

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, September 5, 1969

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. CHERNIACK: In his absence, I assume we can let this stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River Heights. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PATRICK: In his absence, can we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe a motion has already been put. On that basis I would like to have this matter stand until Tuesday.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I have a fairly lengthy but very brief statement I would like to make at this time. Mr. Speaker, if this appears confused, you're right, and this is the way the Honourable Member from River Heights started one of his speeches last year. You'll find this, for the new members, on Page 2084 of Hansard No. 86. And, Sir, I think that the honourable member has been just as confused or more so at this sitting.

Not too long ago, the Member from River Heights accused the government of not being consistent -- not being consistent, he said, because they are ready to file certain reports known as the South Indian Lake, but not to give the information on the Manitoba Development Fund. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that these members are very serious. It would seem that they're confused, but when you study this a little carefully you realize that they're not serious at all, because I think that if they were serious or sincere, or if they had the welfare of the people of Manitoba in mind at this session they wouldn't bring in such resolutions; and I can't see how their colleagues can go with them when they bring in these kinds of resolutions. We must examine that charge that the Member from River Heights made, that the government was not consistent in this, we must examine this. I think that we should quote Hansard of September 2nd, just a few days ago, and see the answer of the First Minister on one of these motions. The Minister, the First Minister said: "As regards the specific Address for Papers before us, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to say that we shall accept it subject to the provisions of the Manitoba Development Fund Act and subject also to commitments as to confidentiality. There is inter-departmental material involved between government and an agency of the Crown and we shall release such as is possible while keeping within the provisions of this Act -- and we can't break the Act after all. The honourable members would not expect us to do so." Now, what is wrong with this answer? This answer is, I feel Mr. Speaker, is quite clear, that this government is ready to give all possible information. Now, if the members of the opposition are not satisfied they should say, "Yes, we want you to break the act; we want you to give us more information that you can under the Act." I think that you should say this, because all this information has been promised.

The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek doesn't like the idea -- he feels that I defend the NDP, or the government, a little too much. I might say to him -- he's not here but maybe he'll read this --(Interjection)-- All right, you're showing that you're going to be useful for something after all. I would like to tell him that. . .

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): I knew I had a purpose in life.

MR. DESJARDINS: To help, boy scout? Fine. Well, if the boy scout would let me finish I'd like to say that the honourable member has been in this House approximately 11 days and I've been 11 years, and I've seen these people in action, and I think that these accusations that they're making . . .

MR. ENNS: You've seen a lot of action in those 11 years from this side.

MR. DESJARDINS: Nearly some flooding also, but I was saved from that.

MR. ENNS: Never mind the flooding, you saw a lot of action.

MR. DESJARDINS: Never mind the flooding, this is a touchy point, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't want to talk about the flooding, he doesn't want to talk about the flooding, but maybe we will talk about the flooding anyway.

MR. ENNS: Sure, I'll talk about it.

MR. DESJARDINS: But I think that maybe we should say a few words about the flooding to educate some of these backbenchers on the government side, because I'm sure that they're a little mixed up with what has been going on at this session.

MR. ENNS: Well, you haven't got their feet wet yet, that's all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, we'll try to help them get a little more than their feet wet.

We're going to try to study, Sir -- the honourable member doesn't like me to defend the government, so I won't talk about the government, I'll talk about the official opposition, the former government, and we'll try to see who's consistent and who isn't consistent. Now in the past isn't it a fact that this government has refused to tell us anything at all about the Development Fund? Isn't that right that the Minister, the then Minister of Finance said that he didn't even have the right to say anything? Isn't that right? And isn't it right that the government said that we shouldn't discuss this in this House, it would embarrass maybe other businesses? But it's also true that the former Minister of Industry and Commerce though cut an awful lot of ribbon and took credit for a lot of openings, a lot of firms. But we were refused this and the members of the opposition in those days kept repeating, kept repeating that as this was public funds we should have something to say, and finally there was a change in the Act and the members of the Cabinet then were given the right to ask questions, to look into this Fund. This was the feeling of the Minister of Industry and Commerce in those days and the other members on that side of the House: You can't talk about these things and it is wrong to ask this. But all of a sudden, not only does he change his mind, he's bringing in a resolution demanding that the government does this. Now is the Minister sincere now or was he sincere then? You're not answering?

MR. ENNS: He's not the Minister any more.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is the former -- well, the way I listened to him I thought he was the Minister, he thinks he's still the Minister.

MR. ENNS: That's confusion in your mind, but he's a member for . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: It is, I admit. Watching the two of you operate I'm rather confused.

MR. ENNS: Yeah, well that's your problem, that's not my problem, that's your problem.

MR. DESJARDINS: And I'm also embarrassed.

MR. ENNS: Right.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm embarrassed for your leader, because you're making fools of yourselves. You're making fools of yourselves, you're going a little too fast for that leadership convention.

MR. ENNS: And what is the Honourable Member for St. Boniface doing?

MR. DESJARDINS: Sit down before you get flooded. Now, let's look at these people. They didn't want to give anything, but all of a sudden these people that are the defenders of democracy and the defenders of industry: bring it out, give us all the names, we want it, we're sitting on that side now. Who is consistent now?

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Not you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Not me? Oh yes I am, my dear friend, oh yes I am, because I'm all in favour of the members of this House having a look at these things because we're dealing with the money of the public. I'm consistent, but your boys aren't, your boys aren't at all. This was wrong last time now it's very good; and they're supposed to be sincere. I think that they should tell their backbenchers, we didn't mean this last time, we didn't -- (Interjection) -- I hope that this is on the tape. I wonder if we could have this played back immediately to make sure that it is. You know if I wanted a fellow to help me here, I've got the best guy in front of me, he's ready to do everything today. -- (Interjection) -- No, no, not at all. I've had to swim a little bit to get to South Indian Lake and now I'd like to talk about the South Indian Lake report. Now they want more information about Hydro and South Indian Lake and so on. They've got to have this information; it's very vital to them. Mind you, they refused to give us reports before, and I think it would be well, Sir, to read what one of the key members of the group had to say last year because this is quite something, and I'm quoting now from Hansard of April 30, 1969, Page 1781:

"Mr. Cherniack: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question. I was just wondering would the member not feel that he would be more able to deal with this had he had access to those reports, the secret reports?

"Mr. Jorgenson: They made the decision (and he pointed at the Cabinet members in front of him). Under our system the government is entrusted with the power of making these decisions.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . .

"Mr. Jorgenson: No, if they're right or wrong, they take the responsibility and are going to be judged on the basis of accepting that responsibility.

"Mr. Cherniack: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I can't force him to answer a question, but I was wondering if he would answer the question which as I recall it was, would he not feel better able to deal with this matter if he had access to those secret reports?

"Mr. Jorgenson: I'm quite prepared, I'm quite prepared when the matter is before the committee to ask what questions I think I must know, what questions I feel I would like to know when the bill gets to the committee. I'm quite prepared to accept years of tradition in this Chamber, as in other Chambers throughout the Commonwealth and throughout the free world, in following the practices that are laid down to the smoothest passage of the business of a Chamber of this kind.

"Mr. Desjardins: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member suggesting that the role of the opposition is to take the word, vote on a question of principle only on the say-so of the Cabinet? This is exactly what my honourable friend is saying."

And he wouldn't answer this question. He made it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that this should be left to the members of the Cabinet and nobody else and we didn't have any right to ask for any information at all.

The Honourable Member from Lakeside who is moving this resolution, I asked him last year - Page 1974 - "Would the honourable member permit a question? Would you deem that we received, the members of this House received enough information to make a fair and reasonable decision or assessment? Mr. Enns: Yes." But he doesn't think -- Oh, it's here. It's here.

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: I think I heard you say we'll wait till after and this sounds good. We'll wait till after.

Now he felt that there was -- maybe we'll answer that question before this is finished. And now the honourable member agrees with the amendment brought in by the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. He agrees with this amendment that we should give all this information, back-date this for three years, and he's the man that refused it last year. He's the man that refused it, and somebody else that we can . . .

MR. ENNS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, while the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is looking through Hansard . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: No, no, I've got it. Never mind, I've got it. I've got it.

MR. ENNS: I could help clarify it.

MR. DESJARDINS: "Mr. Gurney Evans: Mr. Speaker, I find that I'm not able to support this motion" - the same motion - "correspondence between the government and Manitoba Hydro is privileged, and the government is not able to support the motion at this time." Now, who's consistent - who's consistent? This was refused last year and now they want it. The Minister, the then Minister said that he had all the necessary information; we had everything that we wanted. Then if you remember, Sir, they called a halt to the proceeding here, they left that committee and they called an election. And the then Honourable Minister was interviewed - and I'm quoting now from the Winnipeg Tribune of May 23rd, and he's saying: "In an interview shortly after members left the House, Mr. Enns admitted he wants more answers to questions on the proposed project." He knew it all during the last session and all of a sudden he wanted more answers. "I want more answers myself," said Mr. Enns.

MR. BILTON: He sounds like Mr. Shoemaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Shoemaker's not here any more, he's not responsible. He might sound like it, but you've got his chair and you're not doing quite as well as he did. I think that the backbenchers, I think that there's some of the things that they should like to know. We've heard so much about this. We were ready to start a new session to deal with the affairs of Manitoba but those two members won't let us, they won't let us, so therefore maybe for their new members who are shocked or surprised or feel that we are too cruel for those two boys out there, maybe we should read something, and I'm now quoting from a report. Mr. Harold Buchwald, who was the counsel for the South Indian Lake people, and on Page 8 this is what he said: "Throughout the agonizing route that has finally brought us to this hearing and this moment, the communities have been the victims of deceit, deception and manifold breaches of faith as their democratic and fundamental rights have been usurped or over-ridden in the anxiety to grant Hydro this license." -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's what he said, and I think

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . that this probably will be filed also.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, what is the relevancy towards the motion that the Honourable Member of St. Boniface is speaking to.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, Mr. Speaker. These people made the accusation and I've got it here. This government is not being consistent on the same motion, so if it's all right for them I think it's all right for me. I know that it's not so funny any more, it's getting a little close to my honourable friend and he doesn't like this, but he's asking for some information and he's going to get part of the answers that he wants. And for those that don't know who this Mr. Buchwald is, this is in his own words in the report, Page 14 again: "On a personal note, let me conclude by admitting it has not been easy for me to hold up to the cold light of day the atrocities against the democratic processes perpetuated on the two communities by a government of which I am a supporter."

MR. ENNS: . . . all Conservatives are men of principle.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . That is a little too much. Men of principle - men of principle. Why did he ask for this? Why does he want this information? To try to embarrass the official of Hydro, the man who served with these people for so long, and would turn around - it's been the other way in this House in the 11 years that I've been here - everybody's got up and said "you attack me, don't attack these civil servants that are not here to defend themselves." And what does he want? He wants to see if they've changed their mind. He has tried to embarrass these people at all times, a man that practically admitted that he was deceitful himself. -- (Interjection) -- Well, all right, I said practically, this is what he says. He says you know we approach each other's responsibility. That is not entirely deceitful. Just a little bit deceitful. You know, not entirely pregnant . . .

