

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, June 8, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I beg to present the First Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs beg leave to present the following as its First Report:

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Boyce as Chairman. Your Committee has agreed that, for the remainder of this Session, the quorum of this Committee shall consist of seven (7) members.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 5 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-law No. 19680 of The City of Winnipeg.

No. 6 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter (1).

No. 12 - An Act to amend The St. James-Assiniboia Charter.

No. 49 - The Postponement of Elections in Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.

No. 62 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2).

And has agreed to report the same without amendments.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 3 - The Local Authorities Election Act.

No. 13 - An Act respecting the 1970 Centennial and The City of Transcona.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere) introduced Bill No. 121, The Human Rights Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 120, an Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act (2); and

Bill No. 122, The Personal Investigation Act.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Springfield) introduced Bill No. 125, The Hearing Aid Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point, I would like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 27 Grade 5 students of the Linwood School. These students are under the direction of Miss Miller. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Attorney-General.

Also 60 Grade 5 students of the Steinbach Southwood School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Epp, and this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Robert H. Smith School is hosting Birch River School. There are 25 Grade 6 students, all under the direction of Miss Boyd of Robert H. Smith. Robert H. Smith School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights and Birch River School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

And also 60 Grades 9 - 13 students from the Minnedosa School and which is hosting Alexandria School from Ontario. The students from both schools are under the direction of Mr. Friesen and Mr. Black. Minnedosa School is in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in his capacity as House Leader. Because a number of Centennial committees are awaiting the passage of Bill 75 hopefully so that they can carry forward certain family types of celebrations, would the House Leader consider asking the House to give leave to have this bill proceed faster than it is now going, to help these people?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister, and ask him if he has anything to report on the attempts to obtain a Triple A baseball franchise for Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that it would be possible today to make the kind of announcement that would warm the cockles of my honourable friend's heart, and the Member for Assiniboia as well, because of their interest in past months with the prospect of obtaining a Triple A franchise for a Winnipeg-based team. I still have high hopes. It may, however, be another 24 or 48 hours before we know definitively.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JOHN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. Could he tell the House or inform the House what, if anything, could be done for the residents of Albert Beach, especially in view of what seems to have been the government's actions in getting people to set up cottages there. They're now flooded - flooding.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there was a meeting of the residents in that area yesterday which was attended by my honourable friend the questioner, and also members of the Water Control Department. I am unable to make any definitive reply to my honourable friend but the matter is presently being looked into and I'll be receiving a report shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Would the Minister be giving consideration this session to increase the minimum wage to \$2.00 as was unanimously passed by the Manitoba Federation of Labour?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has already announced what the increase in respect to the minimum wage will be effective October 1st.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question Is it going to be \$2.00? Is it going to be \$2.00 per hour?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not a prophet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): My question before the Orders of the Day is addressed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he could inform the House whether his department has made any studies which would indicate a reduction of the bank interest charged to consumers in Manitoba as a result of the reduction in interest rate by the Bank of Canada.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I take the place of the Honourable Minister to report that this matter was discussed briefly with the Minister of Finance of the Government of Canada, and there is no indication yet of any progress that I can report. The honourable member will realize, of course, that banks are independent of any controls or instruction, and there's been no indication of what we consider is an overdue reduction that ought to be carried out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the Liquor Commission has altered its pricing in the last week or two.

MR. MACKLING: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not possible that there will be a change in pricing as a result of the lifting of the freeze on the Canadian dollar? Is it not a

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) fact that there will be imported liquor which will now be cheaper, or should be cheaper for Manitobans?

MR. MACKLING: I haven't indulged in any conjecture on the effect of the freeing of the Canadian dollar. It may be that a number of things are possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and ask him, now that the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg has offered a \$40,000 grant to the Red River Exhibition Association for a winter carnival, will his department be resurrecting plans to make a matching grant for that project?

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, we're always looking at various possibilities and support anything along these lines. I would just report at this time that we'll have a look at it and we'll report to you in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the requisite number of copies of a Return to an Order of the House No. 25 made on the motion of the Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I also lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 24 in the name of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I understand a huge forest fire is blazing just north of Norway House. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if any steps were taken to help control this fire.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take my honourable friend's question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): . . . if the Minister of Mines and Resources could advise the House as to reasons why the Minister of Transportation was not allowed down in the mine?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

STATEMENTS

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a brief announcement concerning the Manitoba Centennial Savings Bond issue, which has been a most satisfactory issue from this government's point of view and indicates to us that the citizens of our province have confidence in the future of Manitoba.

