

8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 19th, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER: Third Readings.

Bill No. 37 was read a third time and passed.

MR. McLEAN, in the absence of MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 39, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1), for third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that Bill No. 39 (1) be not now read a third time but be read six months hence.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I don't think there's much that I can add to what has already been said by the Honourable Member for St. John's and the Honourable Member for Emerson and other members who have spoken against this bill. In my opinion this bill, although I agree with its objective, I say that its objective is impossible of fulfilment by reason of the provisions of said bill and I think that this bill should be withdrawn completely and redrafted in a manner which would make it possible to achieve the objective sought by the bill.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I just want to say briefly that I concur with the statements made by my honourable colleague the Member for Selkirk. I think that this bill will go on the Statutes as useless legislation. I think it was clear in Committee that it does not suit the purposes of the people who are concerned in this and it will achieve nothing. I'm not one of those who would want to impose this legislation on anyone. I stated very clearly on second reading that in my opinion this had to be left up to the decision of the people involved, and I would stick by that all the way through. I believe that the legislation will achieve nothing; there are certain clauses in it to which I object specifically, one in particular is the inclusion of the vote of the official trustee, because I think that in certain divisions, three in particular, this will have put an entirely different emphasis on the situation there as compared to other school divisions in the province and I don't think that this is the proper way to proceed with this. We should have the legislation so that the people can decide what it is that they want and let them decide. This legislation will not achieve this.

MR. PAULLEY: I might say, Madam Speaker, I intend to support the amendment of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, generally speaking on the opposition that we have made evident all the way through, namely, that the bill will not achieve in our opinion what is desired insofar as bringing about the joining of the school boards and the school divisions in general and for that reason we continue our opposition by registering our disapproval at this time.

There are clauses or some sentiments in the bill that we can find favour with, but I think by and large, Madam Speaker, it will not achieve what we desire.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I don't know if a great deal will be gained by me speaking once more in support of the -- against this amendment as suggested by the opposed. I think voting against this bill is a vote against the concept of centralization of fiscal authority. This is a method by which 50 percent of the districts in any one division if they so wish, can elect, hold a referendum to place fiscal control under the central authority as recommended in the Michener Report, and to leave with individual school districts certain duties as outlined in The Public School Act. In meeting with literally hundreds of trustees in the past year throughout the province, at meetings and at conventions certainly there is a difference of opinion as to just how we should go about this but I think, as I have said earlier this afternoon, in the evolution of educational services in this province, we think this is a method which should commend itself to the honourable members.

With respect to the official trustee right now the districts served by an official trustee are submitting to central authority and there really isn't much difference in principle if the divisions concerned were to operate these through the divisional control, that is fiscally. We think that -- I think the amendment to include the official trustee is a good move. I think that in any local district now served by an official trustee, the official trustee can certainly give notice and hold meetings should several of the districts -- as they initiate, when the program is initiated. I think that Bill No. 39 does offer the opportunity as outlined. I would further hope that in concert with this type of legislation the setting up of a consolidation planning office within the department to give even more greater emphasis to the benefits of consolidation, working with divisional trustees, could compliment such legislation. Every day, every day in

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd). . . . . this province, practically every week four or five senior members of this department are out talking consolidation at the request of trustees throughout our province and there is. I feel -- there is a definite mood toward the benefits, toward consolidation as trustees become more and more aware of the benefits of a graded class room.

I would hope that the honourable members would look upon this as a step toward -- as a way in which certain divisions, or many divisions might be able to achieve centralization of fiscal authority and more equality of educational opportunity over the division by giving consideration to this bill.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker. I believe in centralization of educational facilities and it seems to me that the government is putting the cart before the horse. The Minister says that quite an effort has been made to see that consolidation takes place. I believe that the government could have made greater efforts to consolidate these areas before presenting a bill such as this one before us and although I like the principle of it, I feel that the bill does not produce the required results -- will never produce the required results, so I am forced to support the motion in hopes that another bill will be brought forth which will make this centralization a reality.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. that Bill No. 39 be not now read a third time, but be read six months hence.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Roblin, Smellie, Stanes, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 14; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question on the Third Reading of Bill No. 39, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bills No. 52, 62 and 63 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 102. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I was rather surprised and disappointed that the Minister would introduce a bill such as this. I had always held the impression that the Minister was one of those who was anxious to preserve our wildlife and when he introduced a bill which will make it law to sell it in restaurants and encourage poaching in this province, I was real surprised. I have spoken in the House, and for many years pointed out my concern for the wildlife and how it's being depleted in North America. I have criticized the Mexican authorities for their practice of selling game for a profit, and now I find this government introducing legislation which will make it law in this province. I have talked to a number of sportsmen in the province and they were shocked when I told them the contents of this bill. The Minister will say, "Oh, we'll restrict it by Order-in-Council." As long as this bill is passed the way it reads now, it says, "During the periods of the year when the hunting and killing of a wild animal is permitted under the Act or the Regulations for food in a restaurant or place where meals are served for remuneration or the hope of expectations thereof." It spells it right out in the bill that game, venison, duck can be sold in restaurants and I'm absolutely opposed to this type of legislation and I would urge all members of the House to oppose legislation of this sort. Our duck population is depleting every year and to encourage people to go out and hunt game so they could sell it to restaurants for remuneration, is just unbelievable in this day and age. I have an eight year old boy, and I am convinced that when he is of age to hunt that there'll be no birds left to shoot at the rate they're depleting in North America.

I am not suggesting for one moment that the province is to blame for the depletion of our wild game; it's a North American problem. But surely we can do our part in this province to do everything to prevent it, as far as best we can. I have urged previous ministers in other years to take whatever steps they could to encourage authorities in other jurisdictions to try to prevent the wild game from depleting. So you can understand my disappointment when the

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd). . . . . Minister brought in a bill which will have the reverse effect in this province. So I would ask the Minister to reconsider this very seriously and withdraw Section 10 of the bill. If he doesn't see fit to do so, I have no alternative but to oppose the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would call the Ways and Means Debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead, The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. However, if anyone else wishes to speak, we would have no objections.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I would propose that you call the debate on the Resolution on Legal Aid but I notice that the Honourable Member for Rhineland who has the adjournment is not in his seat. Perhaps if you were to call the item, however, there might be others who would like to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead, The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. ROBLIN: If no one else does care to speak, I suppose we had better let the matter stand in his name until he is here.

May I now ask you to call the Resolution on the Constitution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General, The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand although I have no objections whatever if anyone else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, would you now be good enough to call the Resolution respecting Concurrence in Shared Services.

MADAM SPEAKER: The resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that this House doth concur in the First Report of the Special Committee of the House appointed to consider Shared Services, received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on Thursday, the 8th day of April, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in introducing and recommending concurrence of the resolution of the Shared Services Committee. I do so with a deep sense of responsibility. For the first time in 70 years at our last regular session, the Legislature was asked to consider a new approach to a problem which in years gone by has divided our people as no other problem has -- a problem involving a mixture of religion and politics too explosive to be considered over these several years by any single political party. At our 1964 session, the government stated at that time that it could not consider the concept of direct aid to private and parochial schools and yet expressed a concern that the excellent services now available to students in attendance at our public schools might be made available in part to the students in attendance at private and parochial schools, provided this could be done without detriment to the public school system.

The Committee of the Legislature heard formal and verbal briefs as indicated in the report. A draft working paper was prepared by the committee to act simply as a guide to those presenting briefs. It was felt advisable to prepare a paper which would indicate a possible way in which shared services might be offered and how a private or parochial school might affiliate or associate for such services. The committee was most grateful for the great deal of work which went into the large number of briefs which were presented; and the various organizations and individuals who presented briefs are to be congratulated for the excellence of their material

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . . and for the points of view they presented to the committee.

The views on the matter were so divergent that the committee is unable to present a unanimous report. As Chairman I think it is fair to say that one member of the committee rejected the concept of shared services outright; another member of the committee expressed the opinion that the principle of shared services had not been accepted by those who appeared before us. The majority of the committee felt that while few who appeared before the committee had ever had experience with the shared services concept and were therefore reluctant to concur in the principle of shared services. They did indicate that should the Legislature determine that shared services be offered, they would be willing to do their best to deal with the administrative difficulties as they arose.

The verbal and written briefs presented to the committee varied greatly. The opinions expressed before the committee were as varied. Madam Speaker, as those which have been expressed by individual members of the Legislature. The Manitoba Association for Equality in Education was critical of the non-acceptance by the Legislature of the concept of direct aid to private and parochial schools. It indicated that it was not satisfied with the shared services concept, but that it would examine objectively any proposal which the Legislature might put forward in this regard. Some briefs rejected shared services on the grounds that such services would be detrimental to our public school system. Other briefs varied between the two extremes. All briefs were delivered in a most objective and dispassionate fashion and with tolerance and reasonableness.

Shared services, Madam Speaker, represents a new approach. The majority of the members of the committee see some merit, some real merit in the concept of opening the doors of our public schools to children from private and parochial schools for services, provided the public school authority is responsible for any arrangements that are forthcoming, and provided there is no threat of endangering the program of the public school system. This is the reason why in the report we have taken the school population of 5,000 as being the minimum student population in any division which may undertake to offer shared services to new private schools. Committee members feel safeguards to the public school system should be in the report and this is the reason for spelling these out.

The Report before the House recommends that on a voluntary and experimental basis, school districts and divisions may continue present arrangements for experimental shared services to the students in attendance at private and parochial schools under the jurisdiction of the public school authority, and one of the interesting facts disclosed during the hearings was that three school districts or divisions had from time to time offered such shared services on a rather limited basis to students from private and parochial schools. It appeared that the Winnipeg School Board had most experience in this regard. I am informed that it is very doubtful indeed that these activities were legal. The Report of the committee recommends that where shared services have been in effect in the public school system, that they should be allowed to continue and should be made legal.