MR. PATRICK: Who said it?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well who else? Who else? My friends. And now this great man here is attacking Hydro. They're not here to defend themselves but he'll have his day. It's a lot of fun out there. It's a lot of fun, and they will not get away with blaming Hydro because these, and we here are the people that are elected and we must accept our responsibility. We must accept this responsibility. And Hydro summarized their responsibility in their brief of last year in the last paragraph and it's very clear, and I'm quoting now from the Hydro report. "Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Hydro Act charges us with the responsibility of providing for the continuance of a supply of power adequate to the needs of the province and to promote economy and efficiency in the generation, distribution, supply and use of power." And this is what they were doing. Nothing else. They didn't have to worry about anything else. That was the duty of the people in this House.

MR. ENNS: It's a pretty big thing.

MR. DESJARDINS: What is a big thing?

MR. ENNS: The supplying of power for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Right. Right. Then leave them alone. Leave them alone.

MR. ENNS: Keeping babies alive. Putting bread in the mouths of people. Keeping our hospitals going. Keeping the farms going. That's a pretty damn big thing to do, supplying power in this province.

MR. DESJARDINS: Did anybody say it was a little thing to do? Did anybody say they didn't want the babies to be kept alive? No. All we're saying that they have a duty to do . . .

MR. ENNS: All they do is supply power.

MR. DESJARDINS: Sure, supply power; keep the babies alive; but don't flood all the north.

MR. ENNS: No, but it makes the . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, why is he attacking Hydro? Why does he want to hide behind Hydro? Why does he want to hide behind Hydro? Because he can't take it. It's all right to stand here and tell the rest of the House and the new members how wonderful you've been over the years. It doesn't take much courage to stand up here when the people of Hydro aren't here, and because he's in trouble, because the people refuse, the people of Manitoba say we will not have this mandate and because they made a fiasco, and that Minister especially made a fiasco of things here, to turn around and he's going to ask questions to see if Hydro has changed its mind. I think the member should be ashamed - and I see that he is ashamed and that he had to leave the House. I think that he is ashamed. And then the same member was talking about a man that is doing this work; he said he was kicked out of Saskatchewan, he's not competent. Somebody asked him, well why?

MR. McKENZIE: That's not what he said.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh yes, that's what he said! And then when he was challenged, he said, well somebody else said he wasn't competent. Oh it doesn't matter - and we're talking about McCarthyism? The people that are serving the public.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, one question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'll . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Is the member for the high level diversion?

MR. DESJARDINS: What? We're not talking about . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Is the member for the high level diversion?

MR. DESJARDINS: I want to get all the information and then I'll decide, but I won't decide and change my mind . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I asked a question of the member: are you in favour of the high level diversion?

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't care what privilege. He asked a question and he thinks I'm going to answer when I'm not ready to answer. We're studying this now. We've . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface still hasn't answered my question.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of privilege, would he please sit down.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the reference "a point of privilege" doesn't automatically give a member to say anything he wishes, and surely the honourable member should be advised by the Speaker that nothing that he said constituted a point of privilege, and that member should appreciate that.

MR. McKENZIE: I thank the Honourable Member from Inkster.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is fair to attack people that are working for the province. The people of the Hydro Board were honourable when they had the former administration; they told us so. I don't recall any members of the opposition, the combined opposition, in those days criticizing the people of Hydro. We felt that it wasn't right to hide behind Hydro. They had a responsibility. They were bringing in a recommendation on one thing, and they did. They made it quite clear in their report. But I don't think it's too manly and I don't think it's right for the -- especially the man that was the Minister in those days. They had to put up with him for so long and now he is trying to embarrass and he's been going around telling the press and so on that the members of Hydro should resign. I don't think so, Sir. They've done their work and nobody is trying to change their mind on this side, and I don't think that they're these kind of people. The Member for River Heights has been saying the last two days, "I want this member to apologize to me. I want . . ." There's the man that should apologize to Hydro. And I think, Sir, that if we're going to accuse anybody of not being consistent, I think that the honourable members should look at themselves. They refused to give information last year, they are getting it now; they are still not happy.

The First Minister stood up and said, "I will give you all the information. I'll give you everything as long as I can stay within the Act," and apparently they're not satisfied with that. Well, Sir, are those people serious? It's all right to have a little bit of fun once in a while but this now, it's getting obvious. It's getting obvious that there's two members - not all the members - there's two members that are trying to delay, that are trying to delay. Why? And are trying to monopolize. There's one member especially who is trying to monopolize all the time of this House. Mind you, he has ambition and there's nothing wrong with that, and I say this sincerely. But don't embarrass your Leader. Don't embarrass the rest of your members. Don't embarrass this House. Don't be so obvious. Take your time. You've got a long time to go. Don't shoot the works now. We know you've got an office; you've got somebody writing speeches and questions all day, but take your time. You're not an expert on everything yet. That'll come, maybe, and some day you might be sitting in that seat. This might be. But in the meantime I think that you should realize what the opposition is supposed to do. The opposition is supposed to be ready and able to bring in an alternate course of action or program. These people have been here . . .

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Who's got the breathalyzer thing?

MR. McKENZIE: Is this Liberal-Democratic philosophy or is it NDP philosophy that I'm hearing this afternoon?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is that privilege? I challenge the man now to tell me

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . what privilege that was. He's using the rules of the House for his own purpose and I think that he should be chastized. If you want to be funny, wait till you have the floor but don't keep yelling the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface may continue with the debate on the motion and the amendment. I do not believe that the matter raised by the Honourable Member for Roblin was a point of privilege.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege precedes that. The honourable member to which he referred never asked Hydro to resign - it was conditional. And the Member for St. Boniface has implied that someone called for the resignation of the Hydro Board, which is not true.

MR. DESJARDINS: It isn't true? It isn't true that the Member from Lakeside suggested that they should resign? You be careful what you answer on that.

MR. CRAIK: No, you've taken that completely out of context, Mr. Speaker. He's completely wrong in making that accusation, and that is a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: On the point of order. If the honourable members disagree with the interpretation that has been placed on the member's remarks, they can get up and debate but it's certainly not a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it's a point of privilege if he's going to take the privilege of going at this when the honourable member is not in his seat.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just a minute. He's not in his seat because he ran out. If you want to tie him to his seat, fine.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'd like to know what the motion is to which this honourable member is speaking, because most of what he's saying has nothing to do with the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel will have the opportunity to exercise the same privilege as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the same member was talking about Cass-Beggs, was talking about information before. He was in order. But now -- you know what? It's a little close to home, I admit, and they don't like it. It's embarrassing. It's embarrassing, but they brought in the resolution and the member is the last one that should have brought it in. The former Minister did and I think that he is responsible, and he certainly did imply, and I stand to be corrected, not by you but by the member if he wants to come back, or by anything, any quotes that you can present. He certainly implied that they should -- he certainly implied. In fact the press asked the Chairman of Hydro if he felt that he should resign. Isn't that right?

MR. CRAIK: On condition.

MR. DESJARDINS: What condition?

MR. CRAIK: Not the ones you said.

MR. DESJARDINS: What condition? You don't ask people to resign on any condition. First of all these -- you members are not the government any longer, and if they serve you faithfully why should they resign because there's a change of government. You pretend that you're in favour, that you're working for the good of Manitoba. You've scared the rest of Manitoba. You . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we do not pretend to serve the people of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right. You don't even pretend. That's right. They're the same people that said watch out, the industry will leave because they're going to bring, the NDP are going to bring, all these Socialists are going to bring all these kind of programs, and they've been trying to force this government to bring in these programs. And if that's sincere, you're supposed to be there -- oops, there's the point of order kid again.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker. Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Go ahead.

MR. McKENZIE: Are you a Socialist?

MR. DESJARDINS: I think that if he wants to give me his definition of Socialist, I'll tell him. Would you be ready to give me your definition of Socialist?

MR. WEIR: . . . an opportunist.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, yes. Oh yes, I am an opportunist. I am an opportunist. I had the opportunity of pushing these guys out of office and boy, I sure latched on to that I'll tell

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . you. I've had the opportunity of . . .

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Sit down, point of privilege.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I am assuming that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface is in fact a Socialist then.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of privilege he's assuming. I could say if you're not careful I'm going to say what I'm assuming too, about you. The Leader of the Opposition is right. I am an opportunist. I've seen the chance to serve Manitoba now, the chance that wasn't -- and my people and I didn't have that chance before, and I saw where in a democracy the former First Minister stood up in his seat -- or not in his seat; he sent a press statement that he had to go to the people. He wasn't sure; he wanted a mandate. He wanted a mandate. And this was the big thing for this election. And he was refused this mandate but he wouldn't let go, and I was there as an opportunist to see that democracy has a chance to survive, that you don't go in spite of the people and say, "You're not smart enough; we're going to protect you from yourselves." You're right. You're right, I'm an opportunist. You're absolutely right. And I'll tell you something. I've had an easy time in caucus. -- (Interjection) -- What's that?

A MEMBER: Look over there, Larry.

A MEMBER: Take a look at your . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if they could take five minutes to have a huddle and get one spokesman at a time. I know they're not too bright. Maybe five or six together will get one decent answer or remark. I know they don't like this. Well all right; I said that you should have the welfare of Manitoba and I think you should, and if you had the welfare of Manitoba you wouldn't tell us -- write your diary if you want to tell us how wonderful you are. Write your diary. Don't tell us all of this past . . .

MR. ENNS: It's memoirs. The word is memoirs.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I've gained something. We're bilingual now. I don't know if it was the change of government. No, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, if they want to play games, if they want to bring in this South Indian Lake, if they want to attack Hydro, if they want to talk about opportunists, I'm ready. We're going to have a lot of fun. But I don't think that this is the important thing now. The important thing is to look up to the future, and it was clear that this government asked that we have a Special Session and the then First Minister said that if he'd won -- well he didn't say if he'd won, he took that for granted -- we will have a short Session because we have to finish something. This was a statement that was made during the campaign -- Oh yes you did. You were quoted. Eh?

MR. WEIR: A session.

MR. DESJARDINS: We would have a short Session.

MR. WEIR: A session. A session.

MR. DESJARDINS: And nobody is stopping anybody from speaking, but when the Honourable Member for River Heights is up all the time telling us about what he did -- he was the key speaker on all the estimates, every department so far, and we haven't even reached Industry and Commerce. Oh gosh. What's going to happen then? Two departments, and how long have we been at it? How long have we been? You should at least give some of your fellows a chance once in a while. You know, if you want, if the honourable member is **running** and he's running hard for that leadership, this is fine, but I mean they've got to be able to respect you. And if you're ready to embarrass your Leader the way you are now, you won't be respected and you're going to get it right in the back the way you do now. And I suggest that if you want to play games, all right we're going to play the same kind of games. I'm not afraid. Yell opportunist all you want. My conscience is very clear. I have no trouble at all because I think I've done the right thing, and I said that if you want to talk about opportunist we'll open up everything. We'll say a little story. We'll talk about everything. If not, I'm ready to look forward for the welfare of Manitoba, but if you want to play games we'll play games too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a very short contribution to make to the debate. I must say that I listened to the remarks of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface with some amusement. I would think that in this debate, as in other debates, he has -- to use a word -- become the speaker who is the red herring, and I apologize to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood for using the expression "red", but the red herring that enters in the debate

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . so that any logic that should follow from the remarks will be confused by the honourable member in the manner in which he rabble rouses around a variety of topics that seem to suit him at the time, and there's no doubt that one of the topics is myself and the other topic is the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I would suspect that we're going to be hearing more of this in the days to come as the Session continues.