Sales of this series will close at 5:00 p. m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1970. We have decided to make one exception and that is in the case of holders of bonds of previous Manitoba Savings Bonds issues, who will be allowed an additional two-week period, namely up to and including June 24, 1970, to convert their old Manitoba series to the present issue. We feel that although there's been ample publicity suggesting to them that it is to their advantage to do so, there's been very little, really, reaction to that and we thought we should recognize that they be given the extra two weeks.

As at 2:00 p. m. today, Mr. Speaker, today June 8th, we have sold some \$33 million worth of the new issue. At present only about 1.7 million of the previous issues, of all of them, have been converted, leaving some \$9 million still outstanding, and it is for these good people who have supported Manitoba by holding bonds of previous issues that we are making the one exception as to the closing date. The reason we are closing the issue this Wednesday is that we anticipate our sales by then will have exceeded \$35 million. This amount, along with the approximately \$9 million in outstanding Manitoba Savings Bonds of previous issues, will bring our total issue of saving bonds of the province to between 45 and 50 million. This was the ultimate to which we were prepared to commit ourselves, and because we must give notice both in accordance with the Order-in-Council and in all fairness, we are now giving notice that the issue will close on June 10th, 1970 at 5:00 p. m. It's with considerable pride that I'm able to make this statement.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) of this House would be ready to consider granting leave to suspend the rules of this House and allow the removal of the jackets until the end of the session. This is not something new - it's been done before - and I think we could pay a little more attention.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave?

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, in response to the request. I think it deserves a response. Certainly the temperature in here today isn't such that I would think it would require it. The practice in the House has been to authorize the removal of jackets during committee, and unless some of us started to suffer seriously I would suggest that that's a good way to leave the rule. I notice there's members within the House, not all sitting on the benches, that have their tongue out and panting, who have a warmer garb than we have as members of the House, to have to wear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to present a report on the Conference of Finance Ministers of Canada, Federal-Provincial, at the meeting which took place on the 5th and 6th of June, 1970. I can't say it will be as brief as the one I've given on the bonds, but I believe that honourable members will be interested in having some summation of the events of the past few days. Hearing no objections, I propose then to make my report. But first, I would like to thank all members of the House and you, Mr. Speaker, for the excellent co-operation that we received in helping to make accommodations and hospitable running of the meeting a success. We were complimented by a number of the delegates by the fact that we were able to provide quarters for them, and for that we have to thank all three caucuses and you, too, Mr. Speaker. I'm told that Manitoba was considered a gracious centennial host on this important occasion, and I share with all of you the compliments which we received on our welcome and the facilities offered.

I'd like to reprise the highlights of the meeting and to recap the positions taken by the Manitoba Government in relation to those taken by the Federal Government and the other provinces. The meeting opened with a general review of the Canadian economy and prospects for the remainder of the current year. I must say that essentially the views of the Manitoba Government on the economy, as reflected in the Economic Review appended to my Budget Address to the House, were substantiated by the trends that appear to be developing at the national level. The Federal Government conceded that their anti-inflationary fight against rising prices had achieved some measure of success as reflected in national price indicators. I would like to back up to that word "conceded". That's not quite the word I should have used. I'd say that they "indicated" that that was the fact, but the Federal spokesman indicated that their concern was that there is still a gap between wages and productivity. There were also references made to shrinking profit margins.

Dr. Young, the chairman of the federal Prices and Incomes Commission, came forward with proposals for restraining wages and income increases. These have been dealt with rather extensively by the press and other media in the past few days and I shan't go into the specifics of these proposals. However, I must draw your attention to the Manitoba Government's reactions to these proposals, and I'll be distributing some time today a set of summary statements made on behalf of this government on the subject and I will also table copies of the federal statements for honourable members.

We agreed - and I say we, the Manitoba Government agreed - that there was a need to restrain unreasonable increases in all costs and prices. We could not agree that only one segment of income, that is wages, should be singled out for restraint. Certainly we suggested - that's a mild word - we insisted that rent, interest, profits, professional fees, all income sources must be controlled in the same way as was proposed for wages. There is a real concern on our part that once again we are being asked to concentrate all our national energies on the solution of an immediate short run problem, and that in doing so we are being either unfair in selecting one segment for rigid control or unselective, on the other hand, in applying broad axe restraints. Unless the imbalances in social and economic conditions and in the lives of people affected by those conditions are dealt with positively at the same time as controls are applied, this government cannot fully endorse national actions for controls, particularly when they involve obvious unfairness to particular segments of the country and people.

