

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, May 14, 1970

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have with us 15 members of the 70th Girl Guide Company, Atlantic and Andrews. These guides are under the Leadership of Mr. Pfeiffer, Mr. C. Sinclair and Mrs. Desnarais. This company is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this evening.

And also before we proceed I wish to make two observations which I hope honourable members will keep in mind and thus contribute towards the maintenance of the quality and orderliness of debate at the highest level. Both deal with the matter of tabling of documents. Firstly, it is an accepted rule that all letters when read must be signed and they become part of the documents of the House. I refer honourable members to Beauchesne, citation 158, subsection 3.

Secondly, the point of order that a member should lay on the table a document which he quotes, should be taken when reference is made to the document. Again I refer honourable members to Beauchesne, citation 159, subsection 5. I have no doubt that honourable members will be mindful of the aforementioned in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, could I just ask a question? You say "signed". Signed by the member submitting them; or signed by the person writing them? -- (Interjection) -- Okay.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we adjourned at 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I was on a theme of one - in this Bill 56 on second reading which I related to the House, that justice must not only be done in this Bill but we must see that, as members of the Assembly, that justice is done. And with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on that theme.

I, during the supper hour, was lucky to find a couple of insurance agents who like myself will be unemployed as this Bill is implemented through the House, in some form or other; whether I go out and get a job with the NDP or whether I go and get a job with my friendly member from St. Boniface, I'm not sure, but nevertheless I'm one of those that's involved.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): . . . you always bragged about your store.

MR. MCKENZIE: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is one that involves small people. I'm a small person, I come from a small village. I'm a small insurance agent and I appeal to the Minister who is persevering with this Bill, to take a look at small people like me, and there's many of us in this province who are involved in this particular Bill.

The people of Wawanesa today met the Minister on compensation. What was his message? No compensation for Wawanesa. So as I appeal to you tonight, Mr. Speaker, I submit that I'm not going to be compensated either. In fact who is going to be compensated? And I hope the Minister will give us the formula, the data, how you arrive at it. Do you have to be an NDP to be compensated? I want it on the record on this Bill before . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Not till I'm finished if you permit me the time. But I am most concerned, Mr. Speaker, in this debate about compensation. The Minister has already laid it into the record that compensation will be one of the aspects of this Bill. It's not in the Bill so we're at the mercy of the Minister and this government, who in my opinion at times I think are ruthless, and many times that they're selfish. I don't think they have a heart, Mr. Speaker. I haven't seen a heart in my days on this side of the House. In fact I would even say they may be were gutless. It's a terrible thing to say but nevertheless -- maybe spineless would be a better word, Mr. Speaker. But on that Bill, on the aspects of compensation, I ask the Minister to stand up, put the formula on the table and how are we going to be compensated? How are

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) the people in Wawanesa, 50 houses are going to be vacated in Wawanesa. Mortgages on them, sewer and water already put in; Portage la Prairie. How about these - the Red River Mutual - Altona. They've never been brought into the debate. There's another community that will be affected by this Bill. What's going to happen to these communities? What's going to happen to the Old Folks Home at Wawanesa where they've got a mortgage? What's going to happen to the school at Wawanesa that was opened, what? Monday? Half a million bucks went into a school down there; there's debentures on the line. What kind of compensation are they going to get, Mr. Speaker? I'd like in second reading of this Bill to get the answers to these many many many questions that's been created through this type of legislation which is something that wasn't even anticipated in the province.

Historically - it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, you know, the basis of the economy of this province and Canada is competitive free enterprise. This is the way we're born, this is the way we're raised, this is the way we've lived. This is where we are today, we've got the best bloody place in the country to live and we got it under free enterprise - competition, free enterprise. That's the society in which I base my hope. I've lived by it and I like it. I don't want to be anything else but a Manitoban and I'm sure there's a lot of people tonight as they go to bed wonder where they're going to go with this government, Mr. Speaker. Where are they going to rest their head a week from tonight? Where are they going to go? Where are they going to get a job? Nobody's going to get a job in this province, Mr. Speaker, as long as that government sits over there. Who would want to live in this province under that jurisdiction? I'm serious. Some of the ministers are laughing.

I don't pretend that the system is perfect. I do not stand before you tonight and pretend that it's the best of all and that it is not perfect. I only contend that we've had good results in this system over the history of this province; one hundred years yesterday. It's given us a standard of living I think that we are all enjoying, Mr. Speaker. It's one that I like to see. I like to have my family grow up in this province and I think it's preserved for some of the things that I cherish, freedom. And as a consumer - where do we go now when this type of legislation goes through, as a consumer? The consumer has no protection any more in this province under that legislation. Absolutely none. He's at the mercy of this government, Mr. Speaker, at the mercy of this government, because consumer legislation no longer means anything if the powers are granted in that bill which they're asking for in this Bill 56. Of course as the Minister has said, you know the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if we don't like it we can go some place else. He said that. If we don't like it . . .

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The honourable member is making reference to an alleged statement which was never made by myself. I would ask that he withdraw it.

MR. McKENZIE: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, he didn't hear it the way I heard it, but that's the way I heard it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the honourable member withdraw that statement. It is untrue. He knows it is untrue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order, please. I just happen to have citation 126 subsection 1 of Beauchesne which reads as follows: "If a member desires to ask a question during debate he should first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request the former cannot insist, even if he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat and then he may ask leave to make a statement or he must wait until his turn comes to address the House." -- (Interjection) -- Not unless the matter should be so grave as to constitute a breach of privilege, but anything short of that I would suggest that the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . on the point of privilege which was raised by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I suggest the ruling is that if the matter constitutes a point of privilege then the member can rise at any time; I believe a point of privilege takes precedence over any other point. The honourable member made a charge that the Minister of Municipal Affairs said something which the Minister of Municipal Affairs denies. Either the member must prove his charge or he must withdraw it. Because it's a serious charge; it's not a misrepresented - it's a charge that the Minister of Municipal Affairs said that anybody that doesn't like what we are doing should get out of the province. -- (Interjection) --

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the medium today that we're exposed to and all the press releases and trial balloons that's going up outside of this House, all kinds

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) of remarks are being said, Mr. Speaker. And you can't document it. I heard it that way - I'm sorry if I interpreted it wrong I'm sorry, but that's the way I heard it.

MR. PAWLEY: This matter must be dealt with; it must be dealt with directly.

MR. SPEAKER: I heard the honourable member say that if he interpreted the Honourable Minister's statement incorrectly, he is sorry.

MR. McKENZIE: The statement on compensation. The statement, we can't help it; if you lose your job, too bad. You know, too bad. This is supposed to be the government of the people. Little guys, look after the little people of this province, a guy like me who's a little guy from the country, said they'll look after people, you know, this is the great new philosophers of the new world. People - they don't know what people exist, Mr. Speaker, which is most unfortunate. But nevertheless I interpreted the remarks on compensation on these grounds, "If you don't like it, go get yourself a job some place else." Now if the Minister thinks he didn't say it that way, that's the way I heard it, and there's a lot of people in this province got the same theme that I got - If you don't like it, . . . you know, go and do your own thing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in free competition among car insurance companies. That's the best regulator that we got of fees in this province. How can you stand before me and you're going to regulate the fees of an insurance industry? How can you? We've got competition of the best brains of insurance in this country. Now he says he can do it better. Okay. Fine. We'll live to see the day maybe he will, and if he does I take my hat off to him. But perhaps, perhaps you know the reason, and I think this is where the minister is being - he's got so wrapped up in that Saskatchewan Plan of 1946 - that's a long time ago, a long time ago, and Saskatchewan as I said earlier in my remarks, in 1946 is not Manitoba in 1970.

Well let's move on, Mr. Speaker, and we'll get off that theme and move into some other things that I have on my desk here. I'm wondering where the Superintendent of Insurance of this province enters into the debate. Has the Minister consulted 'him any place along - or has the government consulted the Superintendent? Have they even seen some of the documents that he's got? Have they read some of the statistics that he's got? I don't know. You answer the question. He wasn't called at the hearings. I wasn't at the hearings myself but I understand that the Superintendent was not called to the hearing and I'm wondering - and we'll get the answer no doubt from the minister - I'm wondering what's the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance who is the guy that stands up and defends people like me, little people, who is our safety valve in the industry. What happened to him in Saskatchewan? Where does he fit into the compulsory scheme in Saskatchewan? Maybe the Minister's got the answer. I haven't got it. I'm asking him, or is he going to be left out in left field where he is today and all these matters will be dealt by Cabinet or a quorum of Cabinet? I'm not getting any answers, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Do you want us to break the rules?