Nevertheless, it still doesn't take away from some of the very important things that should be mentioned in this debate, and one remark that has to be clarified for this House. Now the Honourable Member for St. Boniface referred to remarks of the First Minister in accepting the Address for Papers - not this particular Address but another Address - and I must say had the First Minister said this on the first occasion when he in fact addressed himself to this particular Address for Papers, I would have felt no obligation to have stood up in this House and said there was a lack of consistency. But, if I may, just for the benefit of the Honourable Member of St. Boniface and for those who may not remember, may I just repeat into the record what the Honourable First Minister said on Page 185 of Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. It's just been drawn to my attention that, according to our Votes and Proceedings of Tuesday, the 2nd of September, the honourable member has spoken on the amendment.

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I think I spoke on the original motion, not on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Votes and Proceedings indicate that the honourable member has spoken on the amendment.

MR. GREEN: I recall that the honourable member got up after I finished speaking and made some remarks with reference to remarks that I had said. Would the honourable member not agree that that's what occurred?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I may be in error. I'm not sure whether I followed -- I do know that I did speak in the debate, but my recollection is that I spoke on the debate prior to the amendment which was introduced, I believe, by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GREEN: Does the honourable member not recall that after I finished speaking he did get up? I think he asked one question and then made some remarks with reference to what I had said.

MR. SPEAKER: I am bound by the Votes and Proceedings. I -- not unless it's been proven that there's an error in the Votes and Proceedings. There does not appear to be at the moment.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member from St. Boniface rose to his feet, I believe it was with the express purpose of educating the backbenchers on this side of the House. He orated at quite a length as to why we shouldn't open our mouths over here because we were delaying the proceedings of the House, and I want to thank him for the excellent example he gave us of how to delay the work of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I too have spoken to the address in my name. I haven't too much more to add other than to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has spoken to the . . .

MR. ENNS: On the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: According -- yes.

MR. ENNS: Well it's tough apples around for the side of the opposition today. I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for -- Sturgeon Creek. -- (Interjection) --

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Honourable Member from Lakeside is right, that there must be a conspiracy. The Honourable First Minister couldn't remember last night where the member was who asked the question about the election, but it was the Member from Sturgeon Creek.

But let's get down to the debate on the amendment, and I perfectly agree. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface has gone all around the floor, completely. The Honourable Member from Lakeside asked for papers that would be delivered as of July 19th -- 15th, 1969, and basically what he was asking for: has the Hydro made any change in their opinions which they gave to the previous government? The Honourable Member from Ste. Rose asked for the papers or any correspondence back as far as 1966, and it has been shown in the House that these papers and all the correspondence is available. All you have to do, to ask the previous Minister

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . of Finance to sign and ask for a record and they can be produced, and it can be done. They're in the archives whenever you want to call them. The Honourable First Minister said it would be embarrassing to have to ask him for it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Am I to understand the honourable member to state that if I ask my predecessor for the information about which you are speaking - that is the correspondence with Hydro - that that could be made available?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The Honourable Finance Minister made the statement that the previous minister said that these papers were confidential, and he said they are downstairs and if you requested and he signed, that they could be produced. Now, they are not lost.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I did not quote my predecessor as saying that they were confidential. I quoted that I was informed that he said that they were personal. I have not discussed it with Mr. Evans at any time but I was told they were personal - not confidential.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, that being the fact, have you pursued the matter any further, is all I can say, Mr. Speaker, because the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose has asked that the correspondence back to 1966 be produced, and this is what is in what is before us right now. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface seems to take the privilege at any given time to get up and take a swat at the other side of the House any time he so feels like it, and I don't think that he is really right in this. He's gone all around the facts. Now really, what we're asking, which is what the Honourable Member from Lakeside has asked for and the Honourable Member of Ste. Rose has amended, it said we want to have the correspondence from 1966, and the government can either produce it or they can't. If you've got excuses let's have them. Maybe we can overcome it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse the amendment that has been proposed because I think this would bring us up-to-date on what transpired earlier than just July 15th of this year, and maybe this would also give us a better idea of whether the recommendation that was made by the previous government in connection with the high level diversion and so on, whether we would concur in it if we did get this information. Therefore, I will support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I only indicate that the discussion seems to have been discussion relating to correspondence dealing with Southern Indian Lake. The motion before us is for all correspondence between the government and Hydro, and I previously rejected that on the basis that it was a scattergun approach and that I was not prepared to open up all the files regardless of the nature of them, and there may be all sorts of correspondence or there may be very little, but of the wide range of subjects that might be covered. I was not prepared to do that, and as a matter of fact, well, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has already quoted my predecessor's stating that on the question of Southern Indian Lake, I might say, "correspondence between the government and Manitoba Hydro is privileged; the government is not able to support the motion at this time," and certainly all the members on that side voted in support of his refusal. Now the point I made was not at all, in my mind, in contradiction of our desire to make available to members of the House that type of information which is necessary for the House to conduct any particular debate, and which is not of a nature which the Minister considers to be privileged or confidential. And I've read May, and I've read Bourinot, and there's all sorts of precedent on it, that the Minister has the discretion to make the decision, and I indicated, when I spoke on this debate in the main motion, that if there were a specific request, then I could deal with it as a specific request. But this scattergun approach, I said, was the wrong way of approaching it, and therefore I could not accept it and that's the position I'm taking. And I don't think that there is any conflict of any type in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The question has been called.

MR. ENNS: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the information of the members who were absent from the Chamber, the division is on the amendment by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Craik, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, McGill, McKenzie, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak and Mrs. Trueman.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21; Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to report that I did not vote because I was paired with the Minister of Labour who is outside of the Province of Manitoba representing the people of Manitoba, and had I voted I would have supported the motion.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, could we have same division on that?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed.) Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Address for Papers as before us is relatively clear and concise. I would like to suggest to the members that among the reasons for this Address for Papers is the priorities that was placed by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on the matter of the contribution that the Mining Association and the mining people make to the Province of Manitoba, very early on the assumption of his office, if I recall correctly - and I could stand corrected - that when the new Minister, the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I suppose the correct term was named, and I think it was even prior to his having been officially sworn into the office, he indicated that among the two priority matters that would fall under his jurisdiction were of course the matter of South Indian Lake and the resource problem involved, and the matter of investigating whether or not the mining community as a whole was making a proper contribution to the economic well-being of Manitobans. And I would have to also indicate to the new Minister, who was not in the House last April or May when my estimates, that is that were then my estimates under the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, were up, and when the total contribution of the mining association, in the opinion of the now government group - that is the NDP Party - could be summed up in one word. I don't have Hansard before me but I can find Hansard and it can be summed up in one word. In the opinion of the NDP Party the contribution of the mining community to the economic well-being of Manitoba amounted to 'peanuts', and peanuts was the word used several times.

MR. SCHREYER: No, not in quite those words.

MR. ENNS: Pardon?

MR. SCHREYER: Not in quite those words.

MR. ENNS: Exactly in those words - and I will supply the Hansard to the Honourable First Minister. Now the Minister of Finance was a little bit more sophisticated in his approach. The Minister of Finance did a very astute job on questioning the then Minister - which happened to be myself - about the failure of the government programs in initiating more exploratory work, and more -- there was a particular program that he was particularly interested in, the program that was announced some time ago but which unfortunately hadn't caught fire, but essentially surrounding the same subject, the fact that the mining community as such was first of all not being either given the right climate to develop as they then thought it should develop, but more importantly - and this is where I come back to the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - more importantly, the question of whether or not the mining community was in fact making an adequate contribution to the economic well-being of this province.

I think that the reason for the - in a very short explanation - the reason for this Address for Papers, I think members will recall that early on in the Session I asked the current Minister of Mines and Natural Resource, in view of these stated priorities of his, had he met with the mining communities? Had he had discussions with them? Had he undertaken, you know, negotiations with them to obviously correct this wrong that was felt so strongly by the NDP Party while they were in opposition, and the reply received - and again I don't have Hansard before me; you will have to get used to the fact that I don't really quote from Hansard, I quote

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . . from memory and I often make mistakes because of it. -- (Interjection) -- No diary - memoirs you might say. But again and I think the Minister himself will acknowledge, that he suggested that he had had delightful discussions with the mining community, friendly and delightful discussions with the mining community, but that that really didn't satisfy me because if there was to be a new direction, and certainly while I sat in that chair I had every reason to believe that should your government -- should your group become government, as you now are, that there would be a new direction, and I still have no reason to believe otherwise that there will not be a new direction, but I would also assume that you would have the courtesy to the industries involved to begin by corresponding with them, to begin by negotiating with them, to begin by outlining to them the manner and the way in which you think, as government, that they should conduct themselves in this province as corporate citizens. And this essentially is the reason for the Address for Papers that's before you.

I suggest to you that the answer that you may give that this is not -- that, you know, you've been in government two months or three months and that this is something that you can hardly expect to do overnight. This is not my priority. You've chosen this priority, or rather your Minister of Mines and Resources has chosen this priority. He indicated that, ranked right beside the Hydro Electric development project at Southern Indian Lake, late as it is, there lay the question of re-negotiating agreements with the major mining companies of this province; you know, implying that there would be a more favourable agreement arrived at - more favourable, that is, to the Manitoba public as a whole. So I simply ask that the government accept this Address for Papers to indicate to us just what has transpired in view of this stated priority on your part - not on my part but on your part - and that we can indicate, or that we can be satisfied that either your previous position was, you know, was one of sham or shadow boxing, or it was real and significant.

MR. SCHREYER: Not entirely, I think . . .

MR. ENNS: Not entirely. Well I would never charge a Minister of the Crown with being deceitful but I think the honourable members opposite know what I'm requesting in this Address for Papers and I leave it at that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in connection with this motion on the Address for Papers, first to say that it would be really more helpful if the Honourable Member for Lakeside would be more specific as to what correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and these three named corporations he wants. There are literally reams of correspondence involved here, involving technical matters, mining inspection, correspondence bearing on mining exploration, mineral exploration, etc. Does he want all that correspondence? The way the motion reads it would seem that he does, and yet I suspect that he really doesn't want that.

The other point I would make is that if he would withdraw the resolution, re-submit it, giving it more definition or more precision, we would try to accommodate him, subject of course to obtaining the concurrence of the corporations involved to the tabling of this correspondence and also subject to retention of all correspondence bearing on matters under current negotiation. I'm sure the honourable member, as a former Minister of the Crown, knows that matters that are under current negotiation cannot very well be tabled here because that would simply impinge on the effectiveness of the position of the Crown in its negotiations with these firms.

The last point I make is simply to correct what I believe to be an error on his part, when he said that some certain of my colleagues used to say in this House that the contribution of mining companies to the development of the province was peanuts. I believe it would be more accurate to say that many of my colleagues felt that the contribution in the way of net royalties to the Crown was inadequate. There's a difference between net royalties and the contribution that they make to the development of our province. For example, we're well aware that the contribution INCO has made to the development of a certain region in northern Manitoba is substantial. That doesn't mean that we're satisfied that the royalties paid to the Crown and to the public of Manitoba is adequate. There's a difference.

Well, but to get back to the motion, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member would indicate whether he'd care to withdraw his motion and re-submit it with greater precision as to what correspondence he wants.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I may be out of order but if I may be permitted to respond to the First Minister - yes, I am prepared to withdraw the Address as it now stands and be more

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . specific. I accept the fact that the First Minister was not in the House when this was discussed last spring. I can be very -- you know, I can define the word specific into one word and the word of course is 'royalties'. And the return from royalties was, I have to correct the First Minister, described as peanuts, and in that sense is the way that I mentioned it. I will withdraw this Address for Papers with leave by the House, Mr. Speaker, and be more specific with this regard. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave? (Agreed.)