The committee also recommends that other school districts and divisions be authorized to offer shared services on a voluntary and experimental basis. The committee recognizes problems involved in an experimental and voluntary approach but as this is the method by which shared services have been developed in the school system to date, and in view of the emphasis placed by a number of witnesses before the committee with respect to the advantage, indeed the need for goodwill and initiative in working with the problem, the committee feels that this is the appropriate method to be considered.

The committee, while recognizing the inherent dangers in recommending a voluntary and experimental approach, also recognizes that the shared services which have been operated in three divisions in our province have worked satisfactorily and that this can only have happened because both parties were willing, and in implementing such services neither one interfered with the function of the other. In these instances what was shared was a school activity which the private school concerned was not able to provide for itself. Your committee remained concerned that the fullest co-operation and understanding is required. And I would like to repeat that: "the fullest co-operation and understanding." Shared services will not work without the full co-operation of both parties. They must willingly understand that we can induce a spirit of tolerance and understanding; we cannot command it or compel the parties concerned. The majority of your committee feel that to meet with any measure of success, the students from the private and parochial schools must accept the control of the public school authority as to the services offered where and when. Your committee feels that the experience to date indicate

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd). . . . . that it is most desirable therefore that shared services be permitted to proceed in a very gradual basis at the local level to meet local needs.

Madam Speaker, there is a major reason for your committee proposing the resolution before the House. In 1965 we are on the threshold of ever-increasing, in fact massive expenditures in the field of education. The changing world situation; the awakening of underdeveloped countries to the need for technology and more knowledge; the emergence of new powers in the world; this tremendous rate of technical progress makes our generation possibly more aware of change than ever before. When we may ask, has change been as apparent to a generation as it is to us today? Change through knowledge. United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration illustrated the fantastic rate of change taking place in human progress today with amazing figures. For example, a Congressional Record of 20 years ago stated that ten professional mathematicians were needed for all of the industry in the United States. Today, 200,000 are needed just to operate computers. Of the children now in Grades 1 to 6, they state 50 percent will be employed in occupations that do not yet exist. The medical profession advise us that 85 percent of surgery performed today was not possible in 1947.

All professions are moving towards specialization to meet the challenge of change. The teaching profession for example is rapidly moving towards high specialization and with change we're all becoming a little concerned as to where this is taking us. We are worried about the pressure that these changes are placing not only upon our teachers but upon our children in the schools. The teaching profession more and more require the skills of the social worker, the psychologist, the psychiatrist, the business man, the labour force, in guidance and counsel in preparing our children to find their rightful place in this mad rush for knowledge. In Manitoba alone great strides are being made right now. The Economic Council of Canada urged in its first review, "That very high priority be given in this country to education and training so that today's youngsters can fit into the world of tomorrow."

We need only to look to the President of the United States who has moved in with a bold, comprehensive, imaginative effort in his proposal to Congress for a shared time concept. While the proposal of the President of the United States envisages a much bolder approach than is being suggested here, nonetheless, Madam Speaker, the same forces are at work here in Manitoba under our eyes as exist in the United States. As our province is involving literally hundreds of teachers in curriculum revision, we have a long mile to go. We are working desperately to enhance and enrich and diversify the offerings of our public school program. It is only too apparent that in our efforts here to offer the variety of programs our children will require, these can only be offered in larger public high schools where we hope to give access to a variety of courses.

The diversified educational program we are moving so rapidly towards in our public schools should be made available to children now in attendance at private and parochial schools. How else will these boys and girls compete in the world of tomorrow? Have we as legislators not the obligation of opening the doors of our public schools to the boys and girls of private and parochial schools for part-time study, or to receive some of the excellent services provided by the public school system? Can we not find a means through shared services of integrating into the public schools some of the children who will require these special services? The majority of the committee were of the opinion, as expressed by the Manitoba Teachers' Society, that there should be no attempt of coercion; that if a system of shared services were approved by the Legislature, it would be best worked out with a minimum of prescription by government but rather at the local level with guidance of advisory teaching and administrative personnel.

The Resolution before you, Madam Speaker, is a sincere attempt by the committee as I've stated to recommend a system of shared services which would use a minimum of government prescription, and as indicated earlier a firm conviction that the whole concept is dependent upon mutual co-operation and a respect for each other's problems.

The Resolution before us, Madam Speaker, is, as I have indicated, of the utmost importance. We did not expect that this matter would lend itself to a ready acceptance by any means. The vast majority of our citizens are concerned lest we take any steps which might weaken our public school system -- a wonderful system, developed over all these long years; a system we continue yearly to enhance and to diversify and one which can only become greater by dedication, imagination and plain hard work by all Manitobans. The majority of our citizens are concerned about any change in the status quo. We all respect the right of parents to educate their children according to their own conscience. We respect their autonomy in this regard.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd), . . . . .

The majority of Manitobans are not prepared to support another system outside the orbit of our public school system. There is a price on this autonomy which the parents have chosen in following the dictates of their conscience. We appreciate the deep subjective feeling expressed so eloquently both in this House by the honourable members and by all those who addressed us during the hearings.

Let me emphasize the point concerning the principle of shared services. The committee members appreciate that it was difficult indeed to persuade persons who presented briefs to deal with the question of principle with respect to shared services. When questioned on this point almost all refused to make a direct judgment on the question of principle but preferred to deal with problems of application. Thus there cannot be said to be any consensus that developed in the hearings on the question of principle as such. However, in another sense, Madam Speaker, there was a very distinct consensus that had to do with the implementation of the shared services plan. Most of those who appeared indicated that should shared services be introduced, they would be willing to co-operate in its practical application. There was therefore a reasonable consensus in respect of this aspect of the problem and it is interesting to note that several of the briefs were in agreement on this point.

Madam Speaker, in looking over the debates from the previous years, both in 1960 and 1961, the Honourable Member for Lakeside with his long association in this House, in calling upon the government to enunciate its policy with regard to direct aid to private schools said the following: "I think a subject of the importance of this question emphasizes the need for it being considered in this House on the very highest plane, and with our greatest degree of statesmanship. I think this is a position that not only I personally, but my group will take now and will continue to take as the debates proceed." The honourable member repeated this in the Speech from the Throne debate in both 1960 and 1961. I know the honourable member meant what he said in this regard.

At that time also, in discussing the question of this matter at that time, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party said, "I trust that when this possibly controversial matter is discussed in the Legislature, that the discussion will be of high calibre and that reason not emotion will be the guiding consideration in the debate."

In our last regular session, Madam Speaker, the Premier made a very eloquent plea for understanding and goodwill in this whole matter. Last year at our regular session the First Minister called upon the Member for Lakeside with his long experience and association in this question, soliciting his help and the help of other members of the House in dealing with this difficult question. Speaking of shared services the Premier said at that time, and I quote: "Of all the approaches that could be devised, I think this is the least politically advantageous because we know it is not going to satisfy those who want the Manitoba School question decisions reversed, and we know it is not going to satisfy those who have pinned their flag to the mast of the public schools," and he went on to say he thought it would be a good thing for our children. Respecting a consensus of the Legislature, the Premier at that time said: "If we approach it in the proper spirit we will find it, but approach it in the proper spirit we must, because unless we take that open-minded approach to this question, regardless of our personal views, unless we seek with real and sincere effort that meeting of mind and that goodwill even on this measure, I feel we will not have the right to proceed in making it part of the law and the legislation of the Province of Manitoba, and I say to this House that a reasonable and representative consensus may well be the test to which we must submit any decision that this committee may wish."

Concerning consensus and the government's stand on the matter, I quote further from the address of the First Minister: "I want to say to the Legislature right now that this is important. I want to say that when we have to deal with the question of concurrence on whatever report this committee makes. I think we must consider carefully whether we should not submit that concurrence to the test of a reasonable, representative consensus because in this field we are not operating in a field where a government may impose its policy, in my opinion, without regard to that consensus. It therefore will be our policy and our aim to find it. I have sufficient confidence in the goodwill and the effort of the members of the committee, whoever they may be, and also in the opinion of the people of our province to believe that we will find that consensus, that reasonable and representative consensus of our people in this very difficult matter."

At this point may I stress, Madam Speaker, the majority of the committee endorse this

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....recommendation to the Legislature. mindful of the most sensitive feelings as to its importance by all the honourable members. We are seeking consensus of the House in the belief that such a voluntary scheme will permit divisions and districts now offering such services to continue. that further experimentation will take place. that fuller opportunities will be made available to many children and that our people will enter into a spirit of further mutual respect and tolerance and that a minimum of government prescription be involved. We seek a broad consensus of the House. Let it be clear. however. that this matter of a consensus in the House cannot affect the principle of government responsibility. The government of course does and must accept responsibility for whatever action may be taken following the report, regardless of whether or not a reasonable consensus of the House is achieved. However, if no consensus can be found the government may very well feel that the report does not pass that test of public acceptability which is necessary to justify its being implemented in the particular circumstances of this particular problem.

The decision therefore with respect to action to be taken will be made in the light of the measure of support that the report receives in this House bearing in mind the over-riding necessity of keeping this issue removed from the arena of party politics. It is clearly understood, however, that with or without the consensus the government must and does accept responsibility for whatever action, if any, that may be taken following this report. Whatever that decision may be, the principle of government responsibility is preserved while at the same time the right of the government to base its policy on the achievement of a reasonable consensus is clear and unmistakable.

Madam Speaker, those who presented briefs to the Shared Services Committee I feel were convinced that shared services could be provided successfully if the parties to it displayed a sufficient degree of goodwill and understanding. In these remarks of mine I have emphasized these requirements. In the debates which will follow, Madam Speaker, in this House, I am also convinced that the honourable members will exhibit the same characteristics of goodwill and understanding as will be required outside this House by those who may undertake a plan of shared services.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

.....continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that Madam 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.