MR. McKENZIE: No doubt they will be forthcoming. I well understand. But I am concerned, as I said earlier, about the community of Wawanesa who were here today, appealed to the Minister and even debated with the Honourable Member from St. Boniface . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Debate is not the word.

MR. McKENZIE: Oh, I'm sorry. There's another word, I don't know . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: They asked to see me and I saw them and discussed this with them. There was no debate.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, of course, it's rumoured, Mr. Speaker, you see, that he's going to be the Chairman of the Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I've been wondering for the last two weeks who's going to be the chairman . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I can fix that rumour right now, if you want, Mr. Speaker. I can fix that rumour right now if you want and then you won't have to lose time on that one.

MR. McKENZIE: The way he's waffling and the way he's walking the fence, there's got to be a deal, and I don't know what it is; but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he's going to be the Chairman of this great corporation; and he's the guy that's going to tell us what our rates are going to be. He's the guy that's going to tell us whether we get claims back. He's the guy that's going to tell me I'm going to get compensated. Maybe there is some hope because he was a Liberal at one time and maybe there is a hope, maybe there is a hope that we will get some compensation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, make up your mind. You want me coming or going, don't you?

MR. MCKENZIE: If I can't appeal to the government, I think maybe there is a humane person over there; there is one.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, come on, do you want me to lose my job? He gives me a job and he takes it away from me.

MR. MCKENZIE: I also heard -- I was lobbying in St. Boniface last night, and you know, when I got over there they said, have you met Larry's lobby, Larry's lobby from St. Boniface. This is the group that I've got to meet. We'll get a lot of answers from this Bill. Basically what concerns me, one man, Mr. Speaker, in this province, is going to make the decision whether we have this Bill passed or not. He's riding the fence, he's . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, that's unfair. I have one vote, the same as my honourable friend. It's all right for people outside of the House to speak like that but I don't think it's fair coming from my friend.

MR. MCKENZIE: He's entitled to his own opinion, Mr. Speaker, on those remarks but I've also heard him make a couple of speeches in this House and he said he's holding the balance of power, so I humbly submit there's got to be a deal between him and the First Minister; there's got to be a deal. There's wheeling and dealing going on here which is not fair to the citizens of this province. There's got to be, and he's holding the balance of power.

MR. DESJARDINS: When did I say that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPIVAK: The Honourable Member from St. Boniface and the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs rose on alleged questions of privilege. I would refer you to Beauchesne 113 and I would suggest that a dispute arising between two members as to allegation of fact does not fulfil the condition of Parliamentary privilege, and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was out of order in standing up in the debate at this time. The honourable member should be allowed to continue the debate. Questions can be asked of him but there are no privileged matters at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I heard the Honourable Member for St. Boniface put a question to the Honourable Member for Roblin; the Honourable Member for Roblin took his seat which obviously indicated to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that he was prepared to hear the question put to him. The question had been put to the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Roblin may now proceed.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Member to repeat the question -- you know, I didn't hear it. You know all the din that's coming from across there. So if he'd be kind enough to repeat it I'll try and answer it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the same point of order that the Honourable Member for River Heights spoke of. I think that members certainly have certain rights. To make a statement that I said that I had the balance of power, is untrue. To say that I was promised a certain job is untrue, and I think that I could correct that right away. I certainly don't intend to leave anybody with the opinion that this is true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest that any right that there may have been to that point of order was lost some time ago and let us now . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . now, Mr. Speaker, . . . thank the honourable friend to tell me when I said that I held the power of debate in this thing, the power in this House. I'd like to tell my friend to quote and show me when I made that statement. I'd like to know where he got the . . . ask him if he wants to tell me where he got that rumour that I was getting this job.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I submit I got the same rumour in St. Boniface at the Pea Soup thing last night about him heading the corporation, that he's got the balance of power. They're saying it right in your own constituency. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm assuming that the people -- (Interjection) -- Well, no doubt the debate will continue on this theme, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for St. Boniface will stand up and quote, and correct this rumour that's going around this province. But it is rumoured that he's going to head the corporation -- (Interjection) -- Well, he'll have his day to answer, Mr. Speaker; he'll answer in the debate and we'll get the name of who's going to head this corporation. So what -- but I'm going to be out of a job, see, and that's why I said, Mr. Speaker, that I hope I could be friendly with him, you see. -- (Interjection) -- That may be -- well, I haven't got an NDP card, you know.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, let's get on to the theme. And I humbly submit that we are

(MR. McKENZIE con t'd.) elected representatives of this province from north to south and east to west and we're supposed to be in here to sit down and talk about the problems of this province in a knowledgeable and intelligent manner. And I humbly submit to you, Mr. Speaker, we're not doing it on this Bill 56. This is not an intelligent or a knowledgeable manner to handle an affair of such great issue as that. And I say, let's sit down; let's sit down with the Superintendent of Insurance. Let's sit down with the industry. Let's sit down with the agents. Let's sit down with the people from Wawanesa. Let's sit down with the people from Altona. Let's sit down with the people from Portage la Prairie. Let's sit down with little guys like me that's going to be out of a job over one little bill, and this great government of this province were talking people's legislation; I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, they're not for people at all. And I'll close my remarks with the same remark that I opened it with, Mr. Speaker, and I say, justice must not be only done. As members of this Legislature, we must see that justice is done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a few questions?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, not one of them loaded lawyer questions.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I'm seeking information, Mr. Speaker, from a person who informs us that he has knowledge of this industry. How many people does he know who earn their entire livelihood from the sale of automobile insurance in Manitoba?

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's a fair question, and I'll tell you the reason. Supposing I lose half my income, supposing I lose 25 percent of my income, supposing I lose 50 percent of my income, I'm losing. Now whether you want to put it in that term or you want to say I'm out of work, I say I'm a born loser. And all the agents in this province today -- (Interjection) -- right. Under that bill we're all losers. There's no way, and he has, the Minister today has told the people of Wawanesa "no compensation." So I humbly submit the agents are not going to get any compensation either.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the next question is related to the answer to the earlier question. The honourable member indicated that he was out of a job - and I'm really concerned about him - aside from the job in this Legislature, so I'm very much concerned to know, would he care to indicate what sort of a proportion are we talking about that a person may lose in his livelihood out of the sale of automobile insurance alone. Now, the honourable member obviously doesn't have to answer, especially if he feels that in answering he becomes a born loser. I wouldn't like him to feel that.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, this is what I thought would be in this report. Those kind of answers. It's not there. Absolutely nothing. This committee went around this province who were supposed to give us some information. What's in there? A loaded gun. Why ask that? They're supposed to bring the information back to the House. I submit it's a blank; it's nothing.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, then I will ask a question direct to the honourable member. Is it true that if this bill goes through he will be out of work, and I'm quoting him when I say that.

MR. McKENZIE: Fifty percent of my time is spent for insurance, so I'm 50 percent out of a job.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now that we've got that, and if the honourable member doesn't have to answer the question -- no, no - my next question. Is he saying that 50 percent of his income is directly attributable to the sale of automobile insurance?

MR. McKENZIE: I don't think that's a fair question. Mr. Speaker, I think that's -- no, that's right. This is one of those loaded lawyer questions which we get across here all the time, and I'm not a lawyer, and, of course, anybody in this House that wants to stand up and talk to a lawyer he should be a lawyer; unfortunately I'm not. But I'll tell you, I'm an agent that has given great service to my customers. If somebody phones me at 3:00 o'clock in the morning he's got an accident, I'm on the scene within half an hour. I throw my clothes on and I'm there, because my client's in trouble. He may be have a problem, want to get a . . . coverage or something - I go out to his place, or his farm or to his home, and we talk business. So I humbly submit that half of my time is looking after the client that I have as policy holders that I represent. And what's it worth in dollars and cents? After all, service is more important than dollars and cents to me as an agent, and I represent a company who provide service, the best service that this province has ever had, and I'll continue to do that until the day that they sink.