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, are you ready for Private Members' Resolutions?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that's the next . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, but before you do so may I be permitted to interrupt? I had undertaken to supply the supplementary estimates and I hoped to have done so an hour ago, but with the consent of members I would like to announce that I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the said message, together with the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I make a brief statement on these estimates? The estimates are ready for distribution and will be distributed immediately. Honourable Members will find that there are three schedules in the estimates that appear before them. Schedule A is a list of further sums requested to be granted. These are the supplementary items which are required to be voted.

Schedule B is a list of the transfers to be made to provide the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with an appropriation for the Ombudsman, and to provide the Department of Cultural Affairs with appropriations to enable it to carry out the duties assigned. I stress that this is only the transfer of funds already provided for in the main estimates and does not include provisions for additional moneys. This schedule is not to be voted.

Schedule C is a list of all special warrants passed in this fiscal year up to August 13, 1969, and includes the special warrants passed by the previous government as well as those special warrants passed by this government.

May I also, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, inform the House that there has been agreement reached between the three parties that on Wednesday afternoon, immediately after question period before Orders of the Day, the House will adjourn in order that the Law Amendments Committee may meet, and notices will be on the desks of honourable members Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could I enquire for what purpose? What is the particular hurry in having the Committee meet on Wednesday?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker we have, I would guess, at least 20 to 25 bills that have passed second reading, and I think it's advisable that we proceed with them.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions -- The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: If I may, I suppose on a point of privilege. It's with regard to the Orders before us, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there is an Order for a Return by myself that should appear on the Orders of the Day but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is correct. That was an omission from the Order Paper. The honourable member may proceed.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Order for Return, I might refer the honourable members to their Votes, or Orders of the Day for Tuesday. It is one that I had actually moved some time ago and, after having moved it, the First Minister made a reply. It being on a non-Private Members' Day, I then indicated that I wished to speak in view of the fact that the Minister had spoken, and it was then referred to the next Private Members' Day, so hence the confusion on the Order Paper. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I had made the motion the once. Now . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . a motion read, I believe, at any time, and it would be helpful

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . if we knew what the member was speaking about.

MR. MOLGAT: Very well. I'm perfectly agreeable to reading the motion once again. The motion, Mr. Speaker, is that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: No. 1. The total amount of equity capital in Churchill Forest Industries as of July 15, 1968, with a breakdown as to the amount held by the company or companies involved, the names of all such companies, and the amount of Manitoba Development Fund money involved. No. 2. The same information as of July 15, 1969. No. 3. The same information as of August 15, 1969.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was moved on Thursday, August 28th. If members will refer to Page 269 of Hansard they will see there when I moved it and the very brief reply by the First Minister. The only point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is with reference to the First Minister's reply, and that dealt with the problems of confidentiality in government affairs, and I recognize that when government is dealing with interests outside of government, there must be a protection insofar as the people dealing with the government, that not necessarily everything that they are writing will be divulged, unless they are agreeable to do so. On the other hand, I wanted to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that the government did not start off now by taking the practice of hiding behind this very helpful expedient. Now we had problems with my honourable friends who are sitting on my right in the past, who gave us this answer any time that apparently they didn't want to answer.

Now I want to remind the First Minister that he has often spoken about openness in government, and not to start now by giving me the answers that "we must be prudent and protect the public interest." I'm all in favour of protecting the public interest, but the public interest very often is in the revelation of information and not in the hiding of information, and it depends how the First Minister decides to interpret the word "prudent"; if it is prudent from the standpoint of his administration or is it prudent from the standpoint of the taxpayers of the province, and it's the taxpayers of the province I'm concerned about.

So I accept what the First Minister said and the reservations he made. I ask him this, though: Whenever he uses the terms "confidentiality" or "prudence" in what he reveals, to be certain that that prudence is not exercised on behalf of government but on behalf of the public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think the point made by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is very valid. I mentioned the matter of equity in the contribution I made on another occasion the other day. It seems to me that today and in recent times, that people in this province are more reluctant to put up equity in businesses and enterprises for the purpose of developing this province. Probably this had something to do with the federal legislation of the AIDA grants whereby they make outright grants, and on the basis of that contribution industries can almost start functioning without any equity being put in by the people themselves, and that this could be one reason why this is coming more and more about. I feel that we, as individuals, as citizens of this province, should be willing to put equity into industries and into business concerns, and especially the one we are speaking of here; that I think with the amounts of money the province and the Canadian Government is contributing, that the people directly concerned and who would be benefitting, should also be willing to put in a greater equity, and I certainly would like to hear as to what the actual case was, because this has been open to question from its very inception and from the time that the agreements were made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe the First Minister has already spoken on this.

MR. SCHREYER: That's fine with me.

MR. CHERNIACK: No. No. Mr. Speaker, let's just get this clear. The rules, as I understand them, are that when a member brings an Order for Return, he reads it, a member of the government may indicate whether or not it will be accepted and the conditions under which it may be accepted, and then the person bringing the motion has the right to have it stood over, and the rule specifically reads - and I'm certainly not quoting it, I'm reading it from my memoirs - that the -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Honourable Member for Lakeside is playing with words -- that the Minister, having made his position known, is not assumed to have spoken on the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I take it the Honourable Member for River Heights is not challenging

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . my right to speak. I want simply to say that I believe the advice and position taken by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the Honourable Member for Rhineland is good advice and a good position. It's a position that I would like to take myself, and that is that it would of course be desirable to indicate to members of the House and to the public, you know, what the equity input of all the private firms that have received loans from the public agency is, and I believe that if you read Page 269 of Hansard of August 28th, you'll see that basically this is the position that we are taking with respect to this Address, Order for Return, but I have to reiterate, though, the caveat that there is a commitment to confidentiality given, I don't see how we can -- given to the corporation or corporations involved. I don't see how we can very well deviate from that just that simply.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do believe, however, that it will be possible to give the information that the honourable member seeks. We accept the Order subject, however, to the reservation that we will not take any action here that will harm, that might harm the competitive position of Churchill Forest Industries.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I may close the debate then, and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . and thank the First Minister again for indicating that he's prepared to give the information. Now he says that there's the problem of confidentiality. I accept that. Notice, however, that what brought the question up in the first place were statements by the First Minister, because this is really what prompted me to ask the question at this time. The First Minister, as I recall now, about a month ago indicated that he was reviewing the equity position of this company. Now I think that once the matter is brought up in that way by government, then the whole issue is bound -- should be produced. Now, the Minister of Finance says no, but . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't say no - I said oh.

MR. MOLGAT: The government has brought into question this matter, and hence . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Wouldn't you have wanted us to?

MR. MOLGAT: I completely agree, because the question has frequently crossed my mind and I frequently sought information here in the House, but I think that once the government makes a statement, that it is in fact doing something about the matter of equity, then in fairness to everyone concerned the full information must come out. Otherwise, I think it's equally unfair to the business firms concerned, because quite obviously now any kind of supposition can be in the minds of everyone, and so I think that if the government says we must respect confidentiality, then the government shouldn't in the first instance either be making a general statement on the subject. If it wants to make a general statement on the subject, then it ought to be prepared to give the full facts. That's the reason, Mr. Speaker, that this Order is before us, because I think the situation now is that the matter has been brought to public attention specifically by government and therefore government has an obligation to clear the air.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask for leave? I think I would require leave to make just some additional comment in response to the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose. Do I have leave, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed.)

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, simply to say to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that when we indicated that we would want to review the equity position of Churchill Forest Industries, it's because we felt that there was a number of unanswered questions there, so we have undertaken some study of the question and we're quite prepared - in fact we would like to very much - give information to the House as to what the equity position is, to what extent it has changed, and to what extent it will change over the next 18 months, but I cannot simply leave it at that. I must add the reservation that we cannot take that action if there is an implication there that it will somehow harm the competitive position of the industry.

Now the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose says that, having undertaken a study, we are now obliged to reveal all. Now that doesn't quite follow. What we are obliged to do is to say whether we as a government are now satisfied or still dissatisfied. That we are obliged to indicate, and that we're prepared to do. I believe that answers the question of the honourable member. Having undertaken the study, what is our position now? We will have to make a judgment on the matter and make a statement and we will do so, but it doesn't follow that

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . we have to give all of the details of the information. Despite that, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is prepared to accept our position that we will attempt to make this information available subject to that one caveat, then we'll accept the Order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave of the House. Without wanting to pursue a personal debate with the First Minister, the only part I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I completely accept that the First Minister and the government ought to have this reviewed, but once they made a public statement that they were doing it, then they changed the names of the game. Had they said quietly on their own. "We're going to review this," then fine, but the moment that they used it to make a public statement, then they have in a sense changed the situation insofar as that corporation, and they owe then an explanation, and then I don't accept it's simply enough to say, "We're satisfied." In the first place, the government wanted to do it; they should have proceeded with the investigation without making any publicity about the matter, then no-one is harmed.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the question is put, I wish to apologize to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for the inadvertent omission and any inconvenience that may have been caused him or anyone else. Are you ready for the question?

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've already spoken on this resolution, and therefore I have given up my right to the floor.

MR. BILTON: I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is a printer's error. I believe the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie took the adjournment.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if anyone else wishes to speak, I'm agreeable, but otherwise I would ask this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: This was an error then. It ought to have been in the name of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party. Agreed to have the matter stand?

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with this resolution. I believe it is something really along the lines of Resolution No. 5, which was well spoken on by the Member from Fort Garry. I, too, believe that it has some effect on the small businessman and, of course, that we have to watch as we go along, the same as we do to protect the worker. I think with most small businessmen, they have two very important things they're on the lookout for: No. 1 is to keep the employees happy, because the small business does not operate without a happy employee. No. 2, of course, you don't have to be told, is for their own pocket, but I think, as I say, this was covered very well the other day and I'm willing to leave it at that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and the amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. BILTON: In the absence of the honourable member, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the House would give permission to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have moved this resolution and I believe it stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's correct, but I would defer now to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for whom I asked the debate be stood.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence to have this matter stand this afternoon, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very straightforward simple resolution calling for the exemption of tax which was originally put on for the purpose of constructing roads and highways in the province, and it's asking for people who earn their living through the use of snowmobiles and motorboats for fishing and trapping, should be allowed an exemption. We have precedent in the province where aircraft are allowed this exemption, and farm vehicles or farm trucks are allowed the exemption, so this is merely a continuation of a precedent which has been established in this province.

I think everyone in the House knows that the resolution was originally proposed last year by a member who is now the Minister of Transport on the government side, so we are hopefully looking for government support on this resolution. Also, we are looking for some government participation other than the odd key Cabinet Minister who feels that they have a position to defend. So I'm inviting all the backbenchers of the NDP Party to get into the debates of this House, because when your predecessors were on this side they had no hesitation about standing up and proposing all their instant solutions for the ills of the province and the world, and I don't feel that my honourable friends who are new to this House on the government side should feel bound to be quiet and take a back seat to their elders. I think that their contributions would be welcome, and I would be very happy if one of them would take the adjournment on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in support of the resolution but I'd like to add a few comments to that because I think it has some far-reaching effects that might not appear at the moment.