MADAM 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 Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman before we begin, I wonder if it would be possible to find out from the Government what Department we will be going to once we complete Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. ROBLIN: The next item on the agenda will be Public Utilities, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 57. Item 1 (a) Passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to rise to protest what I consider the ruthless, oppressive and illegal manner in which the government acted in the expropriation of the land in the Bird's Hill area. On April 10, 1964 the government deposited a plan of expropriation in the Land Titles Office for land in the Bird's Hill area. A letter dated the same day notified the residents in the area that their land had been expropriated. Under Section 13 of the old Expropriation Act, when notice of expropriation is given, the government must set out what compensation it is prepared to pay. This the government did not do. The government failed to stipulate what it was prepared to pay for the land it was expropriating and therefore acted illegally.

As a matter of fact, last week, or April 9th to be exact, one year from the date that the notices were sent out, the government stated what compensation it was prepared to pay to those residents who have not settled. I refer to Chapter 18 of an Act to amend the Expropriation Act which received Royal Assent on April 16th, 1964, six days after the government had deposited a plan of expropriation. And I'll read one section which I think is so pertinent to the argument. Section 19 reads: "The amendments to The Expropriation Act enacted by this act do not affect or apply to any expropriation of land where a plan was deposited, a notice of expropriation was registered, a by-law was passed or a notice of expropriation was served prior to the coming into force of this Act."

Thus by acting in this manner the government has acted illegally and oppressively. Mr. Chairman, in short, the government broke the law in taking the land from the residents in the Bird's Hill area. If this government doesn't believe it has to comply with the law and deliberately flouts it, how on earth can we expect the people of this Province or the citizens to have any regard for it? As a result of the action taken by the government many people in the Bird's Hill area whose land was expropriated have suffered severe financial losses and the tragedy of the situation is that the small land owners, those with small holdings have been hurt the most. These are the people who may have a small market garden or a few head of cattle to supplement their income which they get from working out. The majority of the people would have preferred to relocate in the same general area. However, they were thwarted in their efforts because they had no idea what the government was prepared to pay them for the land that was expropriated. These delays created uncertainty and the uncertainty over many months has encouraged speculation. Prices of land adjacent to the area have skyrocketed and the little man with those small holdings have been left high and dry and unable to relocate in the area which they wanted to. It is felt by some that these people affected will never recover from the financial losses they have suffered.

What's distressing is that the government failed to keep its word. Having broken the law in taking this land they met with these people affected on October 10, 1964 in the office of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and at that time they were assured by the Premier that they would be told what price the government was prepared to pay for the land by December of 1964. As I said earlier it wasn't until April 9th that those residents who hadn't settled finally had an offer of what the government was prepared to pay for the land that was expropriated. Not only has the government acted illegally, it appears they don't know where they are going.

I cite the case of one piece of property that was expropriated. This land was purchased from the government in October of 1963. I think the date is important. The land was bought from the government in October of 1963 and then in April of the following year the government proceeds to expropriate the same land it had sold the fall before. --(Interjection)-- Yes.

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd) . . . . . Molly Ives. --(Interjection)-- If I understood the Minister correctly he said it was not bought from the government. Well I am assured by the person involved that it was. If the information is incorrect, I accept the Minister's word for it. The woman assures me categorically that this land was bought from the government in October of 1963. Now it's true that the government is prepared to pay more money for the land than she bought it for; no question about that. This woman doesn't want to sell her land for any price. The interesting part of it is that when she approached the government she tells me she wanted to buy 40 acres of land. However the government refused to sell her 40 acres and insisted if she wanted that specific 40 acres she had to take 140 acres, and she agreed to do this; and bought 140 acres rather than the 40 that she requested originally. However when the government came along to expropriate the land they refused to take the 140. They just wanted 80 acres involving the choice 40 acres which was sought in the first instance. By taking this particular piece of land the government is crossing two roads to get to this property. Now the Minister might argue that it's the object of the government to get the land as cheap as possible. However, I must add that the government must also treat the people involved fairly and I think it's imperative that the government in purchasing land give the people involved all the information at hand. I have discovered that some and possibly all the people who have not settled with the government yet over this land, own the mineral rights to the land which has been expropriated. As the Minister knows, the land in the Bird's Hill area has a wealth of gravel. My information is that the agents acting for the government at no time advised the people whose land was expropriated that they owned the mineral rights to the land that was being taken. It's quite possible the land is worth a great deal more in addition to the regular value. I'm told that when the representative of the government approached the people about price they wanted to base it on farm values. Well anyone knowing that area knows that most of the land is not good for cultivation. Most of these people who bought land in the Bird's Hill area consider it's a great deal more valuable. They want it for residential purposes. People out there tell me and object to the manner in which the agents have acted for the government. They say they have been virtually threatened and coerced into making agreements. Now the Minister might tell me that the people involved are entitled to 75 percent of the price paid by the government, but when they are not offered anything, as was done in this case, 75 percent of nothing is nothing, so they had no knowledge of what they were going to get and still don't know, they didn't know until April 9th in many instances. People who have had their land expropriated by the government are deprived of a basic freedom, a right to say no. Therefore the government should be meticulous in their action so that it doesn't infringe further on these rights.

Mr. Chairman, the situation of Bird's Hill is just another example how the government has bungled in its land dealings and purchases of land in the province. We have cited the Art Centre. They didn't expropriate in that case. Orders for Return provided by the government show where one individual made a profit of \$137,000.00. The situation at Delta, the Bain Estate, revealed where Octave Enterprises have made a profit between a hundred and a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. There was no expropriation in this instance. Yet in a case where there are a number of small owners who are going to suffer severely financially by the action taken by the government they were expropriated and every obstacle was placed in their way. In the case of the Bain Estate one member of the Bain family has told us how he pleaded with the government to buy the land and his offer wasn't taken up. The tragedy of the situation is the government seems to have one policy for the rich and one for the poor. They bargain with the rich and they expropriate from the little man. And I think it's high time the government changed its attitude and treated the people much more fairly. I think the actions of the government have been completely heartless, the way they have treated the people in the Bird's Hill area, and I think it's time their attitude changed and they rectify the situation which I think, and many like me, think is deplorable.

CHAIRMAN: (b) pass.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we pass this item I think that I should say a word or two and express my opinions dealing with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. I listened with a great deal of interest the other day while the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources outlined plans for his Department with a great deal of interest. I am however, intrigued with some of the propositions that the Minister has drawn to our attention as to what the government proposes in respect of the development of some of our natural resources, and I'm amazed, quite frankly, to hear from my honourable friend the Minister that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . the government is going to embark on a program of added concessions in respect of those agencies that are dealing with our non-renewable assets of the province. If I gathered from my honourable friend correctly, through the suggestions that he has made, we here in Manitoba are going to embark upon a rat race with other jurisdictions in the Dominion in an endeavour to attract more exploration in the Province of Manitoba. We well know in this House that the Government and this Legislature, and indeed many Commissions that have sat on behalf of the government, have attempted to curtail the rights of giving away concessions in regard to our municipalities and are constantly finding ways and means, or endeavouring to find ways and means, whereby our various municipalities don't enter in to competition by granting concessions to industries. And here, Mr. Speaker, they're attempting to do the same thing, in opposition may I say to other jurisdictions as well, and I want to warn my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that once we embark on a program of concessions here in Manitoba, many of the other wealthier provinces than Manitoba will do likewise, and that because of their greater financial abilities will be able to outbid Manitoba.

I quite frankly think, Mr. Chairman, that Pioneer Project as announced by the Minister turns the clock back to the early days when consideration was only for the exploitation for private gain. I think that this is wrong. In the outline of his program the other night the Honourable Minister informed us that concessions of considerable amounts will be granted on the basis of profits of the companies. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I have attempted and members of my group have attempted in the past to find out exactly what are the profits that are accruing to respective companies in the Province of Manitoba, and we've been denied that information. So if my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is going to base his figures on the profits, he must have a better lead than I have got.

It's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that back in 1930, the federal authority in its wisdom turned back to the provinces, control over their natural resources in an endeavour to help out the provinces and forming a basis for which the province may utilize the exploitation of our natural resources in our provinces for the benefit of the people in those provinces. It seems to me that the proposition of the Minister is not to benefit the people of the province, the taxpayer of the province, but those companies which are conducting the exploitation of our natural wealth. And I ask, Mr. Chairman, is this necessary? Is it needed? While I haven't before me all the reports, I do happen to be on the mailing list of the Imperial Oil Company, and if one takes a look at their annual report for the year 1964, we find that their net earnings -- of course not all in Manitoba; I recognize this -- but their earnings, their net profit for the year 1964, was up 11 percent over what they were in 1963. The earnings for the year in respect of Imperial Oil amounted to some \$79 million. Does this indicate inability on the part of this particular company to do additional drilling in order to find more deposits of oil? I suggest not. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the plan of the Minister is proceeded with, the sufferers will be not Imperial Oil but the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba; because they will be receiving less and less return for the diminishing resources that we have here in the Province of Manitoba. Some consider that through these companies more and more people are sharing in the profits that are accumulated over the years. This certainly is not the situation insofar as Imperial Oil Ltd. is concerned, Mr. Chairman, because there is a reduction of 1, 100 shareholders in the Imperial Oil Company 1964 as compared to 1963.

If one looks also at this annual report which covers a number of years, from '64 to '55, insofar as employment is concerned, we find that there's an ever diminishing number of employees in the company, with the exception of 1964 where there was an increase, because of the fact that an additional company was taken over by Imperial Oil. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we don't need further concessions to companies like Imperial Oil and others akin to them.