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

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member accept a question from me? Is the honourable member, who says that he will not be able to do anything because he doesn't have an NDP card, is he aware of any body shop operators in his constituency who are not receiving work because they hold NDP cards from existing companies?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, that's a question that I could give a long answer to because I see letters going out already to those that are holding the privilege of selling licence plates. And this letter, in case you have seen one, is a loaded gun. You know - well . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . answer the question.

MR. MCKENZIE: You asked the question and if I can't answer it I'm sorry, but I'm seeing it in a theme where it could -- I'm not saying it might be, I'm saying it could be political the way that questionnaire is going out to these people that are being told, "you are being phased out as of a certain date," and no doubt it's going to be advertised in the local paper and then the position will be decided by . . . and what happens from there on, if it's going to be carried on the same theme as that bill, Mr. Speaker, I'm scared.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the member obviously didn't understand me. I wonder if he'd let me repeat the question. Is he aware of any body shop people in his constituency who are not getting work from companies which the member represents because the body shop people hold New Democratic Party cards.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, under the present insurance scheme, as an agent, I have no jurisdiction who gets the body work. I have none. That's done by the adjusters.

MR. GREEN: I'm asking the honourable member whether he is aware of any members of his constituency involved in the body shop business who have been denied work because of their association with the New Democratic Party?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, if you'll give me two weeks I'll go and do a survey and I'll come back with the answer.

MR. USKIW: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would permit a question, and it won't be a lawyer question. Would you permit a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. USKIW: Yes. Were have you taken up residence since the House convened on March 12th?

MR. MCKENZIE: Would the member please repeat the question. I was talking to Mr. Bilton here.

MR. USKIW: Where does my honourable friend hold his residence at the present time?

MR. MCKENZIE: The Village of Inglis.

MR. USKIW: The Village of Inglis. Can I assume then that you commute every day from Inglis to Winnipeg to attend the session of the Legislature?

MR. MCKENZIE: Not every day.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one more question? If I was your client and I had an accident in Roblin today, how would you serve me today?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, isn't that the most interesting question? And I'll answer it. You know what? This afternoon I had two phone calls. Two accidents. I have staff there to look after my place. But nevertheless -- no, no -- and that's my good wife; that's my good wife, and give her all the credit. She'd like to come in the city here, but nevertheless she's back home there. But nevertheless, on that theme, I had two phone calls this afternoon from people that I represent as their agent on accidents. And they want to know how to go about it, what to do. I gave them the answers - the problem's resolved. It happened this afternoon. Within two hours they had the answer. As an agent, I provide that service.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member a question. If the bill goes through, who do you suggest the people should call at 2:00 or 3:00 o'clock in the morning?

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, that's -- you'd have to take your pick over there and I don't know who'd answer the phone call over there at 3:00 o'clock in the morning.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): If nobody else wishes to enter into the debate, I'll move, seconded by the Member from Ste. Rose, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 65, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 65. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, from time to time there have been various questions raised, particularly with regard to the Northern Task Force and the recommendations and what the government is doing. I notice that the Member for River Heights and other members, even after this bill was introduced, persisted in suggesting that the government was not taking action on a report that had been submitted to the Legislature not long ago.

Mr. Speaker, when I first became responsible for the Commission of Northern Affairs, as it should be most properly designated, I think it was within a day or two that I met with a group of people who I think were attending a conference of the Indian and Metis people at the Y. M. C. A., and I met at that time with members of the Manitoba Metis Federation. And from that moment on, Mr. Speaker, right through to this very moment, and particularly through the hearings of the Task Force, it became my impression, and I don't know whether this is necessarily a correct assessment, but nevertheless it became my impression that whatever else happened in Northern Manitoba with respect to its isolated communities, that there had to be a different social situation which was created in those communities in order to make the people feel that they were not merely pawns in somebody's game and that they had indeed something to say about their own affairs and particularly something to say about the affairs in their community.

My understanding, Mr. Speaker -- and I'm not at this point making any criticism. I was as new to the situation as I'm sure other people were. But my understanding is that the Department of Northern Affairs was commenced as a means of handling stop-gap situations in various northern communities. The members of the House should understand that there are certain unorganized territories within the province of Manitoba. The organized ones are governed by municipal councils. Some of the unorganized ones are governed by local government districts which have advisory councils, and the last group, that is the area which is even too sparse or too widely separated to be considered as a local government district lumped into the area of northern affairs, and they are governed, by a designated Commissioner of Northern Affairs. And the existing Commissioner of Northern Affairs Act provides that the Commissioner of Northern Affairs -- and I am now paraphrasing; I'm not quoting the Act -- in effect has all the rights, duties responsibilities, and powers of a municipal council. And, Mr. Speaker, wherever I went and that includes Norway House, it includes meetings with the people in Winnipeg and includes meetings at Ilford, at Thicket Portage, even in Churchill which is under a local government district, and at other isolated points in northern Manitoba, I kept hearing the criticism that the Commissioner of Northern Affairs has dictatorial powers -- much as is now being suggested by members of the Opposition the Cabinet will have, relative to automobile insurance, and it's significant, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with this bill at this time, because the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, which position was held by two of the predecessors of mine that I can remember -- one was the former Minister of Labour and Municipal Affairs the Honourable Mr. Baizley, the other was the Honourable Mr. Lyon -- I knew them not to be dictators as far as I was concerned. They were sincere, thinking MLAs elected to the Legislature to do the best that they could for their constituencies and for the departments which they handled, and I never regarded them as the legislation stated their position to be; that is, that they held all the rights, powers, duties and responsibilities, etc., of a municipal council in those designated areas. But the people, Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly, read the legislation and said that this is what these people can do, and one of the major changes that is being made with regard to this legislation is to indicate that the power rests with the people but because legally there is no organized district, that the exercise of these powers must be handled through a designated person who is the Commissioner of Northern Affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't look to that as being a very revolutionary section. I don't think that it changes much. But I think that from the point of view of the people who live in these communities it means a great deal, because it is intended to demonstrate to them that no individual -- and I know that neither Mr. Baizley nor Mr. Lyon nor myself wishes to have powers over the people in the isolated communities, and the change in the legislation is

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) intended to reflect that this is a legal enabling power rather than a power over the lives of the people in those communities.

But this particular step, Mr. Chairman, would not achieve a great deal without what is contained in the rest of the bill. Because under the Commissioner of Northern Affairs Act, legislation as it now exists, there is power similar to what is contained in local government districts to choose advisory councils, and the advisory council advised the local government administrator. Under this Act, Mr. Speaker, what we are intending to do is for essentially community purposes to have the council as being the authority, provided a council is elected in accordance with regulations, and I hesitate to use that word lest it be suggested that now I am seeking dictatorial powers even though we are attempting by the regulations to provide a means for the people to be able to deal with their own affairs, but provided elections are held in accordance with certain regulations, which will be specified and it has to be flexible, Mr. Speaker, because each community is different and the boundaries of the communities are different and they are not organized territories that insofar as these councils are elected in this way, it is intended that they will have community powers, and the first power that it's intended that they will be given is that they will be given uncontrolled power to do whatever is within their discretion to do with regards to the unconditional grant that is now given to the Commissioner of Northern Affairs or now given to the Local Government Districts. In other words, the unconditional grants which every municipality in Manitoba is entitled to will be given to the Community Council to deal with as they see fit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see certain dangers in this type of legislation, but in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, they are welcome dangers because I see no difficulty at all in saying that the people in the isolated communities have just as much right to make mistakes as the people in the Municipal Council, as the people in Metro Council, or as indeed the people in this Legislature or the people in the Cabinet, and I am quite satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what mistakes they make, I will be able to demonstrate that members opposite, or even members on this side or members in Municipal Councils or Federal Government people, have made just as bad mistakes. So I don't see why the government should be the least bit concerned about these people having the right to be just as wrong as we are sometimes. This is the intention of this legislation and I believe, Mr. Speaker, although I can't verify the statement, I believe that this is unique legislation to Manitoba and possibly unique legislation to Canada, in that it is now intended that in these isolated communities there will be a recognized body for communal activities, that this body will have power to deal with those funds which are unconditional grants, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope as Commissioner of Northern Affairs to gradually shift budgetary provisions directly out of the Commissioner's hands into the hands of the councils of the isolated communities.

