

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 1, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the amendment be amended by adding after the word "purchases" in the second line of the amendment, the words "in some of which the government expropriated the land and in other cases failed to expropriate, thereby costing the taxpayers of the province large sums of extra money".

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate for the first time and allow me to extend congratulations on you having your post for another year. I would like to also offer my congratulations to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet for his fine address and his description of his constituency. I would also like to congratulate the Member for Fisher who gave us a very reviewing account of his constituency also. While there may have been some things in their remarks that I will take issue with later, I must say that the honourable gentlemen spoke well and gave a very educational discourse on their parts of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker as I listened to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources this afternoon I was reminded of a story that I had heard about Christopher Columbus when he discovered America in 1492. And it went something like this: "When Columbus started out he didn't know where he was going. When he got there, he didn't know where he was. When he got back, he didn't know where he had been. And he did it all on other people's money." What a Minister of Mines and Natural Resources Christopher Columbus would have made. For the first hour this afternoon when the Honourable Minister was giving his hour and a half discourse, I thought perhaps he was a real estate salesman working for some firm that had a great deal of marsh land to sell. I'm sure the speculators of the province will be rushing out tomorrow morning to acquire the probably millions of acres of marsh land.

Madam Speaker, I haven't had the benefit of five or six days of preparation so I may not have precise dates, but I am going to try and stay as close to the facts of the case that is before us as is possible. I am not going to drag in red herrings. I am not going to quote great naturalists. I'm going to try and stay with the bones of the case, which is whether or not the Minister of the Crown paid an exorbitant amount of money for land using the taxpayers' money to do it with. As was earlier stated last week when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition gave his facts, he gave the figures, he gave the dates to substantiate the facts. And for a moment I would like to go back over these figures and make some comment on them as they were mentioned.

First of all, it has been established --and anyone who cares to go to a Land Titles Office in Portage la Prairie or in Winnipeg in one of the cases may do so and look up the figures for himself. I'll deal now with the parcel of property known as the Delta Hunting Lodge, or the Bain Hunting Lodge at Delta. It's a matter of record if one will go into the Land Titles Office in Portage la Prairie you will see that Octave Enterprises acquired this property for \$60,000.00. Now let us see for a moment how the figure of \$60,000 was arrived at by the seller and agreed to in this case Octave Enterprises, as the purchaser. I have here a copy of an evaluation done by Norman Tilley of Portage la Prairie, which after I am through with it I am quite willing to table it if anybody wishes to have this done. This evaluation is done in great detail - buildings, land and everything that there is to evaluate but not including implements or property, his evaluation is \$53,850.00. Madam Speaker, this figure was used for purposes of selling by a group of Executors who represented a large number of heirs. In case that figure is not acceptable to my honourable friends over there, I would suggest that they can go down to the Court House and check in the Court of Queen's Bench here in Winnipeg, and they will find that Mr. Tilley was called to give a sworn statement as to the fairness and the correctness of his evaluation. And I would like to read this statement. It begins, "I Norman Tilley of the City of Portage la Prairie in the Province of Manitoba, realtor, hereby make oath and say as follows: that I have been in the real estate business in the City of Portage la Prairie for 13 years and during that period have had considerable experience in valuing both city and farm property, in the City of Portage la Prairie and in the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie. That on the 30th day of August 1962 I was requested by Mr. Duncan M. McPherson to make a valuation of certain property being (a) part of Lot 23, parish of Portage la Prairie lying to the southwest of the limits of the said City and approximating 219 acres, and (b) certain farm and shooting lodge

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd).....property elsewhere in the Municipality of Portage la Prairie in the vicinity of Delta approximating 2, 618 acres, all being in Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 17 in Township 14 Range 7 west of the principal meridian in the said province. That initially I was driven by Mr. McPherson to the said areas to enable me to readily identify them and to start on my valuation work. That at no time did I receive any instructions to make this valuation on the basis of it being required for Estate Tax purposes. My instructions were solely to determine the market value of the property in its present use, as of August 15th, 1962, and to submit a written report. That on or about the 8th day of September 1962, I did make such report in writing, copy of which I am advised by Mr. McPherson and verily believe had been filed in court as an exhibit in these proceedings. That in making the valuation of the two parcels referred to, I did take into consideration all factors pertaining to use of part of the land as farm land, and part of the land as a sporting enterprise, which my knowledge and experience has taught me to apply. The valuations which I set for the said two parcels of land based on sales of farm and marsh land in recent years were in my opinion a fair estimate of the market value of these parcels as at August 15th, 1962. That I was today advised by Mr. McPherson and verily believe that the executors of the Donald Anderson Bain estate had been offered a cash amount in excess of 15% higher than the evaluations fixed by me, clear of real estate commissions. That in my opinion a sale of said properties at such a figure is an advantageous one from the standpoint of said estate and was one that should be taken advantage of."

Madam Speaker, my point in reading out this evaluation is to emphasize the reason that it was given in the Court. It was not as my honourable friend has suggested, the evaluations were made by the Bain estate people for the purposes of minimizing their succession duties. It was made for the basis of selling the property at whatever price they could get on the market, and the fact that the evaluations were upheld by Judge Nitikman speaks for themselves, that in his opinion it was a fair selling price and the estate was receiving a just and fair price.

Now as I said before the valuation on this particular piece of land was \$53, 850.00. This included all the buildings, all the land, the land that is known as the Inkster Farm, but it does not include the implements or the furnishings. So Octave bought the property or took option on the property for \$60, 000.00. This government purchased it within the year for \$125, 000.00. We have had it amply explained in the last two or three minutes at 5:30 by the Member from Lakeside, that this government could have taken expropriation proceedings despite the feeble defence that is made that under the Wildlife Act of that time this could not have been done. Even if this argument had of held ...

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't think it was amply demonstrated by the Member for Lakeside that the government could have taken action at all. There was a statement made by him ... (Interjection)

MR. CAMPBELL: .....point of privilege Madam Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the honourable gentleman over there. If they believe that --and we'll give them for the moment the fact that it could be so, , but we know otherwise, we looked up the Statutes and we know very well you could have used expropriation-- let me pose you this question. Why did not the government proclaim The Wildlife Act on May 7, 1963? Then you could have used it. But no, you didn't proclaim that Act until September 1, 1963. What have you got to say to that? --(Interjection)-- Nothing.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentleman is suggesting that we postpone.... He even asked me to answer a question. --(Interjection)-- Madam Speaker I'm trying to answer his question. I expect that we postponed it so that we could make unconscionable --(Interjection)--

MR. CAMPBELL: Who has the floor?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I don't think that there is any rule in the House that will support that kind of ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: Who has the floor?

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member from Portage la Prairie as I understood it asked a question. --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I believe Madam Speaker the members opposite, if that is their defence it is a mightily poor defense, a lot of hooting and hollering. Let us move onto another piece of this land that was acquired by this government. Let's talk for a moment now about the piece of land at Grants Lake, approximately 800 acres of marsh or swampland that Mr. Bain

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd). . . . . By the government's own words this afternoon, their appraiser said this land was worth in the neighborhood of 15,900 and some odd dollars. What did they pay for it? This is in their own words they said that this is what the land was appraised at by their own people. What did they pay for it? They paid \$45,000 for it. And how did they try to conceal this information Madam Speaker? In the Order for Return that was referred to this afternoon by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, when he answered the questions posed to him. The questions were, whether or not the Province had purchased the property known as the Bain Estate at Delta? Is that not a clear question? Third, if so, who was the property purchased from? Is that not a clear question? And what was the answer? No. 1 question, the answer was yes -- a clear answer. No. 2, \$170,000 for the properties at Delta and at Grants Lake. Madam Speaker, I submit to you that that is a misleading answer. This was not the question. The question was what did you pay for the property at Delta? It's a very simple matter -- we found out. We went to the Land Titles Office at Portage la Prairie. The answer is there--\$125,000.00. Now if that isn't misinformation, I don't know what is, a Minister giving you an Order for Return like this.

MR. HUTTON: Here, here. . . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: We'll talk about that later --(Interjection)-- You'll find out. Now the third parcel of land that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture had his oar into. What happened there? --(Interjection)-- Paddle is right. I have here the evaluation done by the same Mr. Tilley at the request of the Bain Estate. The evaluation in detail for the land, the buildings, adds up to \$29,936.00. The Bain Estate executors used this evaluation and they received on option \$32,500 from Octave Enterprises. So what does my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture pay for this piece of land? --\$75,000. How did he arrive at this price? I'd be very interested to find out. --(Interjection)-- No doubt later you will have your chance to tell us. I'd like to hear the whole story.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Portage permit a question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Later. That's a good phrase "in due course". I have here a letter, a copy of a letter from Aronovitch and Leipsic written to Mr. Tilley. They were trying to sell the land for everything they could get and I don't blame them, this is their business. The agent that was working to sell this land was trying to get as good a price as he could and I don't blame him. But here's what he thought was a good price. This letter dated September 20, 1963 addressed to Mr. Norman Tilley, Portage la Prairie: "This is to confirm our telephone discussion and is your authority to offer for sale the Donald H. Bain farm land, including buildings located on Lot 23 Portage la Prairie. The price is \$65,000 and the suggested terms are cash. It is understood that this listing is on a 50-50 basis of commission with Aronovitch and Leipsic." My honourable friend paid \$75,000 Madam Speaker - just a slight matter of ten thousands. These people thought they were getting top price at \$65,000 but they must have found a sucker, is the best I can say.