My friends on my right, the Liberals, seem to worry about profits made on such deals as the Art Centre, the Bird's Hill expropriation, the Delta Marshes, and these are very very serious transactions. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that more serious than all of that is the proposition of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to grant to those who are able, further concessions for the development in the Province of Manitoba. We deal, Mr. Chairman, with the question of the net profits of International Nickel; we find that -- and the latest figures I have are for the year 1963 -- that the net profits 1963 over 1962, increased by about \$12 million. Is this a poverty stricken organization that we must make concessions for at the expense of the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba? I suggest not. I say to the Minister of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . Mines and Natural Resources it appears to me in his program that he is not giving any consideration to the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba. We often speak, we often speak of Alberta because of its wealth in oil and on a comparative basis their taxes are lesser. And I suggest it's because of the fact that they're obtaining the revenue from their oil, not giving it away or reducing it on behalf of the large companies. I suggest to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that if the commodity that the individual firms is seeking, is here in Manitoba, then they will develop.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, just the other day when we were dealing on the matter of a piece of labour legislation, the spokesman for the Canadian Manufacturers Association, dealing with the question of labour legislation made reference of a comparison between ourselves and one or two other provinces, and he mentioned the development for potash as an illustration. And I asked him the question, "Why is there consideration being given to the development of potash in Manitoba? Because potash is here." And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if we have those commodities here in the Province of Manitoba, it's not necessary for concessions to be granted by this Government, that the companies themselves will develop, will do the exploration, after having received the base maps.

I also want to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that after this third of a million dollars that he is suggesting that the Treasury spend in surveys, who is going to get the advantage of them on the basis of priority? Company A? Company B? Company C? Or what? No explanation has been given by our honourable friend. The area that he has under consideration is the gold belt, or considered the gold belt. What was the situation here, Mr. Chairman, just a couple of years ago? We found it necessary as a legislative body to come to an agreement with one of the gold producing companies, San Antonio. I suggest we did not come to the aid directly of San Antonio, but to save a town from going on the rocks. That's why we set up the fund. And I would like to hear from my honourable friend a report as to what the situation is at the present time. While I'm not a stockholder, I have followed with some degree of interest the fluctuating values of the stock of the said company and I understand from outside information that it appears that things may be improving in the area. I sincerely trust and hope they are. But I respectfully suggest that the experience that the Honourable Minister had so far as San Antonio is concerned should deter him from an expenditure of \$300,000 for this development. Has my honourable friend in mind -- and I trust not -- the setting up of more mining company towns to the detriment of the citizens who may go into these towns to work? We had quite a discussion lately on the situation in respect of Thompson and the depriving of the citizens' rights in that community. I hope this will be a warning to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I say to my honourable friend what is the good of development if the major immediate gain is to the investor? The citizens of this province are those who are crying for aid; aid in the reduction of their taxes; an increased amount coming to their benefit through the development of our natural resources. Do we hear this from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources? No. At the special session last August, certain propositions were placed before the House to increase the net return from our natural resources; and lo and behold, some six months later, at least in some regards the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is suggesting to us that the trend should be reversed.

My honourable friend is talking too, of concessions again in the field of oil, for the development -- and I presume this would generally be concerned with the development in the general Virden area. I ask him what is happening up at Hudson Bay? Concessions were, or at least exploration rights, were given to a mining company or an oil exploration company in respect of Hudson Bay. I notice that twelve exploration permits were given to Sojapet Ltd. covering the acres of land on the western shore of Hudson Bay, between Cape Tatnam and the Ontario boundary. What has happened? What has happened? Our concessions in the development there. Has there been any drilling? Or is it just surface exploration insofar as this area is concerned?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is of the opinion that concessions should be granted to those companies that exploit our mineral wealth, that those concessions should take a different form; that he should say to our oil developers in the Province of Manitoba, you increase your output; you set up secondary industries that will use the product; and for every petrol chemical plant that you set up in the Province of Manitoba to utilize the labours of our scientists and our residents of Manitoba, we'll consider granting concessions once this is done.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . .

I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that if he were to say to the developers of other minerals that rather than give you any concessions insofar as direct royalties are concerned, that if you set up factories which will aid in the development of your industry by the production of secondary products, then if the government has a mind for concessions, that on this basis that those concessions should be granted.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that with all of the development of our mineral resources here in the Province of Manitoba, the person who has come out second best is the owner of those resources, and when I say the owner of those resources I do not mean any of the companies, be they oil or be they mineral, I say the residents, the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba now living and those yet unborn, and I think that these are the people that the Department of Mines and Natural Resources should be looking after and aiding them.

So convinced am I, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not doing the job on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba in the development of our resources, that I think that his salary should be reduced to a dollar. I'm convinced -- I'm convinced that a progressive forward-looking government would have under consideration the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba.

I've tried to indicate, Mr. Chairman, in these few remarks that at least two companies that I've mentioned, and I only mention them because I know that they're developing here in the Province of Manitoba, have not indicated poverty, not by a long shot. I think that I've also indicated that the type of proposition that the Honourable Minister is proposing to us can and will lead to a rat race insofar as concessions to operators in these fields, the competition between Manitoba, who I suggest is least able to enter into any competition on a concession basis with any other province. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Minister or the government is qualified to be entrusted with the care of the people's heritage, therefore I move that his salary be reduced to one dollar.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I think this is another case where there's two sides to the coin, and while I listened to the Honourable Member for Transcona a couple of years ago on this, I was very much impressed with his speech and I wondered whether or not we possibly were entering into an era of giving away, particularly our non-renewable resources, that were at some time or other to be expected to run out on us.

I did look into it very closely, Mr. Chairman, and I came up with some remarkable points. First, I would point out to the honourable member that we are living in a changing world and we in the north particularly look sometimes towards the plastics industry, many of those that possibly could become competitive to those natural resources which we do mine in northern Manitoba, and so perhaps we'd better turn and get to these natural resources as quickly as possible so that we can use them while they are still of great value to this world. And not the least, I would point to everybody's hopes that the water, one of our greatest natural resources will be used in the not too far future to produce for us a hydro system which is commonly known as the Nelson River Development.

But I do not rise to speak on that at this time but I do have interesting figures and possibly the other side of the coin again. One thing that we must consider is when these companies do decide to locate in Manitoba they have in all probability spent many millions of dollars in northern Manitoba in trying to come up with the resource that they can be fairly sure of in investing in northern Manitoba. I believe, if I'm not mistaken, the International Nickel Company invested some \$35 million in the north before they decided to invest in the Mystery Lake area, and I would point out that particularly at Thompson that the company had invested some \$200 million before they turned toward producing a profit for their shareholders. This profit, I understand, is a dividend running around three percent, so really while I don't want to get into a debate on finances, it doesn't show a great return for shareholders.

In producing Thompson they invested in structural steel. They required some 800 carloads of steel - 50 tons a carload. This produced profit for the Canadian National Railroad, for the many many towns that the Canadian National Railroad ran through, and for everybody all along the line throughout the Province of Manitoba. In concrete, some 130,000 cubic yards of concrete was used in the construction of the Thompson plant. In farm products, the consumption per month, Mr. Chairman, was 200,000 eggs, 1,200 bags of potatoes, 120,000 pounds of meat, 600 bags of flour -- this is per month -- this is not a non-renewable resource. These are products of Manitoba that are being purchased each and every month to produce a mining town.

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . .

From the very first they spent many millions of dollars each year on supplies, and I'm assured over 75 percent of these supplies are purchased through Manitoba outlets, including sulphuric acid of some \$60,000 worth a year. Their millwork runs over half a million dollars a year purchased through Winnipeg outlets. Their fuel oil for their heating plant, some ten cars of bunker fuel oil alone each week, again purchased through Winnipeg outlets. In the lumber and timber, over a million dollars per year is purchased in northern Manitoba from Manitoba producers, one of the largest consumers of our northern renewable resources going each year to this production of a non-renewable resource.

So we alone are not losing on our non-renewable resources, we're gaining, because they are putting to use these renewable resources in northern Manitoba which in many cases have long lain dormant for many hundreds of years.

The hardware and plumbing supplies run over 50,000 a year, with the purchase of over \$200,000 worth from Winnipeg firms alone during the '62 expansion. Their supplies totalled over \$12 million worth in '62. Manitoba Hydro, they used \$3,150,000 worth of electricity in '62; Manitoba Telephone, \$30,000; CNR, \$2,130,000 in freight a year. This produces a lot of jobs for many people throughout Manitoba, not only in northern Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, but throughout Manitoba. Local contractors were given contracts of \$2,016,000; timber purchases, \$1,200,000. Their services for catering, engineering, insurance, \$2,441,000; local government district taxes, \$267,000.

The payroll runs over a million dollars a month. They have contributed almost \$10 million in services for their local townsite sewer, water, sidewalks, roads, hospitals and schools. They spend over a million dollars a year on further exploration for minerals. They may not find any -- this is only exploration work. To date their investment in Thompson runs somewhere around \$218 million, of which \$20 million were loaned to our own Manitoba Hydro for the development of Kelsey; \$4 million were loaned to the railroad to build the spur line to Sipiwesk.

As I said before, between 1947 and '64 they have spent some \$35 million in exploration. This is an investment in the north which in most cases goes for labour, labour in Northern Manitoba. Granted some of it was done by air, but most of it when you get down to looking for the mineral itself is produced by work parties going in and drilling.

I think that our non-renewable resources is one which we must guard carefully, which we must be assured is mined properly so that we get the low ore as well as the rich ore mined. I do think that we must enter into agreements as quickly as possible so that we can have an orderly development in Northern Manitoba. I would agree that we must be sure that these companies take all the ore rather than just the rich ore, but I do hope that government can look forward to a time when we get our fair share of industrial money invested in northern Manitoba, and I do think that if we can get this investment started that we will see the results of these investments as time goes by.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, after that interesting discourse would the honourable member permit a question or two? First of all, the honourable member mentioned a loan being made by the company to Hydro, and I believe to the railway company. Would he want to leave the impression that this loan was interest-free, or what was the interest rate being earned by the company? Secondly, the honourable member mentioned the investment which the firm has put into the area. I would ask him if he could tell us, if he has the information, what the rate of return earned by the company was in the past year, or in the past two years.