Now, I don't wish this to be misinterpreted, Mr. Speaker. It is still intended that the Provincial Government have a responsibility for programs in isolated communities, and despite what the community council says, just as the Provincial Government has responsibility in the City of Winnipeg or in the City of Portage la Prairie or in other municipalities, the Provincial Government will continue to have responsibility in these communities, will continue to spend money in these communities. There will be a provincial budget under the heading of the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, but it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to try to shift some of the budget that the Commissioner now has to the isolated communities, with the hope that they can demonstrate, Mr. Speaker - and my hope is that they will demonstrate - that they will do a better job of planning programs within their own communities than can be done for them by the civil service of the Commission of Northern Affairs or by myself.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the intent of the legislation. The intent is, first of all, to make community councils mandatory, not discretionary, if the people want them. If they don't want them the commissioner still has the responsibility to those communities. I am happy to say that we are working in this direction now and many of the communities have elected community councils and there appears to be a great deal of success in this.

It is also my intention, Mr. Speaker, to provide within this legislation for a convention of community councils to be held once or twice a year, and at this convention there would be delegates from each of the community councils which would meet together. There will, by the way, be a de facto meeting, it's not de jure meeting, in Winnipeg on June 2nd where representatives from the community councils will be meeting in Winnipeg, discussing this legislation and discussing the kinds of things that are made possible on it, discussing the way elections

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) should be held and matters of that kind.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is also intended that the Provincial Government will have the same responsibility and the same powers with respect to community councils as it now holds with respect to municipal governments. That is, if a community council is demonstrably acting in such a way as to require, the Provincial Government can place a trusteeship on that particular council to see to it that it operates correctly. And I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that this is not particular to community councils. I know that they would be very angry if this was a power that we are seeking to impose on them which is not imposed with regard to other councils, but the same situation is true with regard to municipal councils and it's merely intended as a supervisory function such as is exercised right throughout the Province of Manitoba, and it is not intended to be exercised any more frequently or with any less desire to avoid exercising the powers as is now done with regard to a municipal council where it's very seldom used.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is, and I to that extent have invested a little bit more of myself into this legislation than I have with regard to other legislation coming before the House. Most of the other legislation that I've had the honour to introduce has legislation which has been brought forward by previous governments or which has been found necessary by administrative procedures of the government. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is something that comes, first of all, as the result of the initiative of the people in the area; secondly, as the result of the work that was done by the Northern Task Force and all of the members who contributed to it, and this is directly in line with the recommendations that have been made by the Northern Task Force. I hope, Mr. Speaker, and I say this very humbly, I hope that it also reflects the kind of thing that I myself would want to do with respect to any area over which I had a power of making any decisions, so I feel very happy about being able to bring this legislation to the House in this way. I want to also indicate that the legislation is not the answer to the problems of the isolated communities in northern Manitoba, but it is, Mr. Speaker - and I heard the words used earlier today - it is the sine qua non - it is the what I believe, nothing else is important if this will not be done, that there are no economic gains, that there are no developed mental programs which will be meaningful if the people first of all don't feel that they have an involvement in their community. So this is not the end, but I believe that it is a good beginning.

We will eventually be coming to the estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and at that time I will be able to add more fully how we hope to put meat around this legislation, the legislation I regard as a skeleton. I believe that now the legislation has to be nourished and it has to be given the muscle to enable the people to make it work, and one of the things that is now happening in the Department of Northern Affairs is that we are adding to the department which has hitherto been merely an operations department. There's been a commissioner with operational staff. We are adding to the department a community developmental arm, and just how this will be developed will depend to a great extent on the advice that we receive from the head of this community developmental arm who will be responsible for making recommendations as to just what additional input is necessary in order to make the community councils work, because in addition to saying that there is a great need for the people in isolated communities to have a greater say over their own affairs, and to feel that they are participants in the decisions that are affecting them, it was also indicated to the Task Force and to me personally that the power to do these things will be meaningless unless there is the type of in-training assistance to the community councils that will enable them to function properly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate to the House that this particular piece of legislation is something for which I hold high hopes. It is a departure from the systems that have been adopted in the past in dealing with isolated communities. It's what some people would say is a great risk, but Mr. Speaker, I would say that it would be riskier not to do what we are doing, because the only risk that we are taking is to give people a greater opportunity to make the kind of mistakes that I will undoubtedly make in my position or that any other Minister or any other elected representative will make in his position, and that is, Mr. Speaker, the risk of democracy itself, a risk that we cannot afford but to take. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: May I ask a question of the Minister? How does government control the unconditional grants? Is it fair to ask him at this time, or would you rather leave it to a later date as, far as the . . .

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the unconditional grants are now paid to the Local Government Districts or to the Commissioner of Northern Affairs. The Commissioner of Northern Affairs is now de facto, acting in such a way as to try to get those grants to the community councils that now exist. This legislation is intended to create a formal situation to that effect.

MR. BEARD: . . . perhaps I didn't phrase it right. How do you arrive at the amount per capita?

MR. GREEN: The unconditional grants, I believe, are set -- last year they were moved from \$3.00 to \$8.00 per capita, per person. They're just acts of discretion. I don't know whether legislation goes with it; I'm not sure; but I know that the government has not this year increased them, and we've heard lots about that from the other side, but the fact is that the government decides what unconditional grants will be paid to municipalities in the estimates of spending.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 66, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 66. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second Readings. Bill No. 67. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 67, The Privacy Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm very appreciative of the opportunity to explain the provisions of Bill No. 67. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to make it a civil offence for any person to violate the privacy of another unless he is either specifically authorized by law to do so or has a legitimate self interest. In recent years, the public interest has been aroused by what appears to be a significant increase in the number of incidents of invasion of privacy by industry, government and other agencies or persons. Perhaps the most celebrated case was the intent of the American automobile manufacturers to investigate the life and past history of consumer crusader Ralph Nader, who had been unkind enough to point out the unsafe condition of their product. Fortunately for Mr. Nader, nothing embarrassing was turned up despite the use of sophisticated, investigative techniques including, I am sure, electronic surveillance methods. Nevertheless, he was subject to an invasion of privacy which might have resulted in extreme harm to his reputation and to his worthwhile causes.

Other examples of violation of privacy by officers of the law were revealed in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, where a lawyer alderman disclosed in City Council that telephone conversations between persons held in custody by the police and their lawyers were being tapped by the Police Department. Apparently this shocking violation of a person's basic rights was condoned by the Chief of Police of that City.

Another incident of invasion of privacy took place some time ago in British Columbia, involving several unions, a private detective, and it was alleged also the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In that case, a dispute had arisen between an established union and newly-formed competing union which, it was alleged, had appropriated funds belonging to the older union. The two groups were engaged in jurisdictional struggle for the allegiance of certain workers represented by the older union at the time of the formation of the new union. A representative of the established union, in an attempt to discover the strategy of the new union's leadership, and in order to learn how best to regain what it had lost, took steps to have the hotel and conference rooms of the union's officers planted with devices for voice recording purposes during a convention held by the new union. The listening device was discovered but no action could be taken or was taken against the union or its detectives, as an unlawful act had not taken place. Although many people were rightly upset about the invasion of privacy involved, nothing could be done to deter further offenders or stop similar action.

As was determined in the Commission of Enquiry established in British Columbia to examine this incident and to generally look into the whole question of the invasion of privacy, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police involvement does not appear to have been unusual. Ultimately the Commissioner presented a report to the British Columbia government. In that

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) report he cited many examples of surveillance or eavesdropping, some of which he felt were reprehensible and others were mentioned to which he did not object. The Commissioner placed most emphasis on a practice in Vancouver by a car sales firm, of placing listening equipment in a cubicle or offices used by their salesmen and by customers considering the purchase of automobiles. The trick used by such clever sales firms involved leaving a potential customer and his companion, if any, in a small, apparently private cubicle to discuss between themselves the offer made by the firm, without their being aware that by means of electronic devices their conversations were being overheard by the sales manager of the firm. The information gleaned from such conversations was put to valuable use by the sales manager in the price bargaining process.