Madam Speaker, what does all this suggest? It suggests that some people who weren't competent were taken in the market place. That's what it suggests. People that don't know what they are doing in business dealings. When you take figures like this and try to dress them up the way they did this afternoon passes all understanding. We had an hour's travelogue of how wonderful wildlife is --no answers to the questions. We had evaluations or appraisals supplied by a firm that is selling the land. Do you think they are foolish enough to give low appraisals? They are trying to sell for everything they can get. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources comes in here and quotes us the appraisals of Aronovitch and Leipsic -- and these are the agents for selling the land. What kind of appraisal did you expect them to give?

Now some reference was made this afternoon to the fact that the member from Portage la Prairie was trying to buy this land. I'd like to tell you how I entered the picture. I have here a letter and I'll read it and table it. It's dated August 25th, 1964. "Dear Gordon: Re your enquiry pertaining to Mallard Lodge and the D.H. Bain Estate. The Delta property which included the lodge, all the farm land, marsh area and lake frontage was offered to me for \$90,000 by Dunc McPherson, one of the executors of the Bain Estate. My immediate reaction was that this was too much to handle. After giving some thought to the proposition and making some enquiries, I was able to acquire sufficient monies to swing the deal by bringing in a few other interested parties." I am one of the interested parties. I contacted

(MR. JOHNSTON, cont'd). . . . . Dunc McPherson by phone and told him that we wanted the Delta property. Unfortunately during the few days it took to make up my mind all of the property, Delta, Portage, Grosse Isle, etcetera had been given to Octave Enterprises by the executors. The exact dates of the above have slipped my mind at this time. I gave no further thought to the above for several weeks when I received word from Dunc that Octave was interested in unloading the Delta property and if we were still interested to contact Lou Levine at Aronovitch and Leipsic. Dunc also told me that for my information the Delta property was put into the package deal with Octave at \$80,000.00. I contacted Mr. Levine and the asking price on Delta, without any farm equipment or lodge furnishings was in excess of \$170,000.00. Now I went with Mr. Heal and two other gentlemen to Winnipeg. We listened to the proposal of Aronovitch and Leipsic. Their price at that time was over \$200,000.00. After a few moments of conversation we left. There was never any offer, never any suggestion that we were interested in these prices and we went back. The only other contact that I have had with these people is on two occasions a Mr. Levine tried to reach me by phone. I did not take the message to reply. And the only other time was when he made a trip out to Portage to try and sell this land, he found me at the Portage Golf Club and we had a short conversation in which I told him I wasn't interested.

Madam Speaker, this took place seven or eight months after the late Mr. Bain had passed away. Surely in seven or eight months, the government if they were interested, would have acted. We have heard this afternoon about the great fears of foreigners and Americans acquiring these properties and I state at this time what my interest was in this particular proposition -- was that it was apparent, or it seemed to be apparent at that time the government was not acting and the land was openly for sale.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker before the next speaker speaks may I request that the documents referred to by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, which he expressed his willingness to table, be tabled.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . . . copies of the only ones I have.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker I think in view of the fact that the Honourable Minister this afternoon when he was speaking was quoting from correspondence that he should also table all documents which he quoted.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker I'm not too concerned with the point raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, it doesn't concern me personally. All that I'm asking for at this time is the tabling of the documents referred to by the Honourable Minister for Portage. I would respectfully suggest that if the Member for Selkirk wishes the documents from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he does the same as I do.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Portage answer a question? Now. Is Mr. Tilley an accredited appraiser?--(Interjection)-- Is Mr. Tilley an accredited appraiser or a Member of the Appraisers Institute of Canada?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm not certain Madam Speaker, but I don't think he is.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, what are Mr. Tilley's qualifications?

MR. JOHNSTON: The court accepted his qualifications. I feel that's good enough for me too.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker could I ask the Minister of Agriculture a question?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker did the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture take part in the debate now, or didn't he?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker with your kind permission, I'll forget about the empty and meaningless words that many members start this debate on the Throne Speech. Mind you, I do agree with my colleague from LaVerendrye that you are a very charming lady and I respect the high office of your position, but I don't think that you would believe me if I wished you to have a long term in this office. What I actually wish is I hope that for once maybe I'll be able to stand up here and not be called out of order. I don't believe Madam Speaker that -- I don't like to start with those empty words as I said, I don't believe that one should smile before trying to knock somebody else's block off, not more than I like to be patted on the back before somebody thrusts a knife between my shoulder blades. Now I do believe in this direct approach.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Is the honourable member suggesting that I do this? He was speaking of me?

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, I've never seen you with a knife Madam Speaker. I don't think I suggested --(Interjection)-- Go ahead.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order. I respectfully suggest that the honourable member...

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, how can I suggest it's you, because you don't even take part in this debate on the Throne Speech. How can it be you? How can it be you Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: May I suggest that if the honourable member is suggesting anything of this nature towards my position in the Chair, I ask him to withdraw his remarks.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, how can I suggest it's you, when you don't take part in this debate? Can you tell me? Is there any doubt at all? I said if some of the members, like my friend the would be or the ex-Attorney-General ...

MADAM SPEAKER: I ask the Honourable Member from St. Boniface to withdraw his remarks regarding me.

MR. DESJARDINS: I haven't made any remarks about you and I'm not going to withdraw any remarks, Madam Speaker. I said this --and you can read Hansard tomorrow-- that I will not start with these empty and meaningless words like so many of the members here start this debate. This is what I said. And I'm not going to - and I said --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm speaking for myself. I'm not afraid to speak for myself. I'll speak for myself and you speak when it's your turn. Can I go on, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, before the honourable member continues I don't think on a point of order that it should be allowed to drop there. Because as I heard the honourable member he was making reflections upon the Chair.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh...

MR. LYON: You were, and reflections upon the Chair are not countenanced in this House or any other House in the British Parliamentary System. If my honourable friend needs a bit of education in that, I for one will be glad to give it to him. It's about time Madam Speaker, that my friend began to learn....

MR. DESJARDINS: Is he making a speech, Madam Speaker, or do I have the floor?

MR. LYON: .....the rules of this House are not the same as the rules in the hockey rink where he was brought up. The rules here are much different.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, do I have the floor?

.....Order, Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker do I have the floor or an I going to listen to a second speech?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker may I interject in this that when Madam Speaker is standing all members of this House should be seated.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce rose on a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. LYON: I merely say that the remarks as I heard them from the honourable member for St. Boniface were a reflection upon the chair, and in my opinion you quite properly asked him to withdraw those remarks and I think he should withdraw them. And if he doesn't the course of the House is clear.

MADAM SPEAKER: I take the stand that the honourable member from St. Boniface did make reflections on the Chair and I ask the Honourable Member from St. Boniface to withdraw them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks, Madam Speaker. This is exactly the case. I made it clear that I wasn't speaking about the Speaker. But I was glad to hear these few words from the --(Interjections)-- Madam Speaker, do I have to listen to this fellow? I listened to him all afternoon. What is your ruling? Did you say -- I thought I heard you say that you took this that I wasn't making any reflections on you. Isn't that what you said?

MADAM SPEAKER: I did -- I asked you to withdraw them.

MR. DESJARDINS: To withdraw what, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The reflections you made towards me.

MR. DESJARDINS: I haven't made any that I'm aware of. I said that --and you can see tomorrow's -- that I would not start with meaningless words like so many members in this House started this debate. This is exactly what I said.

MADAM SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

MR. SCHREYER: Before you put the question, will you entertain a suggestion from me, as a dispassionate observer? I'm not entering into this and I got the impression that the remarks of the member for St. Boniface were not aimed at Your Honour. In fact I'm not sure who they were aimed at at all. It wasn't very coherent but I don't think they were aimed at you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, if this is going to please you, I don't know what I should withdraw, but I withdraw anything that you think was aimed at you (here here) And I do this Madam Speaker, because you asked me and not because this member that reminds me of this fogging machine that's always followed by a smoke screen, not because this gentleman asked me at all.