MR. BEARD: I can't give you the exact figures, but I am assured that the loan both to Hydro and to the railroad were lower than the money usually gained on investment in bonds. I don't know how to answer your second question. The only thing that I would go by is the dividends which the companies pay to shareholders, and usually this is around three percent. I think three percent is high, so we must consider that possibly as the returns from the development such as this.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the point but I think that to go by the dividends alone is very misleading since the large firms, particularly Inco, are in a habit of -- in addition to the dividends being paid out, are in a habit to keep large sums of money in earned reserves and this still reflects on the profit although it doesn't show up as dividends admittedly.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I would like to ask the Minister of Mines if and when he is going to reply to the Honourable Member for St. George?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, when I was speaking at the beginning of the debate the Minister shook his head when I said that the land purchased by one individual had come from the government. He shook his head that this was not true ...

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): ..... from the government.

MR. GUTTORMSON: That's what I said, and I have a receipt here signed by C. Vermeulen of the Administration of the Estates for the Mentally Incompetent Branch, a branch of the Department of the Attorney-General, dated November 1, 1963.

MR. LYON: On behalf of an estate.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It's a government department that handled the whole thing. They bought it from the department.

MR. LYON: The government didn't own the land.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The government handled it; it's on government stationery; and a government civil servant signed the receipt for the sale of the land.

MR. LYON: It wasn't bought from the government. It wasn't government land.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I said it was bought from the government, the government handled the transaction.

MR. LYON: You were wrong -- you were wrong.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'm not wrong. I've got the receipt here in my hand.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): You don't understand what it means.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You just wish I didn't.

MR. SMELLIE: I know darn well you don't.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The land was handled -- the receipt is signed by a civil servant.

MR. SMELLIE: On behalf of an estate.

MR. GUTTORMSON: But it's still acted on on behalf of the government, an agent is still looking after it.

MR. SMELLIE: Well the government don't own it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Who said they owned it? I said they sold it.

MR. SMELLIE: Oh, that's not what you said my friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman ..... not on this question but to say too that I enjoyed the remarks of the Honourable Member for Churchill and followed him with a great deal of interest. I had said a little earlier that I wasn't on the mailing list of all companies. I guess I had better get into, or attempt to get on the mailing list like my honourable friend is apparently on insofar as International Nickel is concerned, and I might have as a result of that more indications of the point that I was trying to raise.

I want to say to my honourable friend though that it was most interesting to find out how many hinds of beef went into Thompson. I don't know if Inco bought them or not for the residents of the area. I was indeed interested in the cost of the development of the townsite. I wonder if my honourable friend is inferring by that that this was all paid out of the profits of Inco or whether or not it was the inhabitants at Thompson that were making a contribution to these facilities and wondering whether or not they are not related to the point that I was attempting to establish.

I wonder if my honourable friend recalls, or was he up in the north at the time of the removal of the mine at Sherridon because it became depleted. I wonder if my honourable friend also is aware of the fact that we were worried here some three or four years ago in respect of some of the mining that was going on in the Flin Flon area, and it was because of the development or the discovery of other mines in that particular area that the Town of Flin Flon which has done, as indeed Thompson is doing, an admirable job in the development of the north, but there too we found there was the possibility of a town becoming a ghost town as indeed Sherridon did. These are the points, Mr. Chairman, and the reasons why it is that I raise the questions that I do when we are dealing with the non-renewable resources of the Province of Manitoba.

I recall, I believe it was the Honourable Member for Lakeside who was intimately concerned with the loaning of the money insofar as Inco was concerned, with the development of Kelsey I believe, and it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of about two percent -- or two and four percent -- I think there were two figures. I may be wrong, but I do recall the figure of two percent insofar as the interest was concerned on the loan as far as Kelsey.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . .

I believe the honourable member is perfectly right when he talks about the low interest that was on the bonds insofar as the development of the railway -- where was it from -- Sipiwesk to Thompson -- or from the main line anyway up to Churchill. But why? It paid. It paid dividends for the development.

There's one point, Mr. Chairman, that I was interested in in the remarks of the honourable member from the north when he suggested to the government -- at least I interpreted his remarks -- and he suggested to the government something that I'm doing here this evening, that if there is any concession to be granted that it should be granted on the basis of developing industries accompanying the mining operations. I think that's what my honourable friend meant when he said that the government should undertake to endeavour to do this, so despite the hinds of beef or the sides of beef and the number of plates of porridge that are imported into that great Town of Thompson, he's not so very far out. I think that he would agree with me, from his remarks, despite the commodity aspect of his remarks, that it is necessary for us here in the Province of Manitoba to have orderly development, but in addition to the orderly development that we should have full utilization of the products that are taken from the bowels of the earth.

I want to say this, that insofar as Inco is concerned I am glad that they are coming along with some development in their smelting and the likes of that that previously had to be sent down as I understand it to Sudbury for smelting, or elsewhere, and all I am suggesting now is that the development take place further than that so that I might join with my honourable friend who resides in Thompson in seeing that the north is opened up industrial-wise. This is what my desire is and that is why I am suggesting to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that rather than concessions simply on the product that's taken from our natural resources, that accompanying developments be the basis on which concessions should be granted.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister said in reply to a suggestion from the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that he would be answering the questions that have been raised in due course, and inasmuch as I have some questions for him to answer too, perhaps he would like to get them before him at this time.

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, as I have tried to establish here before, I'm inclined to wait until individual items come up in the estimates, but I do think that where a matter of principle is involved that it's only correct procedure to raise it on the Minister's salary, and I too want to raise this question of land acquisition and discuss it on the matter of principle as well as practice.

I was labouring under the illusion that we were going to have an expropriation act revision this year. I gather that I misinterpreted what the Speech from the Throne said and I certainly misread the notice for the committee, because I thought that we were going to have an expropriation act that would be brought up to date with perhaps some of the principles that have been embodied in legislation in the United Kingdom and other areas that have a longer experience than we have in this very difficult field, but I was assured this afternoon that we're not going to have that expropriation act and so I'm taking the opportunity to discuss the question mainly from the standpoint of principle at this time.

Mr. Chairman, there are at least four members of this government, and there may be more, in addition to at least two boards and commissions that actively engage in expropriation. Recently there has been a great deal of it and I think it is time that we gave careful consideration not only to the setting up of an acquisition board but that we gave careful consideration to revising our expropriation act, and not only to revising the expropriation act but to re-examine the principles under which this act is supposed to operate, because I repeat what I said in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, that I still hold to the view that the theory and the principle of expropriation should be, and in the past was in this province, that expropriation was engaged in only as a last resort and that it was an emergency measure only.

It's true that the powers that were in that act, even when we were in charge of the legislation and even when we inherited it from a previous administration, the powers were drastic even then if pressed to their full extent, and those powers have been made more drastic in recent years. I thought myself, as I have said before, that I didn't observe the increase in the drastic field that was put into legislation in the last couple of years because this act, Mr. Chairman, because of the type of an act that it is to deal with emergent situations or situations where one person, one party, one parcel of land is holding up what is deemed to be a necessary

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . . procedure, that this legislation has through the years had compulsory provisions of a most drastic nature put into it, and last year, that is '64, and in '61, the government put through this House amendments that considerably increased those drastic powers. They took still further away the limited rights that the individual already had and cut down still further the time for the individual to exercise whatever rights it had.

So I want to discuss this matter not only on the basis of practical application but on the basis of principle as well, for I think that's what this House should be considering. I know that it's all very well for my honourable friend, any one of the four ministers concerned or any one of the boards and commissions concerned or any of the other governments that are allowed to expropriate because this goes to municipal governments as well, it's all very well for them to say that it's done according to the act. Many acts are made extremely far-reaching but the intention is to not use the powers that are given unless in cases of emergency or real necessity, and the wholesale expropriation that has taken place under this government in the case of the Bird's Hill Park, or Pine Ridge as the area prefers to be called, is to my way of thinking a case in point.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister when he introduced his estimates invited us in to a picture show in Room 200 and he furnished the commentary for that show, and both at the showing of the pictures and in his introductory statement in the House a little later on, the Minister dwelt on the fact that this department for which he is responsible is concerned with people; they work with people; the main concern he said of the department is people and the department operates for the benefit of the citizen. In many cases they're working -- in all cases they're working for the people; in many cases they're working directly with them.

Well this expropriation procedure as I see it in the area that my honourable friend from St. George was discussing is a case where the department has certainly not co-operated with the people. In my opinion it has used them to the full extent of this very drastic law which I maintain should be used in that way only in cases of emergency and only in cases of where no other method will apply.

Now my honourable friend the Minister has said of me that I'm not at my best when I'm discussing legal subjects. Well maybe not, but I want to support completely the proposition of the Honourable the Member for St. George, because I have looked carefully at the acts concerned and I will stake my legal reputation, Mr. Minister, on the fact that this expropriation for that park was not carried on according to the act. That's why I had asked the Honourable the Attorney-General one time if his department had been consulted in that regard because I completely support my honourable friend from St. George that the act, as we had it in effect when this expropriation took place, said that when a plan was filed that an offer was to be made forthwith, or words to that effect.

It's true that my honourable friend in one of the amendments, that I blame myself for having let get through the House here without having noticed the change that was being made, had extended that period to one year, but that amendment did not come into effect until six days after the expropriation plan had been filed. Now my honourable friend the Minister will answer in due course as he has said, and I would like him to tell us how he squares what was done with the act as it was and as it has been since the amendment came into effect.

If my honourable friend the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is at this time consulting the Honourable the Attorney-General in his official capacity, then I would be very pleased because I think that the Honourable the Attorney-General, good lawyer that he is, would necessarily support the position that I have taken.

Now I ask the Minister to give us his answer to this question and I ask the Minister too, Mr. Chairman, is it a fact -- because this has been rumoured by the people out there -- is it a fact that the Minister has allowed certain large landowners, or landowners who are corporations, or landowners who are believed to have large gravel deposits upon their land, to withdraw from this area, and is it a fact that he has allowed these people to withdraw and has denied the small landowners a similar opportunity. Well I'd like to have that question answered.