The Commissioner's investigation revealed that other businesses in Vancouver, including health clubs and dance studios, used inter-com devices to eavesdrop on conversations and the activities of customers and employees within their establishments. One of the most glaring invasions of privacy, Mr. Speaker, is the widespread use of espionage techniques in industry, both to steal new processes and techniques developed by rivals, and to gain information the timing of new products being put on the market, as well as other similarly useful facts. While, upon proof of the theft of secret processes and intentions, the responsible party may be subjected to an action for damages or criminal prosecution, the mere obtaining of information useful in a strategic sense will not necessarily be actionable in court. Under the common law, which is deficient in the area of protection of privacy, many violations of privacy could not be prevented and no damages obtained for the loss, embarrassment or inconvenience suffered by the persons spied upon. For example, there is apparently no remedy available where a person's likeness or name is exploited or used by others for commercial gain. A recent Ontario court case has held that a professional football player had no recourse in respect of the unauthorized use of his photograph for advertising purposes. As well, there are other areas where no remedy lies for violation of privacy.

Under our common law system there is no right to privacy unless that right is recognized and enforceable by application to the courts. In a very few number of instances the courts of England and Canada have protected some aspects of a person's privacy but in order to deal adequately with the problem, some comprehensive addition to the law is required. Such legislation does exist in two other provinces, namely the Province of Quebec and British Columbia; the latter province having enacted its legislation after the report by its Commission of Enquiry into the invasion of privacy.

Present day concern over invasions of privacy has significantly increased, probably because of publicity given to incidents involving spying and eavesdropping, some of which have been mentioned, and because of the drastic expansion in the electronic technology which can enable anyone with a modest amount of money and time to investigate, tape conversations or keep persons under surveillance almost at will. Some of these devices are extremely sophisticated and for all intents and purposes, undetectable. The experts will readily attest to the ease with which these instruments can be installed and used and their effectiveness. In the hands of the wrong people, information gained in this manner can be used with devastating effect to blackmail persons or destroy reputations, as well as to give the user an unfair advantage over the person whose private affairs or thoughts he has learned.

The government has decided to make any persons who substantially, unreasonably and without claim or right, violate the privacy of another person guilty of committing a civil wrong against that other person and an action for violation of privacy will be actionable without proof of damage. This will mean that merely upon proof of the violation of the plaintiff, he will be entitled to damages and need not prove any financial loss resulting therefrom.

More specifically, it will be a civil wrong to violate the privacy of a person by surveillance by any means including eavesdropping, watching, besetting, spying or following, by wire-tapping or recording telephone conversations or by using a person's name or picture without his permission for advertising anything for the purposes of gain or commerce.

-- (Interjection) -- Not at all. I want to confess that I have a broad mind when it comes to mini-skirts. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'd take a broad view of that . . . The plaintiff will be entitled to ask the court for damages and injunction, an Order for Accounting of Profits from advertising using the plaintiff's picture or name and an Order commanding the defendant to turn over to the plaintiff anything obtained by the defendant as a result of the violation of the plaintiff's privacy.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)

In spite of the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, the government does recognize that there are several instances where some form of invasion of privacy or surveillance may be necessary, especially in the realm of public order, the fight against organized crime and similar circumstances. To this end it will be a defence for a policy officer or public officer conducting a lawful enquiry to show that he was acting in the course of his duties and that the violation was not disproportionate to the seriousness of the matter under investigation, and further that the violation was not committed in the course of a trespass. As long as the peace officer was acting in the course of his duties and was not thereby committing a trespass, he could wire-tap, eavesdrop, and spy without fear of civil action .

Provision is also made to provide a defence to a person acting under the authority of a court or of any law in force in the Province of Manitoba which includes federal law. I want to depart from my prepared text here for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that the Federal Government in dealing with the question of wire-tapping is considering the enactment of specific legislation dealing with this subject matter which would have the effect of making it an offence to use any electronic device for listening or interceding communications, unless that interception was carried out by police forces after application to a Judge of the Court for permission to attach such listening devices. It is also . . .

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Minister would permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: Well perhaps after the conclusion of my remarks . . . there may be a number of questions.

It is also our intention to allow the continued use of sophisticated investigative techniques where the defendant did so for the purpose of protecting his lawful rights of defense of property or person or any other lawful interest of the defendant. This defence should still allow one spouse to hire a private detective to investigate the amorous activities of the erring spouse, and allows employers to investigate their employees where theft of company property is reasonably certain to exist. The bill also takes an important step by rendering such unlawfully obtained information useless in court by making the evidence inadmissible in civil proceedings. This will help discourage the use of invasion of privacy techniques.

There is one matter, Mr. Speaker, that is not dealt with in the bill that we have before us and that is the confidentiality and accuracy of credit ratings compiled on individuals for the purposes of consumer credit. It is our opinion that this matter is of sufficient importance and complexity that it should be embodied in separate legislation which should be forthcoming as soon as possible. I might say that considerable discussion and considerable effort has already been preceded in respect to legislation in this field. Controls are necessary in this area to prevent the injustices and financial ruin that sometimes results from the improper publication of credit files and from the often hastily prepared and grossly inaccurate assessment of individuals. I think some of the honourable members will recall reading in popular weekend magazines the effect, the devastating effect of some of this misinformation that is being supplied by reporting agencies with terrifying effect on the persons affected.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we live in an age where it is all too easy to utilize a sophisticated technology to remove the rights of an individual. We tend to forget unless constantly reminded that real progress cannot be measured in dollars and cents but in the quality of life that a society has to offer. Surely in a mass urban society it becomes even more important to protect a person's privacy. Mr. Speaker, I think that honourable members will realize the extent to which our privacy can be jeopardized. I want to assure honourable members in this House that I have had a concern, a personal concern in respect to the degree of security in this building and for this reason I have had occasion to have checks made of the telephone lines and systems within this building and these checks and processes are continuing. I have received information to the effect that the condition of the lines and the status and the evidence that was indicated was that this building, if it had not already become the subject of surveillance by unwarranted parties, was in such a condition that that was very, very likely. In short, the security was terrible. Lines could have been tapped, or may have been tapped, it's hard to tell, with relative ease. This sort of thing is an invitation to difficulty. I have also asked that other buildings, other important buildings be checked, because as some of you know, these devices have been employed in much more sophisticated and organized centres to the east of us and certainly south of us in our great neighbouring -- well more sophisticated in some degree in technology. So it's been with some concern that I've approached this problem of security and I'm

May 14, 1970

1967

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) receiving the full co-operation of the Manitoba Telephone System and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in respect to this security check.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure honourable members that this is a very very important and timely piece of legislation and I commend every member of this House to give it his wholehearted support, his and hers.

. continued on next page

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

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question? Would you say that the surveillance TV's as employed in department stores and other stores would be an invasion of privacy for the customers in those stores?

MR. MACKLING: If the surveillance techniques were employed in the washrooms I think that would be inappropriate.

MR. CLAYDON: I'm talking about citizens - customers walking down corridors within the sales area we'll say - the surveillance, being watched . . .

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the honourable member that even before the introduction of the closed circuit TV a good many merchants have used mirrors and like devices so that they can better check on security within the store, within their building, and this is quite valid and quite legitimate. But where these devices might be located in washrooms, I think this would be going too far.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he would tell us would criticism of elected officials or representatives cease under this legislation?

MR. MACKLING: Can you repeat that.

MR. PATRICK: Would criticism of elected officials or representatives cease under this legislation?

MR. MACKLING: Oh no, never, I should hope it never would because democracy would be dead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to interrupt the Minister when he was speaking, but he quoted at length from a document. I wonder if he would identify that document he was reading from?

MR. MACKLING: Well I had extensive notes because of the particular references of exact information that I dealt with.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell me if this bill will protect the mating polar bears from the nosey Minister of Mines and Natural Resources?

MR. MACKLING: That would be extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Would the Minister accept another question? If we pass this bill, will this mean that members of this House will have private lines in their homes from hereon -- telephone lines?

MR. MACKLING: I think that's highly desirable but that's a matter that you have to deal with with my honourable colleague the Minister of Finance who reports for the Telephone utility.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BILTON: . . . question, Mr. Speaker. I notice that under this Act the peace officer is reasonably well covered in carrying out his duties in all parts of this Act. I wondered how it would affect an informer?

MR. MACKLING: Well if the informer was trespassing or was using a device which had the effect of spying or intercepting communications then he would be subject to a civil action of privacy.

MR. BILTON: Even if he might be doing it at the direction of the police?