Now, Madam Speaker, the point that I was trying to make, and why I've taken this direct approach is because I feel that the --I do agree, and I do respect the democratic form of government and I do also feel that we should have courtesy in this House. But I think that in this very critical time in the history of our young nation where the very foundation of democracy are shaking, I think that we need more than empty words and more than forced smiles to show that we respect democracy and to show that we have a little bit of courtesy. I think that is more important instead of all this bickering and all this standing up on procedure like some of my friends from across me. I think it is high time that a politician should find a little more sincerity and a little more courage. I think it's about time we had a little bit of less pulse taking, a little true leadership that we're not getting in this House. I do believe that democracy is in danger when we have an egomaniac that is trying to impose himself on the country and on a party and also when there are so many politicians who are flirting with the scandal, I might say, and who are motivated so much by personal gain.

Now it seems to me that these days the definition of a good politician is an opportunist and I don't think that -- we have another theory that seems to be the guiding of our friends the theory of divide and conquer. Now it seems that showmanship and acting ability are the main qualities in a politician these days, instead of judgment, integrity and statesmanship. I'm not absolving the Liberals, Madam Speaker, I deplore the fact that some of the Quebec politicians who have learned their politics under the Duplessis regime where patronage was the order of the day, and later on were discouraged when Premier Lesage swept them clean and who felt that maybe they should have a field in politics. I deplore this ... And I also admit that Pearson, Mr. Pearson is not the most popular man. I think that he has quite a few difficulties. He's saddled with the man of vision out there in Ottawa and also a minority government, and yes, probably some weak members in his own party. But those who mock the speech --we'll come to that after maybe, Attorney-General-- I think I can inform we will come to this fairly soon and show what those people across from us think what they are. I think those that mock the speech impediment of the Prime Minister of this country cannot deny the sincerity and his courage, a man who is considered all across the world and I understand that he will receive another honour, I think it is from the University of Tampa.

It saddens me, Madam Speaker, to see this state of affairs. It doesn't sadden me --it doesn't scare me for the Liberal Party but for Canada. I don't think that we-- it has been said that we don't deserve this man in Ottawa and I think that some of us don't. I think if this man was given a chance he would become the ablest Prime Minister in the history of our country. And I don't care if he's a Liberal, Conservative or NDP. He's a man who had the courage to give us a flag. And I for one thank him for this truly Canadian flag. Oh yes, some of them said well let's keep this Union Jack. How can anybody that wants to be sincere, how do they think that this Union Jack can motivate some people, can move some of the people who fought against this flag in a war. This is no discredit to the Union Jack; we're trying to get a flag that will unite Canada, not divide. How do they think that we should have the fleur-de-lis? What does that mean for a lot of people? What does it mean to the Attorney-General? It only means that it is a strange power, that's all. Strange, in a foreign country. Now some say, well let's combine both, let's combine the Union Jack and then the fleur-de-lis. Oh, this would be terrific. You'd have half a flag for the Anglo-Saxon, and half a flag for the

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd). . . . French Canadian and no flag at all for the others. I think that under this flag we can unite and it can be a true Canadian flag and it can be acceptable by all.

I think, Madam Speaker, that it is high time that we reassess our own value. The French-Canadian in Quebec are standing --want to make a better life for themselves and I think that we have to understand certain things we don't agree with. Now they don't agree with certain things that is said-- for instance the Honourable Member for St. Matthews got up here, the greatest thing in his life, he was born a British subject, he lived a British subject and he wants to die a British subject. This is all right. I don't quarrel with that. But it's not everyone in Canada should do that and we cannot impose these feelings on other people in Canada. Some of the people from --some Hungarians, and so on come in, they want a safe place to live, they want a place where they can bring up their children. This is it. In other words what I'm trying to say is that we can have unity but we don't need uniformity in this country.

Some of us are very moved by the Queen and we want to celebrate these days. I for one believe in this. And others are very interested in celebrating St. Jean Baptiste, or Robbie Burns. Well I don't think that this matters. I think that we could all live in Canada as true Canadians without fighting, without imposing either the Queen or Robbie Burns or St. Jean Baptiste on the rest of Canada. I think that we should live and let live and we respect the rights of all minorities. I don't think that we should judge the people by the fanatics. Mind you we hear more about those people -- we hear more about the extremists in the different places, in the different parties. We don't hear about the good parts of it, and I don't think that we should judge the majority either Conservatives, Liberals or NDP or Social Credit by some of these people. I wouldn't want to judge a Conservative by Mr. Diefenbaker nor the Liberals by Dupuis or the Unions by Banks. I don't think that this is right.

I do believe Madam Speaker, that we need strong parties. I think it is a necessity in a democratic form of government and I think the odd time it's all right to try to outsmart each other. It's a kind of a game that we play and that's fine once in a while. But I think we should draw the line on certain things, Madam Speaker, and I think that then we should put our country before our party. I don't like this business of dividing. For instance, on the Throne Speech my leader spoke briefly in French. He mentioned that he was pleased that things were looking a little better, that there was a little more co-operation between the people of Canada, that we didn't hear so much of the extremists, and the Premier interjected, when he was talking about the improvement in Quebec, Et la visite de la reine - and the Queen's visit. What was he trying to insinuate with that, I'd like to know. Who's he trying to accuse? What is he trying to do? I'd like him to make his point very clear, and put it on Hansard or maybe when he goes to speak to the Chamber of Commerce or the St. Jean Baptiste in Quebec he can tell them himself. There is the danger that we might be a little too partisan and as I say this is the time that I think we should think of our country more than our party when the chips are down and when our country is in danger.

I think, Madam Speaker, that there is a chance, I like to think that the future of our party soon will be --of our democratic form of government will be in the hands of a man like Pearson, Robarts, Lesage, Stanfield Hellyar, Fulton, and yes, my own leader here that I respect very much.

Now we have in front of us a motion censuring the government for its irresponsibility, waste and mismanagement --and I think that we could add dictatorship and arrogance to this. A government completely dominated by one man who came in power riding on Diefenbaker's coattails. A man who like his master, you could say, receive an overwhelming mandate, a majority to see what he can do, give him a chance to do something for his country, for his province. Well like this man that he claims has done more for Western Canada, like this man he has also proved to be a major disappointment. I think that we are a little tired of hearing only words, and only -- oh they are lovely words mind you but there are no actions at all from this man and from this party. It's a man that I kind of admired when we brought in this Metro bill because that was a kind of a tough one, but a short two years after he put that in the hands of a Commission. And he abandoned this, he let it be attacked by everybody. He didn't guide it at all. He didn't help it at all. It was his baby that he had created but that was it. Goodbye baby. Oh, then he gave us beautiful words about state aid. He went around the province talking one way in one place and the other way in another district. He would come to St. Boniface and say, "Oh yes, the Member from St. Boniface is right. He is a good man. But actually he is alone, it's not his party." Then he would go to Boissevain and say, "See what the Liberals are doing with Desjardins?" This is what he tried to do. This is what I have

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd).....talked about division -dividing the country. Now I think that he should be a little more realistic. He reminds me of this Madam Speaker. This is an apple. It is a lovely apple. But it's wax. It looks good. It doesn't mean a thing and I would like him to try to take a bite out of this to see how much nourishment he will get out of that. Maybe he can pass the other half to the --no, not the Attorney-General now-- to the one that was before he lost his job.

This is a man, Madam Speaker, who is leading this province, who has never shown any co-operation at all with anybody. It's a man that cannot take criticism at all, Madam Speaker. He has to be the top dog. He has to be the boss. Look at what happened last Friday. Now there's an example. Look what happened in the Throne Speech, he talked --I am not talking about your decision Madam Speaker-- I am talking about him that he tried to make us lose a day on this, by the definition of a word that he had changed completely. I have never seen, I have looked in five different dictionaries and never seen that definition. So these are some of the examples of this man that wants to be the boss. Today he tried to tell you what to do. He tried to tell you what to say. Right this afternoon. Now a few days ago he wouldn't let the Minister of Health speak at all, or the Minister of Agriculture. Then he was very angry at my friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who has quite a bit to do. And there is the write-up here in the Free Press of October 10th where "Smellie's Statement makes Roblin Angry". Premier Duff Roblin said he was angry Friday because one of his cabinet ministers contradicted him. Then, at the last session he ordered the Minister of Agriculture to leave the House so he wouldn't be caught in the debate. He didn't want him to take part in the debate at all. Even his own people were so amused that they had to laugh. And a year ago he said "Jack", to the Minister of Welfare, "sit down and shut up" right in front here. Eh Jack? Isn't that right? "Sit down and shut up, Jack" that's what I said. This is what I mean when I'm talking about the dictator. He pretends that he wants constructive criticism.--(Interjection)-- Did you want to say something? I don't know if my friend wanted to say something--(Interjection) Fine good. It's the man that talks about advice. He won't take any constructive criticism at all. He tells us we have a role to play. We have a job to do on this side of the House, but he ignores us. He doesn't even know we exist. Here is an example. Here is another little writing in the Tribune, August 3, 1964, "Conservatives attend lectures on Government". "Some Conservative members of the Manitoba Legislature are attending lectures this summer to become better informed about what their government is doing. That's for their members. That's for their members, nobody else, we are not part of this House at all. I'll always remember this trip up north where the government, the people of the province paid for this, we were supposed to learn a little bit. He was so afraid that my leader would be somewhere without him knowing, or that he would be invited to sit at the head table, he had him in the back of the hall --and he was there in Le Pas with my friend. My friend was beaming and he was promising everything. I think that all the Indian Chiefs received a buffalo on that trip. I think we left with a case of about 600. It seems to me that every time I was looking, one of them was receiving the Order of the Buffalo. What a joke. I think that they know a lot more about this buffalo hunt. We were telling them that they were --what were they? they were the great hunter. We, the First Minister was giving them this buffalo to show them that he had decided they were great hunters. Yes in this trip north he spoke in The Pas and he promised a school --this was supposed to be a trip for the members of the Legislative Assembly, but he was telling them what the government was going to do. And at the flag ceremony did he invite my leader? My leader didn't have to do like Diefenbaker, to ask his party should he attend. He would have been there. But he didn't get any invitation at all. Now on this TCA business--(Interjection)-- Did you say you wanted to say something?