Then I support also the contention of my honourable friend from St. George when he said that the department in taking actions of this kind should advise the owner of the land as to his rights under the act and as to his rights and his holdings with regard to his land, because I think that the various legal gentlemen in the House will agree with me in this, that even the best of lawyers are rather careful of giving an unqualified opinion as to whether an individual parcel of land contains the mineral rights or not, or putting it more correctly, as to whether the individual owner is seized of the mineral rights on that land.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . .

Apparently it's a question that most lawyers answer with a very qualified yes or no because it's not easy to get a direct answer, and surely we should not expect, surely the government should not take the position that these landowners, who naturally are not legally trained in the most of cases, should be put to the position of finding out for themselves whether they do or do not have the mineral rights, and particularly in that area where there are known to be valuable gravel deposits.

I think the Honourable the Minister will agree with me that as far as Manitoba is concerned that the term mineral rights does include sand and gravel, and in many parts of this expropriated area the sand and gravel deposits are known to exist, and on many of the expropriated lands there is at least a reasonable presumption that they exist in considerable quantity. And yet what do we find, Mr. Chairman? In general -- in general, the offers that are being made are being made on the basis of agricultural land and this simply is not agricultural land. This is residential property. In many of those cases it has been developing into a residential section very rapidly, and one of the landowners there who has a considerable holding told me that it is usual for him on a Sunday in wintertime as well as in summertime -- but of course particularly in summertime -- it is usual for him to have half a dozen to a dozen people drop in on a Sunday afternoon to ask if he is willing to sell a piece of land because the area is close to the City of Winnipeg and many people are wanting a home there in those rural surroundings and yet so close to the city.

So there is a residential feature here that can't be overlooked. There's a mineral deposit in the shape of sand and gravel that certainly, in many case, has a high value and yet the offers that are being made are largely on the basis of agricultural land and this is not agricultural land.

So I suggest to my honourable friend that if he insists on taking forcibly this land, that at least he should give the people the benefit of the advice of the legally trained people in his department, the Attorney-General's department, as to what their title entitles them to and then make some effort to value the land on that basis rather than as agricultural land, because by the token that a good bit of this land is possessed of sand and gravel, it is by the same token of lower agricultural value. It is just completely and entirely unfair on the one hand by not telling the people what rights they have as far as minerals are concerned to rob them of that potential value, and at the other time to downgrade them as agricultural land by the fact that it is this kind of an area.

Then as I have said on previous occasions in the House and out of it the area that my honourable friends are taking there is in my opinion much bigger than necessary. If I remember correctly the statement that the honourable the minister made when announcing this park, he said it would be approximately 9,300 acres. I understand that some gravel companies have had their land withdrawn. I believe that the figure that's given now is something less than 9,000 acres. But is it anything in that area, Mr. Chairman? I want the members of this House to picture the size that it is because the most of people -- and I have applied this particularly to my honourable friend the First Minister and to the Minister of this Department -- that I am sure they don't realize the amount of land that 8,000 acres is or 9,000 acres -- and I am sure if they did realize the amount of land that that is that they would recognize that it is not necessary even for the very optimistic plans that they have out there, because, Mr. Chairman, you will be aware I'm sure of the fact that Assiniboine Park which you've had something to do with, looks to the average person as a pretty big area. This area that my honourable friend is talking about is more than 20 times the size of Assiniboine Park. Some of my honourable friends play golf at times. Do you know how big Kildonan Park Golf Course is? It's less than 100 acres. The area that my honourable friend is talking about there would be more than 80 times that, pretty nearly 90 times. An 18-hole course seems quite a size when you get walking around it, Mr. Chairman. Windsor Golf Course is 133 acres or something of that nature. Kildonan Park is less than 100 acres I believe.

I know that you would expect to get a larger amount of land when you go out to establish a park out 14 - 15 miles here. But, Mr. Chairman, I maintain that you don't need that much land. All the facilities that we had exhibited to us in here in Room 200 the other day could be put on a considerably smaller acreage and the farmers and other private owners who wanted to be left out could have been left out without great detriment to the park, either as regards the topography which naturally the experts want to capture in as great variety as they can. I approve of that. This is a fine area, but in the land -- and I hope I am quoting the Honourable

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . . . the Minister correctly -- but my recollection is that he said that approximately half of the total area was already owned by the provincial government and the municipality taken together. Well that would be 46 or 47 hundred acres in round figures, and if you had taken and added to that amount of acreage the farms and holdings of the people who wanted to sell -- and there undoubtedly were some who were willing to -- my contention is that it was unnecessary to deprive these other people of an area that was very valuable to them in its potential and in many cases was very valuable to them as their home at this time.

Having mentioned that, and I'll be prepared to discuss it at greater length with my honourable friend when he does find occasion to reply, but in addition to that, I come back to the statement that I made in the beginning that the main thing here in my opinion is the principle. I suggest to my honourable friends that they are going too far in this question of expropriation. It's the wrong method to proceed on. Just because the Act is on the statute books, just because they have made it more drastic than it already was, is no reason why it should be applied in all its severity. I know that my honourable friend the First Minister has said that after the criticisms that were raised regarding the Art Centre purchases that from then on expropriation would be the method by which they would proceed, but I still maintain that even if you proceed under expropriation -- and I still have the feeling that negotiation should be carried on rather than expropriation first -- but even if you proceed under expropriation you still can deal fairly with the people. You still can have mutual understanding and goodwill between the people who are bargaining and those with which they are bargaining. You can still talk to the people on the basis of telling them something of the value of the property they've got and not try to beat them down to the last dollar.

Now I know that my honourable friend the Minister and others on that side of the House can say to me well you have a reputation for being pretty careful of the shekels yourself; and this is true. I have always considered that we should be at least as careful of the taxpayers' money as we are of our own and I do not fault any government for being thrifty and careful and looking after the taxpayers' money. I could wish that my honourable friends were making a much better job than I esteem them to be doing in that regard. But when you come to forcibly taking away from people land that they do not want to give up, this is a poor time in my opinion to start on a policy of rigid economy because these folks have not wanted to have their land taken away from them. For goodness sakes, when you're taking it from them against their will surely if there's ever a time to deal fairly with them that is it. But, I still say with regard to the practicalities of the situation in my opinion there's much to be said, but the principle is still the main thing and I view with alarm Mr. Chairman -- that's a term that the politicians like to use -- I view with alarm the tendency of this government to encroach still further on the rights of the individual. This is basically wrong. We should be going in the other direction. We should be putting legislation on the statute books to protect the rights of the individual, and we should be -- when we find that a policy requires us to take from somebody who doesn't want to make it available to us to compulsorily take from him his land -- that's the time when we should be ultra fair in my opinion. So I had hoped that it was the government's intention to bring before the House this year a revised Expropriation Act. I had hoped that they had profited by the experience of the United Kingdom and what was done there, by the experience of Ontario and what was done there, by the report of Mr. Justice Kline out in British Columbia, and how he commented on the fact that the expropriation authority was going too far these times; how he quoted the fact that they had something like 20 or more I think it was different Acts on the statute books under which the private individual could have his property forcibly taken away from him. This is the principle I think we should be looking at, Mr. Chairman. I expect to have something more to say about the practice of expropriation on both the estimates of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration, perhaps to a more limited extent in the case of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, and perhaps still again with one of the other ministers.

In the case of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works I think that generally expropriation has been applied more reasonably than it has been in my experience with these other departments that I mention, and if a road must go through or a telephone line or a hydro line, or if you've made up your mind that you're going to have a Portage Diversion, which I certainly do not favour as a policy, but once you've made up your mind you've got to go through, but I still question whether a park, desirable though the objective is in general, is important enough in the over-all concept of our democratic system that we should expropriate as a policy and particularly when we have land already available in what I think is sufficient amount.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . .

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have encouraged the Honourable the Minister to answer some time before we close tonight and I'll look forward to continuing this discussion both on the legal and the technical and the practical, and most of all the ground of principle, because that's the one that I think the government should be looking at most carefully of all; that's the one where I think the public of Manitoba should be made very well aware of just the erosion of their freedom that is being perpetrated by actions of this kind and I warn the government that this is a dangerous practice to pursue and I trust that I can encourage them to bring in a revised Expropriation Act at the next session.

..... Continued on next page

MR. SCHREYER: I intend to wait for Item 10 before I speak on this matter of the acquisition of the property for the Pine Ridge Park. I would like the Minister to indicate however when he intends to respond to what was said by the Honourable Member for St. George and the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Could he please tell us now?

MR. LYON: In due course. Carry on.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have much preferred to speak on this matter when the Minister of Agriculture was in his place because what I have to say regarding the Pine Ridge Parkland acquisition should be really related also to the manner of the acquisition of property for the Portage Diversion, for the Red River Floodway and the game preserve at the Delta Marshes and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I will, however say just a few words at this time and reserve the right to speak later under Item 10. It seems to me that expropriation as carried out by a government really breaks down into two parts! One having to do with the procedure which the government follows and the other aspect having to do with the standards of value arrived at by the government agents, the appraisers and so on. In the initial few months during which this land at Pine Ridge was being expropriated I was determined to keep out of the second aspect, that is to say, I was determined not to get involved with the matter of evaluation. I have had reason since to change my mind. It's a picket which apparently I and other members here, once they learn of discrepancies, will see that they too cannot really avoid. And so, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that failing any satisfactory explanation from the Minister both as to procedures and as to standards of evaluation, failing this explanation and justification by the Minister that we should have set up a committee, a legislative committee of investigation because there are just a few too many discrepancies as to values, value standards and as to procedures.