MR. MACKLING: Indeed.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, if no one else cares to speak, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 49. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 49 the Postponement of Elections in Metropolitan Winnipeg Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's a very short Act and it's in accordance with the statement that was given in the House earlier during this sitting of the session in respect to the

(MR. PAWLEY Cont'd) . . . postponement of elections for members of council and for school board within the Greater Winnipeg area. This is in view of the intended restructuring of municipal government expected next year. The areas, the municipalities, the school divisions in question are all listed in the bill itself and the bill is quite self-explanatory and the purposes are well known.

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

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 53. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 53 The Resource Conservation Districts Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation that I think is long overdue. It's something that this country should have had from the very beginning of it's development in order that we may have prevented the vast mistakes and errors of judgment in development which have occurred over the years. I think it is only common sense that we ought to plan the development of our resources to the best use and best advantage. This Bill will enable us to consider all the factors of resource development, all the ramifications of resource development and in that light enable us, Mr. Speaker, to more properly and more beneficially to the community of Manitoba we will be able to develop these resources. We are talking about a number of resources in this bill: land, water, forest, wildlife, and of course the vast recreational value or potential that we have within our natural environment.

The question arises how can this be achieved in this bill. You will notice that there is a methodology which should, I would expect, achieve to a large extent these objectives. Through the setting up of resource districts on a municipal basis, we provide the mechanism through which we can properly develop each area of Manitoba. You will notice in the bill that each district that is established will set up a five man board to develop a plan or scheme, two of which shall be members of municipal council and two members at large appointed by the municipal authority and one member representing the government of Manitoba. I think, Mr. Speaker, that last point I made is very important because we have to look at resource development from more than the local point of view; we have to appreciate the provincial input into the plans and the schemes that are developed throughout the various districts that may be established across the province.

It's my assumption, Mr. Speaker, that there is not going to be a major stampede towards the development of these resources in the planned fashion under the district concept but I'm hopeful that we might get a good start and that we are indeed on the right approach towards the development of these resources.

The aims and objectives of the Board, Mr. Speaker, of course will be to promote conservation, control and use of resources, conserving - in other words, controlling, developing, protecting, restoring or using of any resource. These will all come under the terms of reference of any board that is established within any given district. The Board will have the power to develop these plans and schemes; they will submit these to what is known, you will notice in the Act, as the Commission, another Board, a provincial board set up, which is defined on Page 17 of your bill. The Commission will peruse the scheme or plans and indeed perhaps help in the development of them and make recommendations to the Minister for approval. I just want to stop, Mr. Chairman, for a moment here and requote from Page 17 the membership of that commission which shall consist of: "Members from the Department of Agriculture, members responsible with respect to the administration of Crown land, wildlife resources, water resources, municipal affairs, the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and not more than three other persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. So you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is broad representation of both technical and lay people on this commission that would be charged with the responsibility of helping to develop these plans and indeed to assist the Minister in making his decisions with respect thereof.

The provisions insofar as financing goes, Mr. Speaker, are pointed out in the bill, provides for a limit of five mills on rateable property within a municipality for any project undertaken. Also there is provision which is not defined but subject to standards established

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) . . . through regulation, provincial grants would be available at some point; also provincial technical assistance will naturally be forthcoming from all the departments that have an interest.

Mr. Speaker, these are the main principles of the bill. I know that there will likely be a lot of questions dealing with technical points contained in the bill, but I think at this point I would just leave it at that and hope that we get the pertinent questions put before me from the members opposite. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Would the Minister permit a question? I notice that the committee has five members. Would there be good representation from northern Manitoba on that?

MR. USKIW: Is the honourable member referring to the Commission or the District Board? Well maybe, Mr. Speaker, I might clarify the point. A district board will consist of five members, two of which will be municipal councillors, two will be appointed by the municipality and one will be appointed to represent the government of Manitoba on a district board. Now I think the question that you have brought to my attention has to deal with the commission itself which is the technical body which is appointed by myself. --(Interjection)-- That's right.

MR. BEARD: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister accept the responsibility to see that northern Manitoba is represented on that Board? And I'm not asking for a job.

MR. USKIW: I think that's reasonable, Mr. Speaker. I don't know just right now what the make-up would be in any case but I think that's a reasonable recommendation.

MR. WATT: I wonder before the motion is put, if I could direct a question in the light of the questions that have been asked of the Minister. I wonder, does this legislation then apply to areas outside of organized municipal areas, since it is enabling legislation providing municipalities with the right to establish conservation districts?

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure that I can hear my honourable friend.

MR. WATT: I am asking the Minister if this legislation does provide for the establishing of such areas in the north, or that it would permit representation from membership from the north, when it does in fact, I believe, just apply to - well it's permissive legislation establishing municipal districts to be set up for conservation purposes.

MR. USKIW: This is right, Mr. Speaker. This is simply enabling legislation. The initiative will have to come from local authority, where there is local authority.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 50. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. CHERNIACK: May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Stand.)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 72. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 72 an Act to amend the Executions Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this Act although some several pages really makes very minor changes to the existing Executions Act. It makes provision for a bailiff to carry out the functions of a sheriff where that is indicated as possible in serving process of the court and so on. It also strikes out the words "The court of Queen's Bench" where that's referred to in the Executions Act and substitutes the words "any Court", so that it's clear that a sheriff or bailiff can carry out an execution from any court. The Act, therefore, because of the addition of the word "or bailiff" requires a fairly large number of sections to be amended to make that change. The only other substantial change in any way, shape or form is that presently the extent of the exemption under the Act has been limited to \$1,000. This is the basic exemption of personal property or real property which may not be attached by execution process under the Executions Act. This basic exemption it is recommended be increased from \$1,000 to \$1,500, and I heartily suggest that the Act receive our support.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 77. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. CHERNIACK: May we have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker? (Stand).

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 78. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 78 an Act to amend the Summary Convictions Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Well Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very short Act. I was hoping the honourable members wouldn't be so loud in their chorus of 'explain' because --(Interjection)-- it is worth explaining; it's a very short act but it does involve at least one significant change in a section of the Act, The Summary Convictions Act does list an extensive number of sections of the Criminal Code to which the Summary Convictions Act applies, and it's indicated that the procedures or the provisions of these sections of the Code apply mutatis mutandis in the Summary Convictions Act, and this is merely the additions, merely the addition of one more, of an extensive catalogue of sections in the Criminal Code which would --(Interjection)--I'm getting some static from the rear, Mr. Speaker. I'll be happy to go into that. That's a very involved explanation for the Honourable Member . . . so far as possible - I will explain mutatis mutandis to mean so far as possible, Mr. Speaker. I'll have you know that's a \$10 Greek, Latin word, expression.

Mr. Speaker, the only other principle involved is where it is possible or where an Act provides that the Justice of the Peace or the Magistrate may impose a fine, in addition to - well in the alternative for a period incarceration, then the magistrate must indicate to the accused person that they have a right to pay the fine over a period of time. It has happened in cases that where there was a fine imposed, it wasn't indicated to the accused person that they did have a right to some period of time in which to pay the fine. It is generally accorded and it's considered to be more equitable that people have the opportunity to pay the fine over a given period, and certainly makes good sense, because there is no merit or justification for putting people in jail simply because they don't have the money at a particular time, any given time, and giving them slightly more time in which to pay a fine is a commendable and - well a very desirable improvement in the provisions of justice. So again I commend these very small amendments although important in principle to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, on Page 4. The Resolution of the Honourable First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate on that particular resolution in order to check back on the reports that had been made in previous years by this committee and I find that both of them were incomplete. I recall two years ago when I was a member of that committee that we had Mr. Joe O'Sullivan prepare a report, but I think it was never completed, at least during the time that I was on the committee this was never completed. I did not attend last year's committee meeting because I was not on the committee, and secondly I didn't find time at that particular day, so I don't know what discussions took place, but from the report I gather that the report has still not been completed.

I certainly endorse the situation of re-establishing the committee and hope that something will be done and finalized so that we will have a report the next time around, and something on which action can be taken.

I notice that more or less the same people are on the committee this year that were placed on it last fall except for the Member for St. Boniface who has been replaced by the Honourable Member, I don't know his constituency -- Shafransky -- the Member for Radisson has been put on it now --(Interjection)-- No I certainly have no objection whatever. I'm quite happy about that. I do hope that when this report by Mr. O'Sullivan, or other reports are made, that copies of these reports are made available to members of the House and not only certain people, so that we can gather the information from it that we need.