HONOURABLE J. B. CARROLL, (Minister of Welfare), (The Pas): Pearson sent out the invitations.

MR. DESJARDINS: To this one here? He sure did, for this local--(Interjection)-- What do you mean flag? This flag represent this to you, for gosh sake? And then on this TCA deal Madam Speaker. Oh yes there was a lot my friend here was telling us all about TCA. My leader tried to help. We were told it's a Liberal Government in Ottawa. They tried to help. Oh no, they didn't want any part of them at all. What politics that was playing, that day. But he likes to be bailed out though. Oh yes, he likes to be bailed out. We have a great big committee on Shared Services. Nobody wants it but oh yes, we're going to have a Committee on Shared Services. What did this committee do? They listened to delegations, to all those briefs. They bring those briefs in. Now, he is so mixed up that he doesn't even pretend to discuss this



(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd). . . . . with the committee. They have a meeting and they listen to these briefs. The next day, the Premier comes in, this is what the Conservative Party wants. And if you don't do this we'll take our toys and go home. He wants to be bailed out, he doesn't want only a majority --he has the majority-- but he is not satisfied with that the Liberals and the NDP, they have to give me a majority, and a good majority, or I don't play. I don't bring any legislation at all. Well if this isn't a joke. That's leadership. That's great leadership. He has to put the onus on somebody else.

MR. HUTTON: Once in a long time it is a good idea.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's a good idea. Well, that's it. You play the rules the way you want. You just change here and change that, whatever you want. You don't even know what you want most of the time anyway. Now this afternoon, I brought in another subject. Now we heard today about people being so honest. I can never remember his title --he changes it so often-- the ex-Attorney-General, the one that lost his job because he wanted to peddle beer anyway. Well that one, he made a big speech on how we had to stick together, and about how we couldn't fool the people of Manitoba, and he brought in all kinds of things. Now, I ask him this. On Wednesday --yes it is the changing face of Manitoba-- now on Wednesday over the TV station, Mr. Roblin started first of all, he had to let the people know about the big bad wolves. When the political fur starts to fly the ordinary citizen often has trouble making out fact from fancy, and he's going to give them facts. He continued, take a look at this record of human betterment, human betterment --a law for the poor, and one of the rich. It's a good one. We can be proud of it. And then he says this, "Yet your hospital premium is the same today as it was in 1958, and the reason is that the provincial government's special grants to hospital plan, which in 1958 were \$3.6 million, and in 1964 totalled \$11.5 million." Now, he was giving the impression that again the great white father had helped bail these people out. He was going to keep the premium down. Now right in this House, right in this House, the next day my leader asked him about this, and told him that he was leading people astray. And he said, "Oh, no", Mr. Roblin replied, that this had not been the intention of the income tax legislation, and he could not recall what the title of the bill introducing the legislation was. Now, in other words, that wasn't true at all. Now I have here the Statutes of 1961. In this bill it says here in the preamble, "and whereas it is desirable to make provision for a more equitable distribution of the cost of hospital services amongst the people of the province" --hospital services-- And then it starts another chapter with "Hospital Services Tax". Now after he was told this he went on the radio again, that same night, the night he had been notified in the afternoon that this wasn't cricket, that he wasn't quite telling the truth, and this is what he said, "In 1959, "--this was talking about the hospital plan--" the first year of the plan, it cost the people on the whole \$25 million. A few short years later in 1964, now, it costs \$43 million. An enormous increase of \$18 million. And yet, "as you know your hospital premium hasn't gone up. It is the same today as it was in 1958. And there is a reason for that, and the reason is that the provincial treasury has been offering special aid to the Manitoba Hospital Plan. Then in 1958 our special aid to the hospital plan was \$3.6 million. And this year of grace, of grace yet, it will be over \$11.5 million provincial aid to the hospital fund thanks to which we have been able to hold the hospital premiums steady, the same today as they were in 1958."

Well, maybe we should look back in this session of 1961 to see if this was meant to help the hospital at all. My friend the First Minister should know. All right. Well in the Throne Speech as read by the Lieutenant-Governor this is what he says "my Ministers will place before you a measure respecting an income tax collection agreement and to provide the means to give effect to a reduction in the hospital premium rates. He didn't know anything about that. I don't know who wrote this speech but, he didn't know anything about that. Then, oh this is some of the things from his speech that he says, the First Minister again, that the fact is that it is the same rate of tax, the same number of dollars on all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay, rich and poor alike have to pay the same share. This rate was imposed when in our opinion at that time there was no alternative to doing so, because we did not have an alternative means of raising the money --and it must be raised somehow-- We did not have an alternative means of raising the money unless we introduced a sales tax, which some gentlemen opposite might be advocating he says, who brought it in, to find this money to pay our hospital premium. You see, this is one of the things you think that he knows what he's talking about here, that he is bringing this tax for some reason. Then, a little further on, "we now have the ability to implement the policy in the way that I have suggested, because it seems to me that a 1% increase in taxable personal income on the people of our province does

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd).....introduce a measure of ability to pay." and so on. Oh there's quite a few like this. I will skip some of them. And then he asked of my leader, when my leader was speaking on this in that same special session, he ... "Mr. Roblin: Mr. Speaker, could I ask my honourable friend a question before we proceed with the debate? Mr. Speaker: Surely. Mr. Roblin: I'd just like to ask him whether he intends to explain this hospital premium plan to the House? Mr. Molgat: Yes, I certainly intend to do that when we come along to the Throne Speech debate. I state at this time now strictly to the matters of the Bill. I found very little in your bill with regard to the hospital premiums. I find it difficult to discuss at this stage. And the Premier said, "The hospital premium payers will find more to it than you do my friend", oh yes, they will --(Interjection)-- Oh sure, I have got lots more.

And then we have the member from St. Vital, who I imagine attended these caucuses, and it is clear to him also, he says, "They are in effect", he was talking about the members of the opposition --"They are in effect voting against a decrease in hospital premium. They know that there is no other source at the moment to replace the revenues that will be lost by the drop in premiums. They know that this bill must pass in order to do what both of these parties have been maintaining in the past in the floor of this Chamber; that is, to reduce hospital premiums to those in the low income groups. It was clear. My friend didn't remember when he was on TV and on the radio just lately. Oh and then, well there's the biggest smoke screen there --the expert he tried it on the-- oh he's a great speaker -- he had a wonderful speech on the Columbo plan. We were all murderers around here and then he added again today, -- he brought a lot of things, he didn't say very much-- and there he was really challenging us the same as he did this afternoon. This is what he was doing, talking about the Liberals and the NDP's. Are they in favor of this bill which is presently before the House on premium reduction, which was one of... in it? In the summer of 1960 when the premiums were raised, I recall the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who was then the leader of the opposition, made a public cry for a special session to deal amongst other matters, with the premium increase. It's fine to have a special session to deal with the increase, but what does he say when we call a special session to deal amongst other things with a premium reduction? He doesn't pay any attention - why not? Does the Liberal Party not like to talk about a premium reduction. Are they afraid to admit that the premiums are going to be reduced? You see Madam Speaker it seems to be pretty clear, pretty well to everybody here. But there's an awful lot more of the same. I'm going to skip some here. But then knowing our friends as we do, I hear from this afternoon that our friends in Ottawa don't know him too well. They were sure taken in by accepting their recommendation. But then we weren't too satisfied with that. We thought that this would come back. You see they combine all kinds of bills. They wanted to approve the deal they made with Mr. Diefenbaker --oh no this was an awful deal-- this was a real good deal then and now we are getting an awful lot more --this is no good and the Premier stated not too long ago that when will Ottawa see that they should receive a little more money.

