evening.