Other than that, Mr. Chairman, I certainly will not hold up the proceedings in this regard.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the honourable member that just spoke on this resolution, I wish to tell him that Mr. O'Sullivan and his committee did finally complete their report. It was sent to the committee a few days or a few weeks before the start of the session. I think this was mentioned before when the report was filed and because of that some of the information that we have - we sent some kind of a questionnaire to the different professional associations asking them for some questions. This has been done, we received also the McRuer Report from Ontario, all the members were given a copy of this, and it was felt that as soon as this committee is named, when it starts to function, it should proceed a lot faster because it has this information now.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Industry and Commerce. Resolution 62. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, is the Honourable Minister intending to reply to the questions and statements that were put to him before? If so, I'll sit down at this time.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there were a number of statements and questions put to me before, but to my recollection I answered all of them.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make an observation about the comments that the Honourable Minister has made in connection with his estimates, and about a statement that was made in connection with the TED report and his conclusion that it was an irrational report - I think I'm using his terms - the conclusion that it was an irrational report.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I did not say it was an irrational report.

MR. SPIVAK: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the words would show, and this is a question of debate between the Honourable Minister and myself, and I do not have the particular section here, but I believe that he said it, and used -- described the report as irrational. He also made reference -- well, Mr. Chairman . . . --(Interjection)-- As a matter of fact, . . .

MR. EVANS: I referred to it as a very poor attempt at economic planning. I referred to the TED report as a rather, as a grab bag of various suggestions, many of them worthwhile in themselves, but a collection of miscellaneous suggestions respecting many many industries in the province, but as such it was a very poor substitute for a significant substantial economic plan, but I didn't call it -- I don't think I ever once referred to the TED report as being irrational per se.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll accept now the Minister's remarks. I may say that I think there'll be an occasion in this debate for me to refer back to his words and to read them back into the record. I do not think he is quite correct in suggesting that he did not use the words "irrational".

I may say that one of the things that surprised me in connection with his statements both here and in the other debate -- and by the way the debate that I'm referring to is not in the estimates, I forgot now. The debate I'm referring to when he talked about the TED report was in the budget debate in which he made his contribution, and he's shaking his head in agreement, and I don't have that particular debate in front of me, but in the budget debate I think the words "irrational" were used. It was not in his estimate statement. He says no, but I believe I'm correct in my assumption. One of the things that concerned me was what was bugging him - in other words, why is the Minister so concerned at this particular time in connection with the TED report, it's recommendations. It's pretty obvious that the government has ignored it; it's pretty obvious that they bring it to bear in an argument if it has some value to them and they ignore it with respect to other matters.

I would say that one of the real problems, Mr. Chairman, is the question and the target that was set up by the TED report with respect to population, because there's no question that the achievement of the population target without which Manitoba will not be able to achieve a per capita income equal to the average of Canada as projected by the TED report by 1980,

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . becomes almost an essential ingredient in our ability in this province to be able to develop and to grow and to be in a position to at least remain in the middle, halfway between the worst in Canada insofar as our economy is concerned. Now this is what TED has projected and I see no evidence being suggested by any of the honourable members on the opposite side that in fact there is anything other than this projection to be attained by Manitoba in connection with this economic activity. Now TED suggested a population growth which took into consideration the net gain of births over deaths, stopping interprovincial migration, and providing for a steady immigration into the province of approximately 7,500 per year for the next ten years. Now this was based on the assumption that there would be sufficient job formations in Manitoba to be able to provide the jobs for the people who were entering the labour market, fresh; to be able to provide for the jobs for those people who in fact have been touched by technology and in fact had to be retrained and had to be upgraded, to be able to provide jobs for those people who in fact would be coming to live in Manitoba, because those who would be coming in to live in Manitoba from outside of Canada, those who would be remaining would in fact increase our population, and the escape valve that the Honourable Minister referred to as the, safety valve at least, which has helped balance our labour force, would not have to be put in operation and we would not have to have people leaving this province as the pattern has been in the past and still be in a position to attain for our people a rise in incomes that would be sufficient to at least put us in a position of being in the middle of Canada.

I would suggest that the Honourable Minister's statement in connection with the TED report and the refusal to accept as a target the 33,000 jobs in Manitoba is a recognition of the fact that this is, first, as I suggested before, a very difficult and onerous task; it requires intensive leadership, it requires intensive thrust by the government in economic development, and that at this point having rejected the TED findings and not being prepared to adopt that in any form as a document of any economic planning and being prepared to at least try and now work out their own development plans, that we have had a position taken now of simply a moratorium on economic development and economic planning until they have made up their minds what they think they can achieve; and during the process of this what is going to happen in Manitoba, and it's borne out by the fact, is that people are going to continue to leave month by month from this province. This is what is happening in Manitoba - and the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce knows this to be the case. And they're leaving because there are no jobs provided in Manitoba, and they're leaving because in fact their prospects for jobs in Manitoba in the future are not there. The reason that they're not there is because private enterprise - because that's who are going to provide the jobs - private enterprise is not investing in Manitoba to the degree that will justify those who are entering the labour force from the high schools and from the technical schools and from the universities to be able to find the job opportunities that are needed. So I'd like the Honourable Member to indicate to us why he does not believe the TED targets cannot be attained; why does he not believe that it's possible in this province to be able to stop our out-migration? Is it not possible for us to come down to a zero net out-migration in terms of interprovincial migration? Is TED's target a suggestion that we can have as many people moving from other provinces into Manitoba and as many people moving out not attainable? Why is that so irrational? Why is it irrational to believe that we cannot provide enough job opportunities for at least a steady pattern of 7,500 new people coming in, because we know that if in fact we can provide those job opportunities that the general consumer level will increase. We know as well that we will be able to provide the increased skilled labour force to attract those industries which require numbers, and in turn we know as well that we can create more dynamic economy. I would be interested in hearing the Minister's remarks on that, particularly with respect to how he rationalizes that position with the prospect of several hundred and several thousand people being affected by the actions of the government in connection with the auto insurance. Because I don't think any member on the other side will suggest that the government in any way is going to provide the number of jobs, nor will it have the salary or income figure in terms of wages, that the present industry now provides for its people, it just will not happen. What I would like the Honourable Minister to be able to tell us is how he expects Manitoba to grow if in fact we are not going to stop out-migration, if we're not going to have immigration, and if the government is going to conduct its program of affecting and nationalizing industries who are now in fact causing employment without the government itself providing at least an equal number of jobs for those

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . people who are going to be affected.

Now the interesting thing is that in all the questions that have been asked the members on the opposite side, there is not one individual that can tell me or tell members on this side how many jobs are going to be affected, because with all the economic planning that the new Minister of Industry and Commerce is now undertaking he hasn't determined how many people are going to be affected; he doesn't even know, and frankly he's not even interested. --(Interjection)--Oh yes, I want to tell the Minister of Finance, I suggest he's not even interested. Because if he was interested at least he'd be . . . --(Interjection)--oh, he may be interested in an academic way because we know people are affected by technology and therefore in effect these people are affected by technology because the government is going into the automobile insurance field.

I'd like the Honourable Minister to indicate to this side of the House, how he expects to be able to accomplish the results; keep our people in Manitoba, and stop them from moving, bring new people into Manitoba through immigration, provide sufficient job opportunities and at the same time carry on a program which directly affects the lives and jobs of people in this province who will have no alternative, -- and you had the letter read today by the Honourable Member from Wolseley by one individual and there are many others, and I have had representations made to me, and every member on this side have had representations -- of many people who say they have no alternative now but to leave Manitoba, and they will; they have to leave Manitoba because their job is being jeopardized and there are no other jobs.

I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce can indicate to us whether he's had any recent discussions with the head of Manpower and Immigration, the Federal head of Manpower and Immigration, and whether he knows how difficult it is today for someone of middle age to be able to find a job in a management level or to find a job in any other level. I wonder if he can indicate as well whether he has made any analysis of those people who will be affected as a result of government involvement in auto industry, and whether he can tell us whether he has any statistics which would indicate the age level, the experience and the likely prospects for these people. I think at this point, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to hear the Honourable Minister at least express a few remarks in connection with this and then possibly we will go on further in this debate.

MR. GONICK: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Oh yes.

MR. GONICK: Would the honourable member inform the assembly as to what industries that now exist in the Province of Manitoba would be dramatically affected or improved by a rapid expansion of the population?