If I understand the situation correctly, in the province today the farmers are privileged in that they are able to use tax-free gasoline. As pointed out by the Honourable Minister of Finance the other day, fishermen are now, during certain seasons, privileged to use the same advantages. By this resolution the licensed trapper using his snowmobile would also be privileged. This means that in certain areas, and in fact areas in my own constituency, you will find situations where the farmer and the trapper, side by side, will be using this privilege whereas the people who are earning a living out of the bush industries will not be able to use the same privilege.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in further consideration of this resolution that we keep in mind the people who use chain saws, and in fact tractors for bush operations. I would not like to see this resolution extended to include motor carriers involved in the lumbering industry. I can well realize that further extension of this privilege will mean a loss of some money to the Provincial Treasury and I think in all responsibility we have to see that we don't get too unreasonable in that way. However, I would certainly like to see this resolution extended to include the bushworkers as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the member who just spoke, while I'm not necessarily advocating the amendment, but I think if he reads the amendment it says there "and other mobile equipment for production of a primary nature," and perhaps this would cover the point that he was trying to make.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the mover, but I bring this forth because I have discussed this privately with the Honourable Minister of Finance and I wasn't certain that in his definition this was included.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm most surprised that there's not one backbencher over there that's prepared to adjourn this debate. You know, when I was privileged one time to sit in the backbench of government this was our big day. You know, the big day was Private Members' Day where the backbencher could get involved in debate, but all of a sudden the backbenchers are not prepared to debate on this resolution and I am most concerned, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the front benchers have them all choked off and they can't involve themselves in this form of a debate, but I think this is a most fantastic resolution, Mr. Speaker. My constituency boundaries have been extended to the length now that I am involved directly with

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . people that are fishing, trapping and hunting - Blue Lake, Pine River, Camperville, Slater, Riding Mountain National Park where there's elk coming out there last fall. Remember the big fiasco we had with the elk? Remember last year the debates on the bears? -- (Interjection) -- Unfortunately you weren't here last year. If you'd read back in Hansard you'd find some of the problems that we had in this province and luckily I as a backbencher think I contributed a great deal to the debate and we solved the problem. We solved the problems of bears in Roblin constituency through some speeches that I made as a backbencher and through the help of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. We helped the -- you know the elk problem, where they were coming out in Rosburn there and eating up the farmers' grain? A backbencher got into the debate one day like McKenzie and so words were expressed across the House and we were able to come up with a solution to alleviate at least part of the problem.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: I want to ask the honourable member if it's true that the Grandview Chamber of Commerce has declared Grandview as the bear capital of North America?

MR. McKENZIE: Right. Right, and I thank the honourable member for bringing this to the attention of the House and to Manitoba, because do you know how many bears were taken out of there last spring? One hundred and twenty bears.

A MEMBER: That's a lot of bear.

MR. McKENZIE: My friend over here is a bear hunter from Assiniboia. There's a lot of people like the sport of bear hunting, but let's get back to the resolution. This I think is a terrific resolution, and let me read it into the record again, Mr. Speaker, if you'll permit me: "Whereas the livelihood of many Manitoba citizens is dependent upon fishing, trapping and hunting" - now what is more clear than that? To me as a member who represents Roblin Constituency -- they could add agriculture in there but this is part of the . . . "And whereas the use of snowmobiles and motor boats is essential to these activities" - and I don't think anybody can take issue with the Honourable Member for La Verendrye when he made that statement in his resolution. "And whereas there should be a distinction between the use of these vehicles, whether it is for recreation or sport, or their use by citizens for hunting, trapping and fishing for their food and their livelihood." That I think is a very fair statement in this province and there are many people that are involved as far as their livelihood is concerned under those terms and references, and in a lot of cases the fishing industry today in this province has problems and they do need relief, they do need help, and here is an easy way for us to help them. The trapping people, there are some trappers in this province that do well, but I have trappers in the Duck Mountains, many traplines, and what is nicer for the trapper, you know, to go out on a snowmobile at 6 o'clock in the morning, he's back for noon and he's checked all his traplines, and when the year is over he is not going to make a lot of money, he'll maybe come back with \$2,000 or \$3,000. But if there is some way we can help these people or create the incentive for them to continue that livelihood, because all of a sudden with the welfare programs now and this socialistic set-up nobody wants to trap any more, why in hell should you trap, why should you trap when all these things are -- and I would think this is one of the nice things of this resolution whereby the free enterprisers will carry on with their traplines, and if we can help them with their tax concessions and gas, I'm sure they will contribute much to the economy -- (Interjection) -- Did the honourable member have a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that there is an amendment to the resolution that is apparently being debated.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, can I not speak on the resolution first, or do I have to speak on the amendment? Well then I will speak on the amendment and I apologize to the House. Well let's look at the amendment. "Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba investigate fully the implications involved in widening the use of tax-exempt purple gas for persons using snowmobiles and other mobile equipment for the production of primary nature." That's a lot wider. I was prepared to confine myself to the resolution and now we are involved in I think a much wider concept and I would support this most wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, and I can't see how the -- especially some of those members opposite that come from like The Pas or Flin Flon, Rupertsland, Gimli, Churchill - he's not here right now - or my friend the member for Dauphin. So with great concern, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution most wholeheartedly and I would hope that some of the backbenchers from those northern constituencies

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . would adjourn it when I sit down. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm very heartened at the goodwill of members of the Opposition and their concern for the contribution of members, the backbench members of this party, and some of us on the front bench who have decided to forego extensive participation in debate, and I think that the reason is quite obvious to my honourable friend that we are concerned to get on with the business of this House as rapidly as possible. I, for one, do not wish to impinge upon the time of my honourable friends on resolutions which they are concerned to put forward. I certainly don't want to monopolize what time there is on Private Members' Day to discuss the resolutions which certainly are important, and I want, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the fact that we decline to participate extensively in this does not reflect in any way the serious concern that we have in respect to matters that have been brought forward in resolutions.

. . . . . Continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution before us, together with the amendment, is a good one. The Honourable Minister who just spoke I think should realize that Private Members' Day is for that very purpose of discussing private members' business and I don't think we are delaying the business of the government or of the House in discussing these matters. I think that's the purpose of setting aside certain hours and certain days of the week where we can discuss these matters.

To me, I would not have too much quarrel with the amendment, but it seems to me that the government is just asking for time on this and there is no limit as to the time that they may use for this purpose of considering. It might be two or three years before they bring in a reply to this matter, therefore I would -- I have no amendment prepared to the present amendment that is before us, but I think we should have an amendment in there that would stipulate that a reply would be coming forth at least by the next session. To the people who are employed in this type of work, I am sure to them it is something really worthwhile because the added tax that they have to pay in this way certainly diminishes to a certain extent their income. It lowers their net income, and if we can help them in this way I think certainly this is beneficial to them, and since we are doing it for the people in agriculture I see no reason why we shouldn't extend the same privileges to those who are engaged in this type of work of hunting and fishing and so on. Certainly it is much better to see these people employed than to have them on the welfare lists as has already been indicated by other members, and therefore I am quite prepared to support the motion. I would rather see the motion itself passed than the amendment, but if the motion can only be carried subject to the fact that the amendment is carried, well I imagine we will go along with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I must say I was somewhat surprised at the contribution made by the Attorney-General to the debate. It seemed to me that the Attorney-General was really suggesting that private members' resolutions are of no importance, because his suggestion was that they may be of importance to the members on this side of the House but they are obviously of no importance to the government. -- (Interjection) -- Well if that's not what he said, then it is certainly what he inferred, Mr. Speaker, because he said the government was not prepared to debate them, that it's all well and fine for members on this side, you fellows go ahead and talk but we are not really interested and we are not going to participate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Attorney-General is a new member in this House and I don't fault him for that, but I think it is important to point out to the government that the private members' resolutions are just as important to the work of this House as are the government resolutions, or the bills or the dealing with the estimates, because it is through the private members' resolutions that any member of this House can participate in bringing forward new ideas and new proposals. Other than that it is limited basically to the Cabinet to bring forward other matters. But government isn't only a matter of the cabinet, government is the responsibility of the 57 members here, and so the private members' resolutions cannot simply be set aside by a statement by a Cabinet Minister saying, well we are not really interested in debating them.

MR. MACKLING: Will the honourable member yield to a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. MACKLING: Do you not think honourable member that this is a unique session, a unique session that is being held following an election when 62 bills had been left and not completed?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is critical of the previous government for having ceased, stopped the session without completing its work, I'm in complete agreement with him. In fact during the whole of the election campaign this is the one subject that I discussed most thoroughly and my constituents were in complete agreement with me and returned me here, so I am in complete agreement with him. But if he is saying that we should not be bringing forth some private members' resolutions, then I am in total disagreement with him. And I want to repeat something I said a little while ago here in reply to something that was said by the First Minister when he indicated this was a short session or a special session and therefore there should be nothing else than what the government wanted to bring forward. Mr. Speaker, every session of this House has exactly the same rights and privileges as any other session. Call it a special, call it a short, call it what you want, it's a session of the

September 5, 1969

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . House and a session of the House isn't purely a government operation; it's a session for all the members of the House and I'm not prepared to have a Cabinet Minister suggest to this House that because it's a so-called short session then only government business should be discussed. That's not the purpose of the Legislature. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the resolution itself.

I was a little disappointed when I saw the Minister of Finance suggest a delay in implementation of this resolution, because basically that is what his amendment does. Instead of accepting the principle which was in the original motion that there ought to be an exemption in the fuel motive tax for those who are not using fuel to use the highways - and you are using it for primary production elsewhere, fishing and trapping - instead of accepting that principle, what the Minister of Finance basically is saying, let's not do it now; let's have another look at it. To that extent, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the amendment because it is a delaying tactic and I think that this is the sort of thing that this government should not start off by doing. When they were on this side of the House the present government members were in support of this principle, and now because they are in government, to say "no, we need some more study on it," I don't think is a proper approach.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are other aspects of the amendment with which I can agree, because to an extent the amendment broadens the original resolution. It goes into the whole question of the use of other mobile equipment for production of a primary nature, and if the government is prepared to give a thorough review to this whole affair of the tax exemption, then I am prepared to support the amendment on the basis that it will in fact be a complete review and that action will be taken at the next session of the Legislature. If it is going to be just a shelving proposition, if that's what the government is starting off with, saying yes we were in favour when we were on this side but now we are in government let's delay, then I don't accept it. But I am prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt at this time until the next session, no further, and if there is in fact going to be a proper review of it, then fine, I think there are a number of areas here which can be reviewed with a considerable amount of benefit.

At the moment, for example, farmers are entitled to use purple gas in their farm trucks. There are many other primary producers who I think have equal claim to that same exemption. I can think for example of fishermen during the winter season who have to use their trucks for the transport of fish - a primary product - and very frequently the trucks aren't even on the roads, they are by and large on the lakes, and yet because they are not farmers per se they do not have the right to use purple gas. The member for Emerson constituency pointed out the problems with the bush operators. Once again here people involved in a primary production, and yet in certain aspects of their work they are not entitled to the exemption and I think that it is reasonable to have a look at all of these features.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to support the amendment on that basis. I don't like the delaying procedure unless it is in fact to make it a more comprehensive and thorough review. If that's the purpose, I accept, but I expect to see some action by the next time this House meets.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I felt that I had to get into this discussion after hearing the Member from Ste. Rose. This is the second occasion on which he has got to his feet to point the finger at members of this side and suggest that perhaps there has been a change of heart since we last moved from that side of the House to this side of the House, and I want to assure him that this is not the intention. This amendment was brought in -- with all due respect to whoever is chirping away there, if you let me finish my remarks, you can have it.