But then as I say, knowing them as we do, the Honourable Member from Selkirk made this amendment. Mr. Chairman I have an amendment to add, a new section 7 (a) the amendment, the marginal note to the amendment reads "use of excess revenue for special tax" and the new 7 (a) would read "where the amount received by the treasurer as proceeds on taxes imposed under section 6 and 7 together with all revenues received by the Commissioner of Hospitalization for the purposes of the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan in any year exceeds the cost of operating the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan in that year, the excess shall be deposited in the trust and special division of the consolidated fund and shall be used solely for the purpose of reducing the premiums payable under the hospital services insurance act. I wish to move that amendment Mr. Chairman." This was the Honourable Member from Selkirk.

Then my leader explained what he felt on this, at that time on that same amendment. This is what Mr. Molgat said --"Mr. Chairman it seems to us that the amendment that we offer is perfectly reasonable. I appreciate the position of the First Minister in this matter, .....of taxes and this is possibly as a general rule not a wise course, and that the policy in the past has been to operate mainly out of general revenue and to have most of our income come into general revenue, But the fact is Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend purposely put in this bill references to hospital services. He is the one who put this in, not ourselves, but himself. He put it in the preamble and he puts it in then further on the heading, but nowhere in the operative part of the bill is there anything said. Now surely if he wants to put it in general statement, then he should put it in the operative part and soon".

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

Then my leader asked the Premier this question - and this is an important one too-- "will the Honourable Minister give us any assurance that any surplus that comes in over the 1% will be turned over completely to the hospital services plan? Mr. Roblin: Yes Mr. Chairman I don't think there is any doubt about that." Well this is clear. Now Madam Speaker, does he still say that he wasn't misleading the people, on TV and on radio? This is the man that in 1962, the general election when he was on TV, this is what he said. Who voted against the reduction of hospital premiums but Messrs. Molgat, Campbell and Desjardins. This is the one. He wanted us to be against it then, but now he says this tax was just general purpose tax. Well Madam Speaker, I certainly think that he should call an election at this time and let the people choose to see if they still have confidence in him.

Now two of the, we are talking about expropriation --and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said today that his whole defense seemed to be that the Federal Government had been involved and listened to the recommendation of the province. He thought that this was terrific-- this was the greatest joke ever. I wonder how far he's going to go next time he tries something. We all know that this has been the weakness of the Pearson government. They have had too much trust in people and they are paying for it now. And this is what they have done again today. --(Interjection)-- Then he accused the Member from Portage of something but he backed down completely. Oh when he's standing up there everything is flowing, but he backed up on that. Then he made a big story that they couldn't expropriate, but then when it was pointed out to him that this could be done --well it had never been done before; he had asked and he didn't know if it could be done and so on. See there's another way that he backed down. Oh and he was happy and they all laughed across. The people for this Octave Enterprise, the directors were Mr. Meltzer, Essers and Gold, three Liberals. Oh that was terrific. Well I think that.....yes I liked that because that proves that I don't care who it is. If they are wrong go ahead. And we knew what was going on. My leader mentioned those three names. This was not something that he discovered in the 48 hours that he prepared his speech. I hadn't seen him in the House until he prepared the speech. Now if there is something --we're not afraid to ask for an investigation. Now, not in two or three years, now - we are not afraid to ask for an investigation. We will. We don't care if somebody gets hurt; it's too bad if they deserve it. I think that we stand here for something. We feel that --we don't want any privilege for anyone. I think this is one thing of our party-- we don't want a law for the poor and one for the rich.

He also said when you expropriated it wasn't only the market value that you had to consider. There were many other considerations --value to the particular owner. I wonder if they thought about this man that had worked and had all these trees, this nursery and so on in Pine Ridge and he wanted to retire. I wonder if they thought about that. I wonder. What did they offer? I'd like to find out if this was a fair offer also? And then they are talking about there are other considerations. There is a man that has a natural well out there, no but anybody that had a well had to show their bills. Now he didn't get anything. I think they finally gave him \$100 after that, after a lot of complaint. But this is it, it was a natural thing, he hadn't paid for it, so it wasn't worth anything. Now.....

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the honourable member that he has three minutes left in his time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much. We argued for three quarters of an hour. Then there was the Duthoid property. First of all, there was only a verbal offer, it was for \$5,000 and there was quite a bit of pressure put on this man. This man became so sick with all this pressure and so on that he had to be hospitalized and this man died shortly after that, and I think that this "kindness" of this government helped a bit. Then he was offered \$15,000.00. I think there is two or three offers in now and they are going to appeal this. I wonder if they worried so much about this.

Now they talked about the offer that they give the people and they have to be fair with them. It seems that they are fair for the big corporations like the Art Centre where the people in a few months could make over \$100,000, where on another deal -- now it's a big thing-- we are talking about priorities. Well what do they tell us today? It's a big joke, because it only cost so much to the people of Manitoba, the Federal pays the rest-- and this brought in all kinds of laughter. This was terrific. They fool the people of Canada. Well who are the people of Canada? I thought we were the people of Canada. Well Madam Speaker I think that after the display that we had had these last few days and this weakness of this

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd).....government, this is a government --then in 1962, a few days before Christmas all of a sudden when they tried to divide a family, the.....family and that didn't work, all of a sudden they were panicked and there was an election. They called for an election. I think they wanted the people to tell them to go ahead.....somewhere.

I would like them to go to the people now. Three ministers have been asked for their resignation and I certainly think especially after this erroneous statements that the Prime Minister has been giving us, I think he should quit. He should be the first one to quit. I think Madam Speaker that we should have an election right now and let the people decide. If they are so sure, they have got the number, they are smiling, let's go to the people now and let's see what the people of Manitoba think. Oh it's a big joke. You let the Octave Company and these people double their money. Laugh, Laugh, when they are doubling their money, and the poor fellow out there gets a letter in the mail all of a sudden, this is no longer your property you can't even sell a tree. This is our property, we will tell you when to move, months after, years after practically, they are going to make an offer. Oh yes, wave your head. This is terrific, this is terrific. But some day the people --if we are in a real democracy the people will have a chance to show you what they think of you.

..... Continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I wish to speak on the amendment to the amendment and I will therefore withhold my remarks of felicitation until I speak on the main Throne Speech.

This afternoon, Madam, I listened with a great deal of attention to the Minister of Mines and Resources, and in spite of his oratory, his evident sarcasm, and his reference to matters which I consider to be entirely irrelevant to the main issue, I am still waiting on an answer to the question asked by my Honourable Leader in respect of this purchase of land in the Delta Marsh area. I think, too, that the people of Manitoba are waiting on that answer, and I don't think, in spite of all the Minister's efforts this afternoon, he convinced anybody, including himself, that he had given us an answer.

There are certain facts and matters, Madam, which seem to stick out very prominently, and one of these is this. The Minister extolled the virtues of this particular trace of land. He stated that it was required for wildlife purposes in the Province of Manitoba. He refers to a letter which was written by an authority on wildlife some time in 1960, and I take it Madam, that from as early as 1960 for at least two years prior to the death of Mr. Bain this government was actively interested in the purchase of this land in that area. Now I don't know why the government did not take expropriation proceedings at that time. It's true that the Minister has advised us that Mr. Bain at that time was getting elderly, that he was inclined to be a little senile, and it was extremely difficult to keep his mind actively interested in any conversation which you were having with him, but I suggest this, Madam, in spite of what the Minister has told us, if this government at that time in 1960 or at any time prior to the passing of The Wildlife Act made any propositions or proposals to Mr. Bain to purchase that land, if this government had the right of purchase, it also possessed the right of expropriation. And I submit, Madam Speaker, that the Minister is wrong when he refers to the fact that this government had no power of expropriation in connection with these lands until The Wildlife Act was proclaimed. I submit that they possessed that power under Section 3 of The Expropriation Act.

I'll go further than that, Madam. Even if they did not -- and I say that they did -- but even if they did not possess the powers of expropriation in 1960 under Section 3 of The Expropriation Act, they were specifically given those powers under The Wildlife Act which was passed by this House in May of 1963. It was assented to, I believe, on the 6th day of May and was to come into force and effect by proclamation. I submit that the government could have proclaimed that Act on the 7th day of May, 1963, before any offer or any option whatsoever was given to Octave to purchase this land. And I submit that the government in its delaying, dilly-dallying tactics was guilty of incompetence if it really wanted to acquire this land, because it allowed this land to get into the hands of a corporation, and sat idly by while this corporation was going through all the legal procedure to acquire title to this land. It is admitted by all parties in this House that the executors of the Bain Estate had no power to sell, and that being so, Madam Speaker, I suggest that the executors of the Bain Estate had no power to give to Octave Limited or anybody else an option to purchase. If they had no right to sell they had no right to enter into that agreement, and I suggest in spite of what the Minister says to the contrary, that Octave Enterprises, or whatever their name may be, had no constructive ownership in that land whatsoever up until January 24, 1964, when the option was approved by the Court of Queen's Bench, and I submit that up until January 24, 1964, this government could have stepped in and expropriated that . . . . . for much less money than they actually paid, and I suggest to this House that that is the question which this House requires an answer to, and that is the question which the people of Manitoba require an answer to. We haven't got that answer.