MR. SPIVAK: I'm glad the Honourable Member from Crescentwood mentioned this. I'm going to tell him something. The Department of Industry and Commerce have been working, and I have no reason to believe that they're not still working, on a major development for this province. The development would be probably one of the biggest undertakings in this province. It would cause directly 1,000 jobs, indirectly 3,000 jobs. --(Interjection)--Well, I'll figure it out. It almost happened here, but an event took place in June which I think will affect directly its ability to happen here --(Interjection)--Oh yes, oh yes. Now let me just talk to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood because I want to answer his question directly, through the Chairman to the Honourable Member from Crescentwood. You know, in dealing with this major concern the two problems that were involved were (1) the skill of the labour force now; the skill of the labour force not only for their requirements but the skill of the labour force for the subsidiary industries that would be in fact supported by their purchasing. I may say as well to the Honourable Member from Crescentwood that in five years the output planned or anticipated by this company would be approximately 22 percent of the total manufacturing output of everything that's produced in this province - one plant - and I may say that we are in competition with other provinces in connection with this, and one of the requirements and one of the very serious concerns was the ability of Manitoba to be able to sustain the skilled force coming into the province to meet the expansion requirements anticipated as the volume of business would grow to the 22 or 25% of our total manufacturing output of everything that's produced in this province.

I suggest to the Honourable Member from Crescentwood that in the decisions that will have to be made as to whether this plant locates in Manitoba or locates somewhere else, the ability of this province to be able to show increase in the work force, sufficient increase to be able to

May 14, 1970

1975

(MR. SPIVAK Cont'd) . . . show increase in the work force, sufficient increase to be able to meet their requirements, not just for their immediate direct requirements but the immediate requirements of all the small companies who in fact would be supplying -- oh yes, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says the insurance agent. That I expect from him. He expects them to wait until this company comes here. I think this company is capable of coming here. I have my, you know, I question it now. I suggest to the Honourable Member from Crescentwood that you will not attract major industrial activity unless you're going to be in a position to indicate that there will be a growth and the ability to be able to attract a skilled work force, and this was part of the projections in TED.

continued on next page

MR. GONICK: A supplementary question then. Is the member saying that there are not sufficient Manitobans, 1,000 Manitobans who could be trained with the vocational schools that we are building, so that this would be the critical factor? It sounds to me like an incredible statement that we do not have the manpower in Northern Manitoba that the Member for Churchill is always talking about, the Member for The Pas, that couldn't be trained, given the vocational schools that have been built over the past three years. It sounds to me like this is a gross overstatement of the case.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, may I simply tell the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, the statements that I repeated were the statements that were made by both the president of the company and the chairman of the board and the members of the Board of Directors, who indicated that unless they were assured that there would be an immigration program into Manitoba which would guarantee the increase in the labour force and additional skills coming in, that they would have to look . . .

MR. GONICK: Like CFI?

MR. SPIVAK: Not like CFI. They would have to look to another province who in fact have an increase by way of interprovincial migration as well as by immigration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I have only a few remarks that I'd like to make. I'd like to congratulate the Minister on his appointment and I hope that we get along well. I want to thank him for the help that he has tried to give us with the Morden Cannery, but we haven't ended up with a cannery. It isn't that he hasn't tried but it just hasn't been good enough. It's something like they said about the small man, he was tough for his size but he said, you know, he's darn small, so maybe this is the trouble. Coupled with this, we've had this department change hands a couple of times and this does make it harder, I do believe.

MR. CHERNIACK: The last two were the best.

MR. HENDERSON: The last two were the best. Well, that might be your opinion. The Carman Cannery, there's no doubt, was having some trouble before and we do not say that it was all easy with it, but what really is my concern is, I wonder if something such as higher corporation tax and the way people feel about the NDP government haven't probably had some weight in the decision that these companies have made when they pull out like this. I'm not saying that it is, but I'm wondering about this, and it might just be in some cases that this is the final straw that broke the camel's back, you could say. They just don't want to sink more money in and take a chance, and I wish the Minister and the whole Cabinet, when they're doing things, would consider these things and I wish very much that they'd be doing things like this which help us locally. We had a quarter of a million dollar industry there. If they would help industries at home like this rather than be working on compulsory government-run monopoly insurance plans, I think it would be much better for the province, especially at a time like this. And with that, that's all I have to say. I hope that he can find something to come up with for Morden before the year is out, so as our cannery don't close, because if it ever pulls out of Morden, I don't know how we'll get it back. So that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it isn't time, since I haven't made the statement recently, that I repeat the statement that to this date I've not been informed by any company which was considering the possibility of moving into Manitoba or establishing in Manitoba, that the corporation tax which we imposed to replace the iniquitous, flat Medicare premium tax, has deterred such a company from settling or developing in Manitoba, nor have I received any representations from any company in Manitoba that it had left the province because of the increase in corporate income tax, which was designed to replace the iniquitous flat rate premium tax. I have had discussions with several - I cannot say many - who have indicated that they were unhappy about it; I have had discussions with two or three who have indicated that they are considering it; but I can still say that in spite of the fact that the Honourable Member for River Heights has informed us that every member on his side of the House has had discussions of this type -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm glad to know that I misunderstood him, and that possibly he himself -- Well, all right. I'm under the impression he said that we all on this side have had discussions with those kinds of people, but if I am wrong, and I certainly may be wrong, because I confess, Mr. Chairman, when I listen to the Honourable Member for River Heights I don't listen with the fullest of attention because I hear as much as I feel I need to hear in order to satisfy myself that it's not necessary to listen further, but --(Interjection)--

May 14, 1970

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) I'm still speaking, I believe -- and therefore, in spite of the suggestions which I thought I heard, that others have had that kind of reaction from business, I can only say I have not as yet had it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, so that there would be . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . make a speech . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, no. There'll be no misunderstanding. I simply said -- yes, not in reference to any industries, you know, with respect to the tax, but simply that we on this side have had representations by people who are going to be affected in connection with the auto insurance industry and who have said to us, have said -- and I think I can say that many have, I can't speak for all -- but have said to us, and I think probably have said to you, that once government auto insurance comes into Manitoba, there's no jobs available then, they're going to have to leave.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then, may I just say, Mr. Chairman, no one has said that to me.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if the Minister of Finance was probably trying to ask a question or whether he was making his speech now. Mr. Chairman . . . -- (Interjection) -- Now I waited till you were through, so you wait for me this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I say to the honourable member that it's perfectly in order for members in committee or in estimates to do either one. There's no limitation on asking questions or making statements.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you then, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry about that. You must realize that people in the country . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: If the honourable member is intending to now develop a thought, perhaps it would be better if the Chair remembers that he was the last person speaking and recognize him first the next time committee sits, because we only have two minutes to go. Just whatever he likes. Whatever he likes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Pembina like to make a brief statement or would he be prepared to make it another day?

MR. HENDERSON: I just want the Minister to realize that it's very important to a country town that has a quarter of a million dollar industry if it's going to lose it, and we do wonder, we honestly do wonder if things like the higher corporation tax, the attitude of the NDP government getting monopolies on things like insurance and talking about taking over other business, these are the things that we wonder. It's not the decisions that they always come to you to talk about, it's the ones that are made behind closed doors that worry us too, and there must be many of them made. I don't believe everybody comes quarreling with you but there must be many considerations made behind closed doors that effect them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I know we have a minute, only one minute let, but permit me sixty seconds to make a comment or an answer to the question posed by the Honourable Member from Pembina. He referred to the cannery at Carman. I'm sure he meant the cannery at Morden; and as he mentioned, we have done a lot of work on this particular problem, and among other things, I learned this by talking to the president of the company, Canadian Cannery Limited, that the decision to close the factory at Morden was one that has been pondered over for several years. They were on the verge of closing last year; the decision to close this year had nothing whatsoever to do with the tax structure. We had an extensive -- (Interjection) -- No, they couldn't pay taxes anyway -- but there was an extensive discussion with the executives of the company, there was no reference made whatsoever to the tax structure of the province. That was not the question. The question was -- it was a corporate question -- they could produce their produce more efficiently in their opinion in southern Ontario than in Manitoba. Now, let me just say one other point, and that -- (Interjections) -- not even ten seconds?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 o'clock and the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow (Friday) morning.