This amendment was brought in in good faith. As the Attorney-General has pointed out, this session was something we had to go into because there was no budget and the law requires there be one. We moved very rapidly to get into this House. Hopefully, we can get out in time so that we can bring in a program in 1970 for the '70-71. It is not our intention to just ignore these resolutions. Frankly, private member resolutions are something that I think are essential to democracy and good government. I have always felt that no one group has a monopoly on brains or ideas, and very often if you are too close to something you can't see the answer, and someone being a little more objective can see the answer, and so I welcome private members' resolutions as something that will help to keep us on our toes and also may even sometimes come up with a practical solution to some problems.

So there is no intention on the part of this government to limit debate on private members' resolutions nor to discourage resolutions from being brought to this House. If we are amending them it is because we haven't had the time in the few weeks we were in office to really analyse

September 5, 1969

511

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . what the impact of some of these resolutions might mean, either in the way of revenues or expenditures, and in order to do it it requires some study in depth, and I can assure the Member from Ste. Rose that this is our intention. As he pointed out quite correctly, the amendment broadens the terms of reference of the resolution itself and it does imply that we intend to look into the whole spectrum of the use of tax-free gas for purposes of primary production. This is our intention. Now if a couple of sessions go by and he doesn't hear any more from this side, then I quite agree with him he has every right at that time to be critical. I would just ask him to be co-operative to the extent that he has been by saying that he intends to go along with us for the present, and I don't think he will be disappointed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The question on the motion as amended. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: I just wish to thank all the members who finally did take part in this resolution and I also wish to take the Minister's assurance, because as my colleague from Ste. Rose mentioned and the Member for Rhineland, possibly it was still ringing in our ears some of the thoughts that came across from this side over the years, but now that the Minister has assured us that they feel it is just a matter of looking into it on a wider - and as the amendment is now passed - on a wider basis you might say, I think it is quite appropriate at this time to say no more.

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

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye,

WHEREAS the cost of Education represents the largest single charge against property, and

WHEREAS Education is not a service to property, and

WHEREAS the property tax bears heaviest on those who can least afford to pay, and

WHEREAS basic Education costs should be transferred from the property tax to the broader provincial tax base where they can be financed on the basis of ability to pay,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government of Manitoba consider the advisability of changing the foundation grant formula from the 70% now payable from the consolidated fund and 30% now payable from the uniform levy on property to the following formula:

(1) 80% payable from the consolidated fund and 20% payable from the uniform levy in the calendar year 1970.

(2) 90% payable from the consolidated fund and 10% payable from the uniform levy in the calendar year 1971.

(3) 100% payable from the consolidated fund in the calendar year 1972, with provision for this target to be achieved earlier if provincial finances permit.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of instituting an annual review of foundation grants payable to school divisions to ensure that they are increased in relation to increases in basic education costs so that school divisions are not forced to meet the additional costs of these basic services through the imposition of higher special levies as at present.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, Mr. Speaker, this resolution has appeared last year and there was a very good discussion on it by all members, or all Parties in the House, and it was thought at that time to have been a good idea.

When we are talking about the Foundation Grant in the Department of Education to the school divisions across the province, we are talking about something in the order of \$95 million that is provided for this purpose. In the Winnipeg School Board it is approximately -- of that \$95 million approximately \$34 million are taken up by the Winnipeg School Division Foundation Grant, so that perhaps it would be worthwhile to examine the machinery that is presently used in this regard. We know it is a rather complex formula that was instituted in 1967. It says in effect that the provincial government will provide through the Foundation Program a sum of money in each year by way of grants for all unitary school divisions across the province, and the government at the same time would I think acknowledge that the Foundation Program is not completely sufficient to run our schools. Any additional monies that are required have to be raised directly from the taxpayers. The school division does this by

September 5, 1969

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . means of a special levy. By March 15th in each year the school division advises the - in this case the city of Winnipeg - the amount of extra money it needs over and above the Foundation Program and then the city adds this to their real property tax roll and the money is raised in that way.

In 1968 the Winnipeg School Division spent a little over \$30 million. Approximately \$22 million came through the Foundation Program; the balance of about \$8 million came through the special levy. At first look it might seem that the \$22 million came from the province and \$8 million from the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg, but this is not quite so. The legislation spells out that of the money needed for the Foundation Program for the entire province, 65 percent comes out of general provincial revenue and 35 percent is raised by taxing real property across the province. -- (Interjection) -- 70-30 now yes, so that the percentages are worked out in this manner and applied to each division.

Now how does the province decide how much the Foundation Program will receive for the entire province and how much does each division get. To do this it established the Public Schools Finance Board which examines the budget of each division at the beginning of the year and then decides on how much the grants are going to be. When they complete this review they have a total amount that is going to be paid out under the Foundation Program for the year. Now once this figure is established, the province knows that it will have to contribute 70 percent and 30 will have to be raised through real property tax across the province. The Public Schools Finance Board looks at the assessments of real property across the province and decides what mill rate will apply to raise the 30 percent. In 1967 the mill rate was 9 mills on farm and residential property and 33 mills on other property, and of course this figure went higher in 1968 and if nothing is changed I expect it will go higher again the next time that the figure is struck.

So in 1968 the Foundation Program was \$22 million for the Winnipeg School Board and the other \$8 million was raised from the taxpayers of Winnipeg by the special levy. This \$22 million the Public Schools Finance Board levied against the real property taxpayers of Winnipeg to raise the 30 percent of the provincial total which would be around \$14 million - I could be out, that's a general figure - the balance of about \$8 million came directly from the provincial government. This \$14 million the Winnipeg taxpayers contributed a little over 40 percent, not near the 30 percent that the rest of the province would pay. This is of the total amount raised by the Public Schools Finance Board from all municipalities in the province, so that if the \$22 million that Winnipeg needed in '68 - of course this was based on the 65 percent 35 percent formula, the figures I'm using - of the \$22 million that Winnipeg needed in '68, about 65 percent of what was needed came directly from the real property taxpayers of Winnipeg and 35 percent from the province, which is not a true picture of what goes on across the province. Eight million dollars came directly from the provincial government. In other words, the province's direct contribution to Winnipeg in '68 was just a little over 25 percent.

To put it another way, the province needed around \$100 million for the Foundation Program in '68. The province put up 65 percent or \$65 million; the Public Schools Finance Board, 35 percent or \$35 million from all the property taxpayers in the province, which included the taxpayers of Winnipeg. Of the \$65 million that the province contributed directly to municipalities, Winnipeg received just \$8 million which is about one-eighth of the amount, although they are about one-quarter of the population of the province. Of course the difficulty here is that the Winnipeg real property taxpayers are paying partly for rural school divisions costs. Now we might argue the point as to whether or not they should, but still it is not equitable in my opinion. When the sales tax was first instituted it was designed to - in fact it was called an educational tax - it was designed to relieve the load of the property owner in the province. Well we know that the money was not used entirely for that, it was used for other purposes as well, so the problem is still with us.

Now my resolution is designed to gradually make the transition. We know that the Consolidated Fund cannot stand in one fell swoop to have the whole tax placed on it for schools. We know that. We also know that in a good school system there should be teacher grants for other than just the actual school room teacher. For example, there should be a teacher grant for nursery schools and kindergartens in any good school system. In the technical school the teacher-pupil ratio is not as good as it should be, because we know that in technical and vocational schools not necessarily large classes are taught. Where the ratio 1 to 28 may be proper in a standard school room, it isn't proper where a course is being offered and maybe only 12

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . students are available to take it that year. The helping teachers, the resource teachers, the school librarians, they are not covered under the Teacher Grant, the physical education teacher, the music teachers and the art teachers. So that the time has passed when we should say, well we can wait awhile longer before this should be looked at. I think this should be looked at now.

We just had a short debate as to whether or not a special session or a short or a long session should not be used to debate policies and ideas, and I think that everyone would agree, although I know the government have other matters that are preoccupying them, but I think everyone would agree that this is the only way policies can be publicly discussed in this Legislature. Ideas can be discussed, and from the ideas come policies.

So I won't say much more on that, Mr. Speaker, but I note that last year when my then leader the Member for Ste. Rose spoke on Tuesday, March 18th, he made much the same speech that I did and gave figures to support his idea. The next speaker after him was the Honourable Russ Paulley, Leader of the New Democratic Party, and right in his opening remarks he says this, and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, may I first of all indicate support for the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, but may I also suggest that in my opinion it does not go far enough" — and he goes on to develop his arguments as to what more should be done.

So I would hope that the New Democratic Party may find it within their hearts to accept this principle as the place to start from and not put some meaningless amendment on it to have it studied or referred to some committee or something, and I would like to have a wide-ranging debate on the idea of how we can transfer some of the taxation from land and property tax onto a broader basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel,

WHEREAS Canada is a constitutional monarchy and the legislative executive and judicial sovereignty of the people of Manitoba is vested in Her Majesty The Queen of Canada in right of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS in recent years questions have been raised as to the continuing ability of Her Majesty to provide, under our present system, the best form of government for Canada and for Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS the present government of Manitoba, by announcing in the Throne Speech of the 29th Legislature its intention to invite Her Majesty to attend and preside at our celebration of the centennial of Manitoba, has reaffirmed the express position of the previous government regarding our present constitution and Her Majesty's essential and indispensable role and function therein;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House hereby reaffirms its conviction that our constitutional monarchy continues to be the form of government most conducive to the peace, order and good government of Canada and of Manitoba, and to the welfare of our people, and that our invitation to Her Majesty to attend and preside at our centennial celebrations formally expresses our abiding faith in, and steadfast adherence to the fundamentals of our constitutional monarchy and our continuing and enthusiastic loyalty to Her Majesty as constitutional sovereign of Canada and of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take too long certainly at this stage of the introduction of this resolution, but I would like to indicate my surprise first of all in the suggestion the other day by the First Minister that challenged my motives in introducing a resolution of this type, and he later withdrew it, which I am very pleased that he did, because this resolution is here because I firmly believe that the monarchy has stood us in good stead in our first 100 years and that any talk of replacing it with some other type of system until there was consideration of what that would be, would certainly be premature and I would like to see the Province of Manitoba speak unanimously in this House in support of this system of government.

(MR. WEIR cont'd.)

I think that as a background I might say that the government of Manitoba, that it was my privilege to lead, had prepared for presentation at the Constitutional Conference held at Ottawa last February a booklet entitled "What tomorrow - Canada". It contained a number of propositions for consideration by the government of Canada, both the government of Canada and the provinces, in the process of constitutional revision in which this country is engaged at the present time. Three of those propositions on the subject of basic principles are as follows: No. 6. The Constitution should provide for the continuation of the present system of government with such amendments as may seem appropriate. No. 7. Canada is a Sovereign State, the executive, government and authority of and over which is continued in the Queen of Canada. And No. 8. Canada should continue to be a parliamentary democracy.

The explanation to No. 7 read as follows: "This makes it clear that Canada is a Sovereign nation with a monarchical system of government. The constitutional monarchy has worked well under Canadian conditions and should be continued. The Monarch being above political considerations can best symbolize the unity of the diverse regions and peoples of Canada."

No. 3. The reference is to the Queen of Canada, to emphasize that Canadians approve her constitutional position as head of the State of Canada.