To be more specific, Mr. Chairman, I suppose the best thing to do would be to start at the beginning. Last year as was mentioned earlier we passed an amendment to The Expropriations Act which appears in the Statutes of 1964 as Chapter 18, and in Chapter 18 there is Section 6 which made that change that members have referred to already, namely that once this amendment came into effect the government would then have one year under the Act in which to make a formal offer to the people expropriated. Now it would surely have been said at the time that this one year limitation was an absolute maximum or limit which the government would not want to use, would not want to find refuge in that one year maximum, but, Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that this government has waited 362 days, 3 days short of a year, before it did make formal offers to these people expropriated in the Pine Ridge area. In other words this government has waited to the absolute maximum, has taken complete refuge in the protection given it by Section 6 of the amendment passed last year. Well now I wish we would get this straight, Mr. Chairman, the question has been put on several occasions from this side as to whether or not the government acted legally or illegally last April 10th when it filed the notice of expropriation in the Pine Ridge area, because the notice of expropriation was filed on April 10th and my honourable friends are of the opinion, and I'm of the opinion too, that the amendment did not come into effect until a week later, six days later. Well this is a question that has been put to the front bench opposite and they haven't answered it, and upon that question rests the whole matter of legality or illegality of government action. Now surely a question as serious as that is one that they would not want to evade if indeed they had any sort of answer to give.

MR. LYON: . . . . four years ago on the Red River Floodway.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, last year, last regular session, I rose in my place when mention was first made of the Pine Ridge Park plans and I, you might say pleaded with the government that they should avoid using the same tactics and procedure in acquiring the Pine Ridge Park area as they used in acquiring the floodway property, because the floodway property acquisition experience left a great deal to be desired.

The Honourable Member for St. George has referred to the methods and procedures used by this government regarding the Pine Ridge acquisition as -- I believe he used the word ruthless and vicious. There are two ways you can describe this acquisition, Mr. Chairman. On the one hand if one wanted to be unduly kind, one could say that their method and procedure left a great deal to be desired. On the other hand, if one wanted to be perhaps a little more accurate, closer to the truth, he would have to say that the procedures followed both in the floodway acquisition and in the case of the Pine Ridge Park that it did border, it did border on the ruthless. Vicious, I'm not sure, but it's in that general area, Mr. Chairman, in the sense that for eight or nine months the people of the Pine Ridge area were not told what sort of price, not

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . even the general level of price that they would be receiving for their property. On April 10th the government filed notice of expropriation. Nothing happened for three months after that until July 15th and then on July 15th or thereabouts appraisals began to be made. Appraisers agents were sent in after three months and this work of appraisal was commenced. It carried on through the balance of the month of July through the month of August and in early September I phoned to find out when the appraisal work would be completed because there was at this point mounting impatience on the part of the expropriated and understandably so. I was told when I phoned on September 7th that the appraisal work was on the very brink of being completed, so this seemed not too bad. Mind you, there was a delay there between expropriation and completion of appraisal of some five months which is considerable. But still that wasn't too bad, Mr. Chairman.

And then, what happened after that? September passed, October passed, almost all of November passed; three more months before the first tentative verbal offers were made to the residents that were expropriated there. Altogether then between the date of expropriation and the date when the first tentative verbal offers were made there was a lapse, a time period of very close to nine months. A period of gestation I suppose. In that nine months I don't know what was happening but I do know that the work was done very slowly, it was started late and done very slowly, and for nine months the people were left to sit on pins and needles to wonder about the general level of price they would receive; and not until they were given those offers, Mr. Chairman, could they really look about the area to look for alternative property and so these months were a complete waste insofar as they were concerned. And then of course having received these initial offers they had at least a general idea of what sort of money they would receive, then they could proceed to look around to see what they could afford to buy in the surrounding area in the Winnipeg area, or for that matter anywhere in the province. But in the month of December and January and February there really isn't much you can do in the way of picking alternative property because it's under snow and one has the feeling that he may be buying property sort of sight unseen in some respects.

Well, Mr. Chairman, after the offers began to be made in early December, late November then there was you might say negotiation. Not until that time was there any slightest bit of negotiation. Negotiations started after December 1st. After nine months, after expropriation, and it is going on to this day. January passed, February passed, March and on April 7th the Minister of Mines writes to the expropriated, gives them a written offer and informs them that under the provisions of the Act they now have 30 days. I have the letter here or a copy of the letter, Mr. Chairman, and in this letter the expropriated are informed that they have 30 days in which to reply whether the offer is satisfactory or not. Silence on their part is to be taken as agreement. The irony of it, Mr. Chairman! It takes the government 362 days to make up its mind and give them a written offer, then the government tells them but you reply in 30 days or else we shall assume that you are satisfied and then if you aren't well the odds are already then stacked against you.

There are all sorts of complications, Mr. Chairman, which have arisen out of this park land acquisition and I would certainly start with the assumption made by the, or postulated by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that this was the kind of proposition that may very well and very properly have been commenced by way of free negotiation. Here again I have some personal experience. The Federal Government wanted to build a satellite airport in the St. Andrews district north of Winnipeg. They wanted some few thousand acres of land, I believe in the order of three or four thousand, and that land that they wanted was owned by about 30, approximately 30 different property owners. They could have expropriated I suppose and got themselves into the same kind of tangle and mess as this government has done now on two separate occasions, the floodway and the Pine Ridge Park but they didn't do so. What the Federal Government did was to commence negotiation and within a period of 100 days the Federal Government had bought up these few thousand acres, three or four thousand acres, I believe closer to three, without having to expropriate in any single instance, and the price they paid was the price that this government ended up paying for in the case of the floodway. This government started out by offering the people in Narol for example 100 and \$125 an acre on the average. After 18 months of bickering and hard feeling and ill will this government ended up paying \$250 per acre, on the average, to the people in the Narol district. The reason why was because the people there stuck together and this government did not relish the prospect of having to take about 30 or 35 property owners there all to arbitration and so they finally ended up paying what the people there had wanted in the first place, what the Federal Government had paid

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . for somewhat similar land in the St. Andrews district about three miles back of the Number 4 highway.

I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister the Minister of Mines gave an undertaking to the people in Pine Ridge that he was receptive to their proposition that they be allowed to hire two or three independent appraisers at government expense, as sort of a double check to satisfy these people. So the property owners association in the Pine Ridge district did take them up on this offer or accepted his acquiescence or approval and they prepared a slate of six independent appraisers which they then submitted to the Minister some time in February I believe, or rather some time in March, and from this slate the Minister was to pick two or three and then the Pine Ridge property owners association was to retain these three appraisers, pay them and the government would in turn reimburse the property owners association. This was gone ahead with. The property owners association prepared a slate, submitted it to the Minister, and lo and behold he turned it down. He turned it down on the grounds that the slate submitted by the property owners association was a slate of out-of-province appraisers with the exception of one, and the Minister put it to them that he was not prepared to accept out-of-province appraisers. But, Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the appraisers that these people there want. For whatever reasons they may have -- and they may have a variety of reasons -- they want out-of-province appraisers to do this second or is it third check? I'm not sure. It's a tertiary check, let's compromise.

MR. LYON: Fourth.

MR. SCHREYER: Having had an appraisal made by the appraisers retained by the government, having had a secondary appraisal made by appraisers hired, shall we say by this government, it's only natural that the property owners association if they want to have a third appraisal made, a final check, a spot check appraisal made of a few properties that they should ask for appraisers who are not from this province, from this city. They want somebody to come in with an entirely fresh and objective view of the matter. The Minister turned them down, which is causing a good deal of consternation, and I would like the Minister to justify turning them down in view of the fact that he did give an undertaking that the government would reimburse the association if they retained or paid for two or three appraisers, to do this third spot check. The Minister insists on fourth. Well somewhere along we've lost track of one series of appraisals.

MR. LYON: Read the letter you've got in your hand.

MR. SCHREYER: It's a lengthy letter, Mr. Chairman. It's four pages in length, signed by the Honourable Minister, but I think that the hard information in it could be condensed to a paragraph.

I'm still very anxious to hear the Minister defend in a step by step manner the sequence which this government followed in acquiring this property at Pine Ridge and I would be also very interested to hear him justify the expropriation procedures there in the light of the procedures followed and being followed in the case of the game preserve and in the case of the Portage Diversion which I understand now is being -- that the property acquisition in the case of the Portage Diversion is now being held up. There's been a sort of a moratorium put on the acquisition of property for the diversion at Portage la Prairie. Why? Is it because this government was surprised this session by the controversy that sprang up over the Bain Estate? Are they still worried that the way they are acquiring property for the diversion is somehow hard to square with the way they've been acquiring property in the case of the Pine Ridge Park?

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside made mention also of the fact that many people in the area there are not too familiar with the question of mineral rights and allied matters. I want to say that this is also my very definite impression. The people there are in most instances confused as to the question of sand and gravel value, extent of deposit and also rather in the dark as to mineral rights. I would go so far as to say that the government agents have not been helping in this regard. I suppose that's because they haven't been instructed to, and they follow instructions. I think it would be an act of public responsibility, and act of grace on the part of the Minister if he were to instruct the appraisers and the acquisition agents to delve into this question of mineral rights on the individual parcels and to inform the individual owners accordingly. I have had it told me by one particular owner -- obviously I can't mention names in this setting -- I have had it told me however, that not only was he not informed but that if anything, he was misinformed, that it was intimated to him that he had no mineral rights and being rather on the curious side, and I suggest on the sharp side, he did make legal enquiry and found out otherwise. -- (Interjection) -- No, not here Mr. Chairman.

MR. LYON: Don't repeat what he is alleged to have said if you can't give the name of the owner.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is for the information of the Honourable Minister.

MR. LYON: Well give us the name of the owner, so we can check.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm putting it to the Honourable Minister as a matter of policy. If he wants a case treatment I suggest let him set up a committee of this Legislature.....

MR. LYON: Give us the name.....

MR. SCHREYER: ..... so that we can deal with the procedures followed by this government in acquiring property and so that we can also, by taking a few select cases, deal with the matter of land values, because that's another kettle of fish that has to be gone into.