I listened with a great deal of interest to all of the arguments submitted by the Minister of Mines and Resources regarding the procedure followed by the Court in fixing compensation, but here we have a case, Madam, where the executors of the Bain estate appeared before Mr. Justice Nitikman in the Court of Queen's Bench in January of last year, to obtain the approval of the Court to an order for sale, where we have an affidavit on file which was accepted by the Court placing a valuation on this land which was away less than what this government paid for it. That was the valuation which was submitted to the Court for the purpose of obtaining the court's approval to an order selling this land to Octave. It is true that Octave jumped the evaluation by a few thousand dollars, but nevertheless the amount which the Court approved as being the consideration for the sale to them was about a third of the amount which the Province of Manitoba subsequently paid for this land.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, would the member permit a question for information? Is that same Order that same sworn valuation that the Minister dismissed so lightly this afternoon? The question is, Madam Speaker, this sworn valuation, sworn before the judge, is this the same sworn valuation that the Minister dismissed so lightly this afternoon?

MR. HILLHOUSE: That is the valuation which was filed in court by Mr. Kelly of Portage la Prairie whose ability to value or appraise was questioned by the Minister of Agriculture because he was not an accredited member of some appraisal society.

MR. HUTTON: . . . . . bar room lawyer.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Pardon? Well I may only be a bar room lawyer and I may be only a little country lawyer, but I'll tell you one thing, I'm not satisfied with the explanation that you've given the members of this House for what . . . . . the price that you . . . . .

Madam, what worries me about this whole transaction is, are we getting into a pattern in Manitoba? It seems to me that there's a similarity between the procedure followed in this particular purchase and the procedure followed in the Arts Centre. Now Madam, it may only be a coincidence and I'm not charging anyone, nor am I suggesting by way of innuendo that there was any wrongdoing on the part of any member of the government, but I do say that the government has been allowing people to incorporate companies for the purpose of taking the people of Manitoba for a ride. Now what is the procedure that's been followed in both these instances? In the first place, it becomes known that the Government of Manitoba is interested in purchasing a piece of land in a certain locality. It also becomes known that the Government of Manitoba does not intend to take expropriation proceedings. The next thing we find is two or three, or three individuals at least, becoming incorporated; then we find those individuals who become incorporated, acquire an interest in that particular property by way of option. Subsequently, the government deals with that particular organization and pays to that organization a price which is far in excess of the real market value of the property and gives to that organization what I consider to be an exorbitant profit. The facts speak for themselves. The facts speak for themselves.

Now the Honourable Minister pooh-poohed the valuation that was submitted to the Court of Queen's Bench in the Bain Estate. He can pooh-pooh that valuation all he wants. That was the valuation that was accepted by the Court, and I submit that that is the only valuation which we have before us which has been proved to be an actual valuation. As to the valuation of some 700 or 370 thousand dollars that was submitted by Aronovitch & Leipsic, or whoever it was, subsequent to this deal going through, I submit that we're not entitled to even look at that valuation. (Interjection) Beg your pardon?

No, Madam, I think that all the questions here have not been answered and I think the main question is still unanswered, and that is the charge made by my leader that this government was inefficient and was incompetent and dilly-dallied in respect to the purchase of property and thereby cost the taxpayers of Manitoba a large sum of money. That is the only issue here. There's no charge of wrongdoing against anyone. There's no suggestion or any innuendo of wrongdoing. I don't blame the Octave Enterprises, or whatever they're called, for making a profit. That was their business to do it. But I do blame the Government of Manitoba for allowing them to make that profit, at the expense of the taxpayers of this province.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I feel that I should say a word or two in connection with the amendment to the amendment that we have before us at the present time. I think I owe it to my party, the New Democratic Party of Manitoba and of Canada, and also to the citizens not only of Manitoba but also the citizens of Canada, to say a word or two as the result of the deliberations and debates that have taken place over the last few days regarding this whole matter of land purchase.

I'm convinced, Madam Speaker, that we all are, or all should be agreed that the whole basis of the methods by which properties have been bought or expropriated by the Government of Manitoba are wrong. Indeed, I suggest, Madam Speaker, the government itself tacitly admits error by virtue of their inclusion in the Speech from the Throne, a reference that we members of this Legislature will be asked to consider propositions in connection with the purchase of land. And to me, Madam Speaker, this is the vital issue that we here in this Legislature are faced with at this time. It is very interesting, Madam Speaker, to hear Tory and Liberal argue against each other, yes, in a see-saw battle, as to whether the price that was paid for the Bain property was correct or whether it was not. It's interesting to hear whether the Attorney-General or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources did or did not have authority of expropriation, and if he did have them why didn't he expropriate? I hear my

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . friends on the right, and indeed my friends across the way, basically admit that in this free enterprise system of ours profits are secondary to the question as to whether or not the law was fully adhered to. I just heard the Honourable Member for Selkirk, as indeed all of those who were present in this House heard him say, that an evaluation was made before one of the Courts here in the Province of Manitoba, and he has said just now that because of that evaluation having been made and accepted by the Court, that it was a proper evaluation and one that should have been accepted in the interests of the people of this province. I will not argue, Madam Speaker, with my honourable friend, but I will argue with him and both sides of this House, for it appears to me, listening to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources this afternoon, that he was upholding the price that the Government of Manitoba had paid for this land. We heard the Member for Selkirk this evening condemning the government for paying this price for the land because the poor taxpayer of Manitoba was being rooked, but the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Madam Speaker, told us this afternoon that the Liberal Government at Ottawa has accepted their evaluation of \$170,000 for the property and that the Liberal Government at Ottawa are prepared to pay half of the amount, the sum of \$85,000, and the Honourable Minister now tells us, Madam Speaker, that this has now been paid. What about -- (Interjection) -- and that proves it, my honourable friend says. What does it prove? To me, Madam Speaker, it proves that the Liberals in Ottawa and the Tories in Manitoba are prepared to rook the taxpayers of both Canada and Manitoba, and this is the net result, Madam Speaker, of the deliberation that has taken place in this House over the last few days.

Here we have the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources saying, and I repeat -- I think it's worthwhile repeating -- the price was right, the Liberals in Manitoba are saying the price was wrong because the sufferer was the taxpayer, and then we have the leaders, the government of the Liberal party at Ottawa saying, well Manitoba, it's O. K. The price that you have paid for this land is right and we don't care a continental if our deputies in Manitoba think that you are rooking the taxpayers of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd like to ask the honourable gentleman who has the floor if he wouldn't prefer to re-phrase that statement and say instead of that both the Conservative government in Manitoba and the Liberal government in Ottawa were prepared to rook the taxpayers, wouldn't he be prepared to put it in a more correct form and say that the government of Manitoba was prepared to rook both the taxpayers and the Federal Government at Ottawa?

MR. PAULLEY: Well Madam Speaker, maybe my honourable friend for Lakeside has given me a thought. Maybe he has given a thought, because never in the history of Canada has a government been so susceptible to being rooked than has the government at Ottawa at the present time, so I thank my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, for giving me or allowing me to place on the Hansard of Manitoba a true fact insofar as the governing of Canada and Manitoba is concerned.

It might be, Madam Speaker, it might be, Madam Speaker, that somebody would suggest, as indeed my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has inferred, that because of the rooking of the Manitoba Tories, the rooking of the Liberals at Ottawa, because of this, the Liberals at Ottawa swallowed the bait, the line, but Madam Speaker, I reject this completely. Ottawa should not accept on any shared program the valuation that is placed by the Province of Manitoba or any other province. Surely if they are a responsible government -- and I'm not suggesting that they are -- but surely, Madam Speaker, if perchance we happen to have a responsible government at Ottawa, then the onus certainly is on them to investigate into the matter as to whether or not a fair price was being paid in respect of this land that will be used for a waterfowl preservation.