From time to time in recent years quite a number of persons, either more or sometimes less informed but usually responsible, have said or done things which would seem to indicate that they had little use for our monarchical form of government and that we should give short shrift to it. As an example, the present Prime Minister of Canada has been heard to flippantly dismiss the monarchy as a subject of too little significance to warrant a public expression by him in that regard.

Propositions submitted to the Constitutional Conference by other governments refer to the establishment of other systems of government and often refer to the republican type. In search of means of improving the efficiency of some of our institutions of government, for example the Senate and the Federal Cabinet, some persons have looked south of the border and would find solutions in the congressional system. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's quite obvious that the government of Manitoba which I led and that advanced the propositions last February that I have mentioned, does not agree with so-called republican views. I don't propose to make here and now an elaborate or an exhaustive review of our parliamentary democracy founded as it is on our constitutional monarchy in its particular Canadian form as this has evolved over our last century, but of all the virtues of our system as compared to others, it may well be that its greatest are its flexibility and its inherent capacity for adaptation to constantly changing circumstances.

For our purposes it is suffice to restate that our Canadian monarchy has served us well indeed, and to assert my own abiding conviction that it continues to be the best form of government for Canada and for Manitoba for the present and for the foreseeable future. Because of this conviction that is shared by my colleagues in the previous administration and by my colleagues in our present caucus, and I think by a substantial majority of informed people in Manitoba as well as in Canada, I find it most gratifying and reassuring to learn that such views appear to be held by the present administration and that the policy of Manitoba in this particular regard will be probably continued at further Constitutional Conferences. That such are the views of the present administration I believe is implicit in the announcement in the Throne Speech of the 29th Legislature of the present government's intention to invite Her Majesty to preside with us in Manitoba as we celebrate our centennial celebrations.

During that year we reflect on our first hundred years and the development that has taken place in the Province of Manitoba, as we did in 1967 as we looked back on the development of Canada in her first hundred years, but at the same time as we look back we must look forward, and looking forward, I believe this is one of the areas that we could very well use to unanimously, Mr. Speaker, endorse our confidence as a Legislature, representing the people of Manitoba in the monarchical system of government and in its present office holder, the Queen of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, without any further comments from me at the moment, I would recommend this resolution to all members of the Assembly.

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital. The proposed resolution standing -- I'm sorry, the Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Swan River, that

WHEREAS several members of the New Democratic Party, many of whom are Cabinet Ministers in the present government, affixed their signatures to a petition of the Manitoba Association of Students promising to act upon the following matters in the first session of the Legislature after the election of June 25th:

- (1) Freeze University fees at the 1968-69 level;
- (2) Study higher education financing and call a national meeting of provincial governments to discuss this problem;
- (3) Set aside a sizeable amount of money for student aid.

AND WHEREAS it appears that these promises along with many other such commitments of the New Democratic Party will not be honoured;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government explain to the students involved and the general public the apparent lack of action on this and other important matters on which they have promised to take immediate action.

MR. SPEAKER: May I inform the honourable member that I have some reservations in my mind as to the admissibility of this resolution, but I would be quite happy at this point to hear debate on the question of whether or not this resolution ought to be allowed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that you've anticipated an objection from this side in any event, and I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I have no objection to debating the issues that are being raised or which the honourable member seeks to have raised by this resolution. In saying this, I say it with the full knowledge that the resolution could be brought in in a proper form, and I assure that members in our group are not sensitive about this issue, have nothing to hide from it and are prepared to debate it, but we don't feel that we should be involved in debating a question or setting a precedent for debating a resolution which in our view doesn't amount to a resolution at all. I would be quite happy, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would go back over the last three years in the House to try to compare the resolution which is now presented with any resolution which was prepared at that time.

It's very very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to present authority to confirm the obvious. Any lawyer or any mathematician or anybody seeking to demonstrate that 10 and 10 is 20 would have a great deal of a problem, or that if equals be divided by equals the result is equal. Any axiom is difficult to support with authority and I think that the resolution before us is so axiomatically not a resolution that it may take some argument to put the position.

In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that the word "resolution" by itself - and I've referred to the dictionary which I have on my desk and I'm not going to go to it - but I would ask the seeker to look at the meaning of the word "resolution". It means to determine something, to resolve something. The resolution that is proposed by the honourable member is that somebody explain something; that the members, or that the government explain things that have been said by certain candidates in running for office; and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a resolution which, after it has been decided, determines anything. It's different than a resolution which says that an enquiry should be held, because that at least determines that an enquiry is held. It's not a resolution that says that a commission be established because that determines something. This resolution says that somebody should explain something, and I say it leaves unresolved any question other than that an explanation be sought -- an explanation not be sought but an explanation be given by the government. And I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of the House and that the procedures in the House militate against this type of resolution, that this type of information is not available according to the rules of the House by resolution. There are several avenues in which this type of information or type of activity can be resolved. They can be resolved in the question period by the asking of questions; they can be resolved by means of an Order for Return if specific information was requested - and in this case an Order for Return of course would be inappropriate; or questions could be asked during the estimates.

So there are these three areas plus - and I hasten to add the plus because I don't want the honourable member to feel that I don't think that a debate should take place - plus a resolution. And I'll even give him suggestions: that the government be censured; or that the government

September 5, 1969

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . be applauded - and I don't readily expect that that will happen; or the House resolve some type of action with respect to the matter that he is complaining of. And if that resolution is brought in that way, then I assure the honourable member that we would have no hesitation in debating, but this type of resolution says that we explain something.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you're well acquainted with the rule that the Ministers need not answer a question - not that I feel again any difficulty about answering this type of question - but if this type of resolution were permitted it would mean that the Ministers would be required to do something by resolution which they couldn't be required to do if a straight question was put in the House. And I submit, Mr. Speaker - or which they would not be required to answer on the estimates - and I submit that that is not appropriate in resolution form, that the member should not be able to require a Minister to do something by resolution which he would not be required to do -- not be required to answer a question by resolution which he would not be required to answer if the questions were asked in the House.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, and this is the last point that I'm going to make, the very nature of the resolution would indicate that it does not resolve anything. Let us assume - and I don't suggest that this would occur - but let us assume that the resolution were affirmative. It would mean that the Minister, or the government would have to explain, and let us assume then that somebody got up and gave an explanation and the members were not satisfied with the explanation. Would it then be appropriate for a resolution that the government give a better explanation or another explanation? I suggest to you that this is patently an absurd result to be obtained from a resolution and that the only reason that the result would be so absurd is that the resolution is not in fact a resolution in that it determines any question by the House which is of necessity the subject matter of a resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: I think in terms of the resolution that we have before us, certainly it hasn't been researched in the detail that obviously has been done by the other side in terms of looking up the dictionary in terms of the word "resolution". The resolution appears because there was a request by the First Minister earlier in the session to do it by resolution rather than do it in some other way. I think that if there is a technicality that the wording of the discussion does not meet with the approval of you, Sir - I'm not worried about my friends on the other side and their interpretation of the rules, if I was going to argue the rules I'd spend a little more time in the technicalities that are involved - but on this occasion I think that I, and I'm sure my colleagues, would be prepared to abide with your judgment and if you believed it to be out of order either on this afternoon's agenda or on another occasion after some study, we would be prepared to resubmit the resolution in the form in which it would be appropriate for the House.

It was presented in this fashion as a matter of courtesy because of the request of the First Minister, because it seems extremely difficult to be able to get the kind of answers that we wanted on the question period, even to the point of having partial documents tabled when we believed that there should have been full documents tabled and so on and so forth. So without going into anything further and without attempting to delay the proceedings of the House this afternoon while I might look at the detailed research as to whether or not I believe it's in order or not, may I say that from our side of the House on this particular occasion I think we would accept your judgment as to what you believe would be the right procedure in this area, and if you believe that a different wording was advantageous, I think that we would agree to resubmit in a proper wording.

MR. GREEN: On the same point of order, and I'd just like to acknowledge to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that the Premier did say that perhaps it would be better debated in submitting a resolution, and I hope that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would accept the implication that we would think that it was in fact a proper resolution. Our sole objection is that this resolution is so framed that we would not like to make it a precedent for questions to be asked to be answered on resolution. A resolution has to take a position on something and we don't think this does, but we would welcome the honourable member submitting it in a form that would make it acceptable.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, without getting into a debate on it, may I accept the judgment of my honourable friend and still refer to your ruling whatever it may be and whenever it comes. But I think it might have been more helpful, if they have recognized this for some time, if somebody had indicated to us earlier that they thought that this might happen we might

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . have found some easier means of getting it back on the Order Paper.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'd just like to add that I think your ruling is in fact correct -- (Interjection) -- I might point out that in regard to this, the question of whether or not this is an appropriate subject of debate, that the honourable member who submitted the resolution will have ample opportunity to debate this on the very next day, when the next department comes up under Youth and Education and he can make his comments then, on Monday.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Minister of Health was speaking I took it that you were looking for advice from the floor and I wondered whether or not in view of the fact that the Minister of Health is involved in this particular resolution as to whether or not it did not nullify him in advising you as to what might not be the proper procedure. I believe, Sir, that as has been put forward by my leader, you may like a little time to consider the remarks that have been made, and possibly it will assist you in making up your mind as to whether this is in order or not by next Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may join in the point of order at this point, I have not had a chance to look through Beauchesne to get to the citations that would apply. I see some validity in the statements made by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services that the remedy or the action sought by the resolution is very difficult to do, and the resolution may in that sense be one that cannot be acted upon and that there may be some validity here. I would think, however, that it could be remedied very easily by some redrafting by the mover, and certainly insofar as we are concerned we would be quite agreeable - I haven't consulted with my Leader, but I think we would be agreeable to giving leave to have the matter stand and a redraft of the operative section. I think everything is fine until we reach the operative section, and if that were to call for a meeting with the Students' Union in Room 254 where the government Ministers will appear, I think this is the sort of operative thing that the government then can vote in favour or against. But it's a specific action that can be taken, and we would certainly be, I think, agreeable to giving leave to have the matter stand at this point for a redraft in the form that can be, if accepted by the House, can actually be carried through.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I certainly would have no objection. In fact I would be quite prepared to give leave to have this matter brought forward in a different manner in a redraft. It seems to me that the matter of the Resolved part, where the explanation is to be given, in what form, what manner, where and how is not indicated. I think a better draft could be presented.

MR. SPEAKER: I have heard a suggestion made that three of the parties are willing to give the mover and seconder leave to withdraw the resolution, but hearing no response from them I take it that it is their intention to have the resolution stand or fall as presented. I wish to thank the honourable members for their contribution to the debate on this point and I wish to take the matter under advisement, and the comments made this afternoon, and give my decision thereon when this resolution next appears on the Order Paper.

The proposed resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose,

WHEREAS historically the prairie provinces have turned to Port Churchill for relief in respect to the high export and import freight rates respecting western farm products and northern industrial natural resources, and

WHEREAS Port Churchill area provides unique facilities to encourage out of the province tourists, scientists, historians and nature students, and

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba has never actively promoted a practical program to support and participate in the development of this great provincial natural resource,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Government be asked to consider the advantages of establishing a year round Harbors Board Industrial and Tourist Information Office in the townsite of Port Churchill to develop, encourage and supply information to secure larger volumes of industrial trade while assuring Port Churchill of services comparable to those now used by competitive harbors in Eastern Canada.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think you come from the north end of Winnipeg

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . and I come from the north end of the province and probably we have something in common here. The rest may end up out in the coffee bar but we will have a good chinwag about the problems of Churchill Harbours Board and the promotion of the harbour itself. I reflect back when I am thinking about this to the federal omnibus bill, was it, sometime ago that was just recently passed and I think the recent changes in these federal laws may now legalize the abortion that has taken place in Manitoba and that's called Port Churchill.