MR. LYON: If the complaint's legitimate give us the name. We'll be glad to look into it.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I will check with the individual concerned. If he gives me his permission I will not hesitate for a second to give the Honourable Minister his name.

Mr. Chairman, right from the outset, as of last April 10, we have had this government repeat most of the errors it committed in acquiring property for the floodway and not only that, it's embellished upon it. We have had people in the area there when they enquired as to what proportion or what ratio of the expropriated had settled and so on, we have had them -- they've been given all sorts of conflicting information. They have been told for example that 70 percent in the area have signed. This is presumably what was said by an appraiser.

MR. LYON: To whom?

MR. SCHREYER: To one of the expropriates.

MR. LYON: Which one?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, .....

MR. LYON: Well tell us .....

MR. SCHREYER: If the Minister wants to set up a case study, then we can do a case study in a few instances, .....

MR. LYON: Just don't repeat hearsay unless you are prepared to back it up.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, this is a favourite defence of the Honourable Minister. The minute that some information is related he wants to know the names, and I suggest that the Minister knows full well that in an Assembly such as this one does not reveal or divulge names until he has checked the person concerned and obtained information to do so. But just because I haven't obtained that information is not going to deter me from putting before members here certain bits and pieces of information which when taken in the whole are very disturbing, very disturbing indeed.

Now I come to the matter of values. I cannot say much at this point about value standards being arrived at within the, what you would call the Pine Ridge area proper, that is to say in the escarpment area, except one point, Mr. Chairman, and that is there seems to be a complete breakdown of negotiation between the government appraisers and the individual expropriated on the question of sand and gravel values. In many cases the expropriated are informed that their sand and gravel deposits have no marketable or saleable value. In other cases they are told that the deposits might be considered by the government at valuing out at about 5 cents a cubic yard, etc., and then at several meetings held in the area it has been generally agreed upon that the going rate for sand and gravel from the pits in the area is in the order of 15, 17 cents a cubic yard and so there is a differential there of 5¢ to 15¢. And then of course there's the overall general question of what is a marketable deposit of sand and gravel and what isn't. Of course the department would like to put these deposits in the light of them having no immediate sale or market value, but let us bear in mind that the City of Winnipeg will be with us forevermore we hope, construction will take place at a rate of geometric increase, more and more construction. For all that the geologists know the earth is not manufacturing more silica and sand and gravel and so these deposits do have if not immediate, certainly intermediate range value, and that's certainly one sore point or spot of negotiation that is going on now.

And in addition, Mr. Chairman, it must be said again, and I said it at the last session when I spoke briefly on this question of the Pine Ridge Park, I said then that the Pine Ridge area was one not of agricultural value so much as one of residential potential. I think I can quote the page number but I can certainly find it in Hansard and apparently -- of course I'm not an appraiser but I have some knowledge of the area and I'm sure that the Honourable Minister has. Despite all that, despite my having said so, despite the Minister's knowledge of the area

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . . and the knowledge on the part of others in the department, this government persists in treating much of that land on the basis of agricultural land value. And this is simply preposterous, Mr. Chairman. This is not farm land and I understand that the Minister, here I can mention names, the Honourable Minister I am told said that one reason why he would not accept these out-of-province appraisers was because they had no experience with agricultural land value, farm land value, in the periphery of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area--(Interjection)--Did not say that?

MR. LYON: . . . . . accept Manitoba land values.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh all right, Manitoba land. And in that statement I read the connotation of reference to farm land. Mr. Chairman, if I must repeat it, I repeat it again, this is not farm land and the people there rightfully resent it being regarded as such.

Now I leave the question of land values in the Pine Ridge escarpment area generally and I want to say a few words about land value standards being arrived at in the case of the expropriated in the Springfield, correction -- in the St. Clements municipality area, that is to say the property lying between the floodway and the Pine Ridge escarpment. That property there is owned by people living in St. Clements, not in Pine Ridge; it's the end pieces of four mile long Red River lots, and those parcels have at least three distinct types of soil and three distinct levels to them. At the far eastern end you have the edge of the Pine Ridge escarpment, there is sand, gravel and there are in almost all cases heavily treed areas with people using those areas over the years for firewood and so on. Then as you proceed westward toward the floodway, the level descends and one comes into shrub area and then beyond that into either hay, meadow or cultivated area. Now when this government was acquiring land from these same people for the floodway, they ended up paying on the average \$250 an acre for land that was in some cases cultivated, in some cases low lying hay land. Now this government through a different department in buying the land just adjoining to the east, and if anything the value should be slightly higher since it involves sand, gravel and trees, not just low lying areas, but low and behold the price being offered does not average out to 250 an acre; it is averaging somewhere closer to 120.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand full well that appraisal and appraisal work can be a pretty complicated business. I also know, however, that it is highly subjective and the people there are just not going to accept an appraiser's word for it when the differential between sister pieces of property is in the order of 100 percent, the differential between \$120 an acre and 250 is truly 100 percent differential. Why should they accept it? And I intend -- well it's not necessary for me to demonstrate what will be done there. The fact is that these same people having gone through the ordeal in the case of the floodway are quite sure of what they're going to do now, and that is they are not going to deal on this sort of basis. If the government wants to proceed to arbitration they of course must submit, and they're anxious for arbitration I might add because they have come to the conclusion that it is in a court of law or in a court of arbitration that they can expect to be dealt with with all the cards on the table. And speaking of all the cards on the table, I want to ask the Minister why it is that the government, the department when making offers to these people simply refuses, but simply refuses to give them an itemized statement of what the offer, what basis the offer is being made. The offer is given in a lump sum and it's not itemized which doesn't tell them very much, but then in return when the government asks for a counter offer it encourages them to give a breakdown or an itemized statement of counter offers, which is a rather lopsided way of negotiating, Mr. Chairman.

It is my understanding that one reason why this government does not want to give an itemized statement of offer to the expropriated is because by doing so they may be revealing their hand a bit to the people and so when they get into arbitration court they will have a little tougher time of it. If this be so, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly suggest to the Honourable Minister that it is his public responsibility to give to the expropriated or to see that the expropriated are provided with itemized statements of offer so that the people there know what they are being offered and for what particular part of their property they are being offered a certain amount of money; how much money they are being offered for the next item of property and so on. This is not being done at all according to my understanding and I think it's wrong.

And then too, still dealing with this property west of the Pine Ridge escarpment, between the floodway and the escarpment, we find not just a big discrepancy and differential between what was paid by the floodway purchasing committee and what's being offered now, not just a differential in that respect, but also a differential, really amazing differentials which I would

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . . like honourable members to be informed of. amazing differentials as between immediately adjoining properties. I have here a map; it's a sort of topographic map taken by way of air photo survey and then the air photos are plotted on a map . . . . . and it shows the escarpments of the Pine Ridge graduated by 25 feet intervals and so on, and the area in question shows up quite clearly, one gets an idea of where the 800 foot escarpment is, the 775 foot escarpment and so on. I have plotted some of the lots that have been expropriated, lots owned by different individuals. and I have walked the area in previous years, some people there I have known for some time and we have differentials as high as \$120 on one lot. then just 200 feet over on the next lot we have an offer. it comes close to a thousand dollars an acre. Mr. Chairman. Lot 256 -- the Minister is probably going to challenge me again for specifics. so I give him these particular specifics. I think I'm not revealing any confidence when I do so. In the case of Lot 256 the offer comes to about \$120 an acre -- it does now, Mr. Chairman, it was even lower than that a few months ago. This has been after some dickering. And then we come to the next lot over, would be Lot 258; then two lots over on the other side would be Lot 254, and the prices offered in there, in one case comes close to a thousand dollars an acre and--(Interjection)--yes -- and in the other case it comes to over \$200 an acre, the differential still being almost twice that of the price paid on Lot 256. These are but some examples and I would like honourable members to be fully informed, because quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I'm at my wits end. I've had to deal with this sort of stuff ever since 1961 and I'm beginning to doubt my own judgment in the matter and I would like other members to be informed of the procedures followed on the one hand and the standards of value being set and reset and reset and reset again -- standards being reset, Mr. Chairman. that shows you what kind of standards they are -- on the other hand. I am seriously requesting that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a legislative committee to look into this matter and we can do it by way of select cases I suppose. I suppose there would be difficulty of getting permission from individuals but where permission can be received, and I suggest it can be received in several cases, that a committee of this House do work with the department in looking at these cases. All I know, Mr. Chairman, is that it is only natural that one would get a lot of rumors flying around when wholesale property acquisition is taking place. Rumors are to be expected, but you can only discount rumors so much before there comes a point when the rumors must obviously have substance to them and I have regretfully come to the conclusion that many of the rumors in the case of the park land acquisition do indeed have substance.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister was not too eager to reply to the Honourable Member for St. George earlier this evening. Unfortunately I have prevented him from replying now but I would hope, I would hope that the Minister will be prepared to reply tomorrow and that he will in doing so also reply as to whether or not it is a conceivable or a practical possibility to have a committee look into this. Because if we do establish a committee and once the committee makes a report that would more than any other single thing go to dispel whatever ill-founded rumors have sprung up in the area of Pine Ridge and so on -- and I'm not so sure but that most of these rumors aren't beginning to have substance, much substance to them, Mr. Chairman.

I am sorry that I have had to speak on so many occasions about this government's land acquisition practices, but when you have in one case over 8,500 acres expropriated for the park and in the other case several thousand acres expropriated for a floodway and when the method used is one of expropriation without negotiation, who in his right mind would expect that the people involved would take to it kindly, especially when they look around and see that this same government does not resort to expropriation when it acquires property for other essential public works. Immediately there springs in their mind the suspicion this government's false I suggest; the suspicion that equal treatment before the law is not being lived up to by this government. And on that point, Mr. Chairman, I would have to agree.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the committee to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.