So I say Madam Speaker -- no, I can't say it. I can't say it because I'm afraid that it might be ruled on by you Madam Speaker, as being a little unparliamentary. I guess maybe I'd better use an oft-used phrase "a plague on both of their houses," because it seems to me very evident from the debate that has taken place thus far in respect of this land purchased, and I don't suggest that I'm an expert in valuations, but it does appear to me definitely that if the Liberals in Manitoba are correct that the government has paid too much for the land, then certainly they should talk to their feeble colleagues in Ottawa and point it out to them, but the basic principle that we should be arguing about or trying to reach a solution for here in this Legislative Assembly at the present time, is the establishment of a fair basis of land

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . acquisition for the Province of Manitoba that will be just for all concerned, and I think, Madam Speaker, that we, the members of this Legislature, should get down to brass tacks and start governing for the people of the Province of Manitoba, cut out our innuendoes and our slanders against one and another and do the job for which at least I as one of the Members of this House thought that some ten years ago I was elected to do in this Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I am happy to see you healthy and well and still able to conduct the affairs of this House, and I hope that you will do it with impartiality. I do not envy your position.

I would like to congratulate the Member from Swan River on his contribution in moving the Speech to the Throne -- or Lac du Bonnet, I'm sorry -- I'm giving him a different constituency. I do not agree with everything he has said. I agree with the description of his constituency. I have been through it and I agree with him that it is a beautiful country, but when he starts heaping laurels on the present government, with some I may agree but with most I do not. The Member from Fisher, the honourable member did present a picture of his constituency and I would say that although the honourable member didn't use such a fine choice of words as the mover, I enjoyed his speech much better because to me it seemed it came from his heart and from his mind right at the time.

I would also like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker. He is not present. I think it is a refreshing change.

Madam Speaker, I'm not going to say that the present government hasn't done anything worthwhile. In fact, I would like to say that in certain fields there was some success. As a whole, I would say that Manitoba made some progress during the last six years and that in spite of the present administration. This government, in my opinion, this government's record is one of dismal failures in most of the departments. That's where I disagree with the mover of the Throne Speech, and here I must give credit to the Premier for being man enough to admit this, at least in one department, and the Premier did so at the Thompson hearing, and I would like to know why don't the members behind the front benches boast about the progress made in assuring new jobs for Manitobans, and I know why. Because by his own admission the Premier indicated that his efforts were a failure.

The honourable members talk about schools. So does the Premier, and to listen to the Premier, especially on television, you would think that the Premier was the man who invented the high schools. You would think that prior to six years ago there were no high schools in the Province of Manitoba, and the backbenchers picked that up and said, "Look at the schools we have now. We've got high schools now." Didn't we have high schools before the present administration? Yes, we did. When I was much younger I went to a high school and I'm sure that the backbenchers must have gone to some high school. If they didn't, we hope -- unless they are completely illiterate. I went to a high school. We had high schools, maybe not as palatial as the present ones but at that time, for that period, these high schools functioned proportionately as well as the present high schools do in the present time.

Transportation wasn't an innovation of the present government, and that's for the information of the mover of the Throne Speech. Maybe in his area I do not know. For the information of the honourable member, I would like to say that in our area for about ten years we have had transportation of all pupils, high school and elementary, for at least twelve years now, and it still does exist, and the government of the day did assist financially in the transportation of the children -- all the children to the different schools. So this is nothing new, and as some members pretend that this is an innovation, I would say that they have not been past the boundaries of their own town or else they are completely blind to the truth. Winnipeg had good high schools before the divisions, and I'm not criticizing divisions, as such, except in certain areas. Winnipeg had good high schools and Winnipeg has good high schools now. Winnipeg had good teachers prior to the divisions, and they have good teachers now. Just how much benefit did the large cities like Winnipeg -- what benefit do they derive from the divisions? High schools were as good as the times required at that time. Sure, they have made progress, but the whole world has made progress; even the underdeveloped countries have made progress in education. That is nothing new and it isn't fair for the present government to take all the credit for progress in education, and listening to some of the speeches you would think that there were no high schools, there wasn't even such a thing as maybe a Department of Education before the present administration took over. Sure, many of the areas, including the City of Winnipeg,



(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . . carry a greater financial burden at the present time, but academically are they any better off than they were before the divisions? No, so when they boast about the divisions it doesn't apply to every area.

And here I'll say at least 70 percent of rural areas, how much benefit are they deriving from the present division system? I agree that in larger towns the division system works as it does in the City of Winnipeg, but you take many of the smaller areas when in a division there are five or six high schools and none of them larger than about five classrooms. I don't think that this is doing justice in the present day and age. Sure, they're paying more money. They probably have better looking schools, but that's simply brick and mortar. They carry a much greater financial burden, but due to the shortsighted policy of the Manitoba Government millions of dollars have been spent on new schools which now are far too small for the diversity of the new curriculum which is envisioned.

Members across like to boast about hospitals and hospitalization. Some mention was made of it now. Who instituted the Manitoba Hospital Services? You can boast about it now. You haven't improved it any. Maybe the system on itself . . . . . But I would like to know the contribution of this government. Sure, money. Whose money? Taking it from the people and then putting it into the Plan. The same applies to road construction, and here again with the exception of the two northern roads, what has the government done? Was there anything spectacular? No, I would say. Some of our pioneers in the southern parts of Manitoba, people who have lived all their lives here still drive on roads -- dusty roads. They still eat dust and breathe dust. And I do not think that is fair.

I wonder why the honourable members, the backbenchers, do not boast about some of the prize firsts that Manitoba could rightfully boast. What are they? We carry about the highest per capita debt in Canada. The Province of Manitoba. That's one first. What about another one? We are using the highest priced gasoline in Canada, thanks to this government. Number three first: we enjoy the highest prices on cigarettes -- number three first. Only those who use them have to enjoy them. Number four, per capita we are among the highest taxed people in Canada. Here you have four firsts. Why don't the members, the backbenchers and the frontbenchers boast about this? And I never dreamed that I would live to see the day when air would be taxed, and air is being taxed now. By that I mean warm air.

Talking about taxation, taxation by government is taking your money or taking your bread and milk from the citizens in return for certain services rendered by the government with the citizens' money, and government should exercise every effort to see that taxes are kept within bounds. This government certainly does not look at that. If the government looks as this government does look, at the tax load or at the tax dollar as a means, a chance to squeeze every last penny from the citizens, that government deserves nothing but contempt, and this government sure takes the cake.

The new \$22 million tax load would not have been imposed or should not have been imposed by this government, and it would not have been imposed if Manitoba had a government subscribing to some sound policies, but they're bankrupt on sound policies. The outrageous tax would not have been necessary if the Roblin government was efficient. This government is not efficient. This ruthless Roblin tax could have been avoided if the Conservative Government of Manitoba was not so wasteful and extravagant with the people's money. We on this side have proved -- of course it's up to the government side to disprove it -- that this government wastefully overpaid \$142,000 in the Bain Estate which was purchased for \$245,000. In the Arts Centre purchase of around \$750,000 the government extravagantly overpaid \$137,000. Now on the total purchase price of these two sites, almost a million dollars, on a million dollars the government overpaid almost a quarter of a million dollars; that is, 25 percent overpayment on a million dollars. The government either has or has no purchasing policy. If it has, then the policy is very unsound. If it has no policy then it is guilty of gross negligence. It constitutes a criminal offence against the people of Manitoba.

Now let us assume that some kind of a purchasing policy does exist with the present government, which I doubt, but let us assume that there is a policy. Now the results are the same, especially in this case. The end results are the same, policy or no policy. The government in either case would, I hope, at least try some consistency. Maybe they did, and would have applied the same tactics in past purchases on land as in the present Bain and Arts Centre purchases. Mr. Roblin and the government, through his various Ministers, purchased extensive parcels of land. What for? Portage Diversion, Winnipeg Floodway, Arts Centre, the Goose Preserve, Highway rights-of-way, Bird's Hill Park, Grand Rapids and so on. The list

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) .....is very long. An article in the Post tells us that the Roblin administration has, since taking over, purchased about roughly \$90 million worth of property. Now, by applying the same ratio of overpayments in all these purchases as the purchase price that is indicated in the Bain and Arts Centre transactions, that is, 25 percent overpayment, we may rightly assume that the total in this total of \$90 million purchase the government wasted roughly \$22 million. \$22 million! Doesn't that strike a chord? Yes, it does, I'm sure. This sum is just about the same figure as the expected revenue from Mr. Roblin's outrageous 1964 tax burden -- the new taxes -- \$22 million. About the same. Is this a coincidence? I wonder.

I believe that this government's extravagant spending, if allowed to continue, will bankrupt Manitoba. I would say to the government, please remember that not every citizen of Manitoba was born with a silver spoon in his mouth. Even a dollar, which evidently means so very little to the government, may mean the difference between being able to feed a family or letting them go hungry.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fine performance in this Assembly and I have full confidence that you shall do so for many more sessions to come. I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech in Reply. The two members have performed wonderfully well and they have given a fine picture of their wonderful ridings.