I have no progress to report at Port Churchill and I say why hasn't Port Churchill become a major port, a profitable public enterprise, a major Manitoba industry, a growth centre, a major showpiece, a valuable tourist attraction complementary to what the Churchill area has to offer. I ask what are the reasons for this slow growth area which has lasted now since dating well back to before 1914. I think it is commonly felt that the slow growth comes from the disgraceful deceit and the blindness of past governments to recognize the potential resource of Port Churchill. I believe too that the artificial advantages awarded to eastern establishments have in fact held back the growth of Port Churchill in respect to freight rates, the effective lobbying that goes on in Eastern Canada and certainly many of the other problems which our friends in the north, the Hudson's Bay Route Association, have rubbed noses with ever since their conception.

I believe that there has been no support by government agencies to encourage the growth of Port Churchill. They seem to be in a comfortable position and at this time I would like to refer to the shipping companies that indeed are doing trade in the Port Churchill area, the National Harbours Board and the Canadian National Railway. There is no movement by any of these groups to really do anything about effectively enlarging the facility. Certainly Mr. Dalgleish comes over each year and makes representation to the people but he cannot do it alone.

I keep going back to members of the National Harbours Board and Federal Government in respect to their thoughts, and it seems to be an extremely negligent view that they take in respect to the development. They are satisfied with the status quo. Are government agencies happy to allow present conditions to remain as is? I think so. I think so, because there has been no growth since 1958 - and I refer back to the Jones report which was used a few nights ago against Churchill - but from '58 on there has been no real change. I am not going to quote statistics, it's in Page 43 of the Jones report, but if you review in 1958 it was 19 millions of bushels shipped; in 1967 it was 20 millions of bushels. This is not growth and certainly we can't expect any major changes until it doubles and triples, and as the Agriculture Minister in Saskatchewan stated a couple of years ago, maybe we should be looking to 50 to 100 millions of bushels.

I believe in many cases that there is nobody around to rock the boat, and I think that something has to be done about this. I think that members in this House should consider the fact that in the whole area there is really no private enterprise system included in this development and I think that probably some of the problems come because of this.

And I refer back again in history. Did really 190 thousand-odd business and farm people of western Canada make a mistake when they signed the petition back in the early history? I don't think so, because while we can say today that you could send a petition around and anybody would sign for something and then turn around and sign against it the next day, but I don't believe that was the case back in the early 1900's when this first was presented to the people of Western Canada and certainly to eastern politics, and the eastern politicians fought it for years. It came about that really we didn't win the war, we only won a battle. We only won a battle. I believe that Port Churchill is a slow growth industry because of government policy, yet the Federal Government has left this area out of the new policy on slow growth areas, and if there is one place it should be indelibly imprinted upon our friends from Ottawa it should be Port Churchill, because I am sure they hear about it politically, and if they didn't they must have studied it at school. The Prime Minister was there just some short few months ago - or a few weeks I guess or a month or two ago, whatever it was - and he saw what was there and I think he should be well aware of the problems that have come up.

I think that I would like to take another approach on this, Mr. Speaker, while there are still two or three of us gathered around here, and if you look at the elevator costs alone, you will find that by rule of thumb it costs approximately \$1.00 per bushel to build an elevator. Now they tell me this is a general rule that is being considered. Now then, what would the

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . . book value of the elevator capacity be in Churchill today? It would be depreciated by a large amount, and I think, Mr. Speaker, if we were considering this, we should say that if this book value is reduced enough then why doesn't the Federal Government consider selling the elevator to private enterprise. We have elevator companies, co-ops in the business of storing grain, and they have to look forward to storing more and more grain, because particularly this year, I understand by the paper if I read it properly, there will be over six to seven hundred millions of bushels again this year and we will have a record carry-over. But there has still been nothing done about wheat storage; there has still been nothing done about extra movement through this port; and I think that there should be a study done on it. Certainly I understand that the government has taken off the five percent tax on building of granaries, but if the farmer is forced into this part of the farming then certainly he will go out of business in a big hurry and it is causing the cost-price squeeze. I say that if you get private enterprise into the middle of this abortion, then perhaps, just perhaps they can bring the pressures to bear that are necessary to bring these facilities into the full use that they should have.

Now then, what would happen if private enterprise were allowed to buy this, and on a condition. They are getting a good deal. If their condition was that they had to over a short period of time double the size of the capacity, this would then in effect take care perhaps of some of the rail abandonment. And I know our rural friends in western Canada are going to fight this and they are going to fight it just the same as this government and members of this House fought Air Canada in their withdrawal, but I believe it is generally conceded by most people that the fight is lost already. And if this is the case, then we have got to take a look at where are they going to store their grain? Are they going to double the size at Port Arthur? Are they going to triple it at Montreal? Are they going to use Halifax? They are going ahead with a large program in B. C., and I must take my hat off to the Premier in B. C. Apparently he was the one that instigated it, some of the new harbour that is being considered or being built there.

I think that if we also considered the port in respect to modern day trends, because no harbours board today can rely on grain alone. It has to have a multi-use facility. No harbour can prosper from just one commodity. It has to, in my mind, be one that will complement western imports, western exports, northern industrial development, our resources - and I only point out that we have an \$80 million guaranteed development or exploration for oil and minerals in the eastern Arctic and it's quite obvious to anybody that is a Manitoban that Churchill will be the place in which they will have to distribute these great amounts of material to run the exploration program from. And if we work back, Mr. Speaker, then who does this help? Everything comes through your back door through the Greater Winnipeg area, and I remember one time when you were sitting as a backbencher I called Winnipeg a warehouse for the whole of Manitoba and you weren't any too happy with that application, but it is a warehouse in which everything that passes through it provides free enterprise with money, free enterprise with profits in the development of this northern area, and I think greater consideration should be given by the businessmen in this Greater Winnipeg area on the fact that northern Manitoba is going ahead, the politicians say so, the businessmen seem to be excited about it, the Chambers of Commerce are excited about it, but nobody seems to do anything about it. Nobody seems to want to provide a means or go up and see what they can do about developing or getting in on the early stages of this wonderful expansion of northern Canada.

I think that private business people of Winnipeg are asleep at the wheel today. They are like squirrels running around trying to find out where they are going to store their -- (Interjection) -- Acorns - thank you - for the winter, but they are acting like a bunch of nuts. I think they're going a lot further away than what they have to. If they'd stay at home and look at what is provided in northern Manitoba or what faces them in northern Manitoba, then they probably would stay closer at home.

It's obvious to us who go up there that there is a breakdown because the stevedores are not on a 24-hour basis and this is amazing. The International Nickel Company work on a 24-hour basis. They realize that they have got to work 24 hours a day but this is not the case as far as the Harbours Board are concerned. They are working on a short period of a year. They're trying to keep it down to a couple of months, and yet they will not service the ships on a 24-hour basis. This means that ships, or two ships come in, at the end of the shift the boys say, Well, that's all for today and they go on their merry way and the Harbours Board close

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . down. Can you imagine such a thing? This wouldn't happen in free enterprise. We'd be worried about what it was costing us to close down an operation when there were customers, ships lined up waiting to take advantage of the commodity that we had to provide them with. I'm not just sure of what it costs a ship to stand idle, but I know in my mind it's somewhere around ten or twenty-five thousand dollars a day, they point out that it costs for this type of waiting. And of course if we want to go back far enough we had strikes a couple of years ago where ships were waiting for months but never a one was diverted around Churchill. I asked why. I don't know, but I have in the back of my mind, and I believe you realize too, that they didn't want to send them down to the north then, they wanted to keep it down in the eastern part of the country regardless of what it was costing the shippers.

If we follow through on this program then we can say, why doesn't the Federal-Provincial governments on their trade training program look after some of these Indians? They could assure them of a local native labour for years to come. It's a matter, I understand, something to do with unions, something to do with training these people, but it's been going on for years and they take them from everywhere else and I think that the Indian people can provide a labour pool - now it may be or may not be that they decide on payday that they've got enough money and stay away - but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there's another Indian ready to step in line and take that fellow's place, and maybe that's what they should be considering instead of governments sitting by waiting while these good people drink themselves to death and into obscurity because of the despair and discrimination and discouragement.

I believe that extra storage is available for export-import products. There's the navy base; there's the American SAC building, all served by the CNR spur lines that are available for additional grain storage. I recall just reading in the paper a while ago that in the spring where Russia had a problem and it pointed out that the government was scurrying around finding every available space to store grain so it wouldn't get wet, and the Federal Government policy and our own Department of Agriculture policy in the western governments did not do this. They didn't look around for every available space to store the grain; they left it for the farmers. They said: It's yours, we haven't bought it yet; that's your problem. I think that this is one of the things that they could look into because certainly the loss to the farmers was a great deal more than it would have cost for the extra handling of looking after that grain.

I think then we should move to marine insurance. Much has been said about marine insurance, but I would not like to think that the marine insurance was actually subsidized by government because then I think that we would get caught into that trap where it would tend to discourage volume growth because they would be saying, "The more that you get through there the more it's going to cost us so let's keep the status quo." So I don't like to see the word "subsidy" used. I don't know whether it's any different to call it co-insurance, but I term my thoughts in using co-insurance would be to say the government are ready and prepared to assist private insurance companies if there are problems in opening the days to 120 or 130 days shipping, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that maybe this is an aspect of it that we should look into. Certainly don't try and use the port for the reason for subsidy. It must back up to the fact that we are at present at least using this as a form of distribution of food, which is important, and I think it's subsidized from the consumer and not the port.

And why do you need marine insurance? Why can't you have more days? We've heard it over and over again, Mr. Speaker. But when I sat and listened, when I was on the Mauro Commission - or following the Mauro Commission around, I wasn't on it - but when I followed it around one of the Commodores from the Canadian Navy who was retired and who I understand - I don't know what his name was - I understand he's considered one of the top experts in shipping in the north today, considered this by the world over, he said: "There really isn't anything different in our way technically of shipping than what the Russians are using and the Russians have got their port utilized up to two-thirds of a year." The only difference, Mr. Speaker, that the Russians have is that they're using a trained crew to take over the ship when it first gets into the ice waters, bring it in and take it back, and this, I said before in this House, is no different than the control tower on the large airfields that take over the bringing in of large air transportation. The pilot loses control to the control tower and I think these ships and these ship owners and the crews and the captains should lose control of their ships until they are brought safely in and taken safely out and then they can go merrily on their way, because I know in talking to these captains, many of them have never been in ice water before and so they're expect to land in there and land the ship safely and the insurance company will

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . look after any damages. This is where we get the problems, and I think when you reflect back there was a picture of a Danish, I believe it was, captain came in, and what was he - 23 I believe - 27 somebody tells me, one of the youngest captains who'd ever brought a ship in, but I'm sure he did not have adequate training even though he did get in. So I think if we had a combination of these many things then I believe that we could move forward.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker - I see it's 5:30 - I would like to continue the following day.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have the opportunity to complete his debate when this resolution next appears on the Order Paper.

It is now 5:30. I declare the House adjourned and it will stand adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.