Madam Speaker, when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition got up to speak the other day, in a very short while he informed us that all their policies for the present session, the former sessions, had emanated from a conference which they had held at Clear Lake. Well, Madam Speaker, I have great confidence and I have a great liking for Clear Lake because of its clear and cool water. But however, Madam Speaker, the very particular thing that he has said about the present administration and goose sanctuaries and everything else, very unfavorable comments about the administration, I think that they were not at Clear Lake when they were formulating their policies. They must have been somewhere amongst the loons or something like that, and the frogs, because after all, things that were thrown at the government were very untidy.

However, Madam Speaker, we must now -- this is 1965, and even today the Official Opposition is not willing to accept progress. We were told, I think it was last night, that the Minister and the government in charge in purchasing the almost 9,000 acres of land in the Pine Ridge area did not know just what an immense amount of land it was. Well Madam Speaker, I think that is an affront not only to the government but to every member in this House. I think that we all know that every acre is composed of 160 square rods or 4,840 square yards, or 43,560 square feet. Madam Speaker, a block of land containing almost 9,000 acres, will roughly, if arranged in this particular way, will be four miles long and three and a half miles wide. I do not think that it is too large. I think that the government made a wise choice when they chose a plot of land in the neighbourhood of 9,000 acres. We were told by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that that was far too much. But Madam Speaker, just about a year ago when we were discussing the estimates of the Department of Public Works, the honourable member then admitted, when they were the government, they had permitted to choose a site for the South Perimeter Road which today is far too close to the city. He admitted his mistake, and said it in just about the same number of words. Now .....

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I am sorry that I will have to correct that. I did not make that statement.

MR. KLYM: I don't know. I would have to have the Hansard of last year, but I just am speaking by what I have remembered of it. However .....

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I am sure my honourable friend does not want to misquote me. If he wishes me to, I would be glad to tell him what I said. I admitted that the route that I had thought was a correct one was too close to the city. I admitted I was wrong, it's true, but it was in thinking that the route that I had tried to get the group to agree to had turned out in the interval, in my opinion, to be too close. But I did not say that the present one was too close.

MR. KLYM: Well, all right sir, I'll take your answer as being correct. However, had the government at present purchased that amount of land, I mean about, say, like one-third of what was purchased at Pine Ridge, I am sure that the development could not go on very well, and we know very well that the land surrounding it would have been land for speculation, because I am almost certain the land would have been required in the very near future by the

(MR. KLYM cont'd) . . . . government. I am sure that the amount of land that the government had purchased, had done it in good faith, and I think that fully justifies it, and that this will be a well planned development rather than limited space development.

Turning to other spots, one especially which was singled out was priority given to a goose sanctuary. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't care how well goosed I might be, but I still think that we need sanctuaries in Manitoba. We need them and we will need them. We have to be able to preserve those sanctuaries and birds and waters and so forth, for the future of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba. And even looking at the cartoon the other day, I happened to see in that cartoon three very large geese flying, and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition there sitting in the reeds with a beautiful gun and a kindly smile and a kindly look on his face. He could not even bring down that . . . . . We could pretty well see that he was wrong in anything he had said about the price. Parks are beauty spots. We need them. It would be a calamity if we'd lose them and the beauty that is to remain with the people in the future of Manitoba.

Now, it was also referred to, that in the purchase of that goose sanctuary, a certain bachelor farmer owned a great deal of land. Well Madam Speaker, I don't mind him calling anybody a bachelor but I still think a better term would be still available. Do you know that even bachelors are good-hearted people, and if that person at that time believed that a sanctuary for geese or any wild bird was a necessity in Manitoba, I think that he was a man with a heart. We must know that even bachelors love to see nature unspoiled.

Madam Speaker, let us think back on the thundering numbers of buffalos we had in Western Canada. They would have become extinct. They were a large target and easily molested, and easily exterminated had it not been for one particular human being who thought of a plan of saving some of them and the end result today is that we have a few, as I say, few, as compared with the millions that they had before, only at present in the game preserves.

Also, there was something said about the park at Pine Ridge, or the park-to-be, that that area was not exciting. Well, Madam Speaker, it all depends what anybody thinks of as being exciting. I think that that area in the Pine Ridge, the land that is being at present bought for the park, was always exciting in the years gone by. It is exciting today and will be much more so when it becomes a park. In the early days it was the only road leading in across the country towards the City of Winnipeg and it was a great market road to many people who travelled by horse and buggy, or teams of horses at all times. There's plenty of miles, there is plenty of game, there is plenty of birds there. I should know something about it because I lived in the area for seven long years. The people in associated areas took advantage of that particular area going through towards Winnipeg. This park, when established, Madam Speaker, will be a boon to the working man of the city, and now with the daylight saving, any person, working man in the city will be able to get out after work with his family and have a nice picnic right in the park almost any day of the week. The land is such around there where there is sand -- it won't be muddy. The development will be just right for the right people and the right kind of Manitoban that we all intend to be at all times. Now the Perimeter Bridge will shorten the distance for the people travelling from the north and east of Winnipeg and St. Boniface and so forth on their way to the park. Now what about the fine island that is being created by the -- between the floodway and the Red River? That will be rather an envious place to make a home and live. (Interjection) We might have, yes.

Now, that is a . . . . . army, Madam Speaker, has always been getting after the government, calling them the mismanaging type, the wasteful type, the extravagant type, and so forth, and unbusinesslike. Madam Speaker, I think that all the amount of work that has been done in Manitoba during the last seven years or so, it is really amazing. And we can always look forward to the future of Manitoba as a great province, as coming up along with tremendous strides in every direction we look -- east, west, north or south -- whichever way you do, you see progress. I believe that the Opposition wanted the government to impose a sales tax. But unfortunately for them, a difference type of tax was established, and then they found themselves caught. Not knowing what to say, they began getting after the government from all angles. Let us take, for example, one particular utility and the tax on it today. And I mean the power, the hydro.

Madam Speaker, when you come to think of it today, how many of us depend upon hydro for a terrific and a certain service at all times? What did we have years ago? At the turn of the century if there was any power it was just used for the public for lighting purposes. Today

(MR. KLYM cont'd). . . . power is used for a multiplicity of services, as for example, milking machines.

Now, just in case of power failure, we must have it immediately restored because if anyone believes that to keep milk from getting sour is just leaving it in the cow, they are terribly wrong. Now, what about the tremendous amount of food that would be destroyed which is kept in fridges and deep freezers? What about that? What about our particular -- (Interjection) -- Never mind the bachelors; we're all right. Talk about the modern areas that are getting power today. Talk about the telephones being up-graded. Talk about the dial system, coming left and right. And as I said awhile ago, just in case of power failure, the tremendous number of personnel, trained personnel, which are really expensive people to work, but they get out, the Snorkel . . . . and all that, and they perform their jobs in a very thorough manner. Fast service is restored. If you will only recall what happened in Manitoba not quite a year ago -- somewhere around the middle of April. What would have happened had we had a storm like that in February or in March? And it lasted a week. Now, power was being restored at a tremendous rate, and the machinery, the expensive machinery we have today to work with, is just equal to the task.

Now, someone has mentioned also that some time ago -- not right now, not this session-- that the Conservative Party was only fond of extending years ago, of extending roads from wigwam to wigwam, and right now they are trying to connect igloo to igloo. Well they may. If they are successful in opening up the north all power to them. What really bothered some people was the rebate on school tax. No doubt probably somebody expected to get rich on that. It wasn't meant for that purpose. It was only meant to relieve the property owner of part of the education tax. Now besides that there is the one percent provincial tax, provincial income tax, that will not be collected, and it was stated in 1964 -- I think the Leader of the Official Opposition stated 1964 was one of the hardest years for taxes on the people of Manitoba. Well he may be correct but 1965 will find it different because of the rebate, and the one percent provincial income tax out of the total of six. That should help the situation, probably just equalize it. It won't be so hard on anybody.

Then it was also mentioned that the Red River Floodway had some priorities somewhere. Well I agree that this should have. It was not so long ago, say fifteen years ago, when the people of Manitoba or Winnipeg and along the river south were almost pushed away from their homes and everything that happened to them was a total loss. Today we all know that the cost of repairs was tremendous, and I think a one-shot deal then cost Manitoba about \$30 million. Now today when Manitoba will be paying in all about \$26 million over a number of years, and Winnipeg throughout the years will be free of floods, I think we should have this as a commendable effort on the part of the government. Besides we mustn't forget that there are nine other provinces of Canada that are supporting us in that particular venture to the tune of some \$33 million.

I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Inkster would not be asking every particular year of the Minister of Agriculture what is the status insofar as the flood prospects are concerned for this area. Every spring I notice that. He has been after them, and not only once but two or three times every spring. He is concerned because there are many people who have not forgotten about that particular thing that has been ravaging for years.

I think, Madam Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to continue any longer because there probably is someone else to continue on with the job of talking about different things, but we all know that the Government of Manitoba, the present government is not in the land of nod.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General 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 Tuesday afternoon.