Controls leave unresolved the social and economic imbalances that have been with us as Canadians for a long time, and we contend that action must be taken on these too; and so

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Manitoba urged the Federal Government to recognize that immediate response must be made through various means - and we were specific. We said that there should be more meaningful DREE programs; that there should be more adequate assistance for housing and urban assistance, urban development and urban problem assistance; that there should be more educational training and easier access to training facilities; that there should be more decentralization of federal departments and agencies, agencies such as Air Canada, CBC, etc., and more effort to apply freight rates and other transportation policy fairly among regions.

We have taken this position because we feel that it is in the best interests of the Manitoba people to ensure that long-standing problems of disparity continue to be fought, and at accelerated pace, even while we are resolving immediate cost and price problems. Controls alone will not work and they are even irrelevant and may only serve to exacerbate difficult situations which exist in other aspects of the economy unless we complement actions for immediate control of the economy with actions to remove the aggravating problems created by continuing social and economic imbalance.

We don't mean by this statement that immediate problems should not be overcome until problems we have had with us for a long time are resolved. Certainly we must control excessive or unfair expansion in costs and prices which make more acute our economic difficulties. However, we must not let these immediate concerns divert our energies from the correction of long-standing social and economic conditions which have given rise to much of the real difficulties facing our people. The Manitoba Government will not find it acceptable to penalize those on already low incomes, many at only minimum wages, by ill-advised attempts to cut back essential services and other programs for redressing the non-productive conditions which are the very causes of that gap between productivity and incomes, the federal spokesman emphasizes.

I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that people earning only a minimum hourly wage will not be victimized by the Manitoba Government in any attempt at arbitrary wage controls, nor will we accept the proposition that workers with contractual wage arrangements should be singled out for restriction while the incomes and profits of others in the economy are left open.

On the subject of the announcement by the Minister of Finance for Canada that the Federal Government is to make available to the provinces in this fiscal year and the following year substantial new money, it is essential that we understand exactly what is involved here. I only gave a cursory review to newspaper reports on this aspect of the meeting and I must say that the impression one would receive is that provinces have now received a great bonanza from the Federal Government; I owe it to members of this House to make clear just what my understanding of this announcement is.

But first, Mr. Speaker, let me say that we do welcome any effective recognition of need of the provincial governments for additional support to ease the increasing economic strains, conceded even by the Federal Government to be manifest in the country. Therefore, the federal proposals have merit and are acceptable to the extent to which they go, but, Mr. Speaker, the advantage has to be carefully evaluated. For example, the Federal Government has simply presented a scheduled re-estimate for adjustment in equalization. There is no new benefit involved here at all. The complex formula involved requires working through, and many factors operating elsewhere will affect the ultimate impact for Manitoba. For example, if Manitoba's economy and tax resource is at the national average, or better than the national average, then we would not be entitled to equalization. This could be an indication that we are doing much better in Manitoba than we were before in comparison with the national average. On the other hand, this may not show tremendous progress in Manitoba's economy if, let us say, Ontario's economy has suffered and declined, thus lowering the national average to closer to our productivity in the fiscal line. And we know from as far as we can see, and I'm not prepared to make a final report on this, that Manitoba will not receive any more money now on the basis of this adjustment that was announced, which I believe that the Finance Minister of Canada said was some \$60 million. As far as we can see, we will not benefit and there is even a possibility that there might be slightly less from the equalization factor that we have estimated on the basis of earlier federal data, so that's one of the three pronged statements made by the Minister of Finance, Mr. Benson.

On the matter of tax payment acceleration under the collection arrangements with Ottawa I can be very specific. Manitoba had asked that the new revenues effected by tax changes in this province be made available as soon as the money was collected by Canada this year, and

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) when we posed the problem other provinces then shared in our concern that the actual receipts by Canada from the shared taxes in their provinces, and in all provinces, be more promptly passed on in the shares payable to the provincial governments. We found that there is now approximately a three-month lag between collection and remission to us. Ottawa has proposed to accelerate the transfers to provincial governments of the provincial governments' share of taxes collected by one month. We argued for at least a two month speed-up.

Furthermore, the Federal Government does not propose to make the change effective until next January, and what is happening here is that the additional money the federal Minister of Finance is proposing to pass on to us is money already paid in by our taxpayers. It's not new money and it is our money, and it is certainly not a federal grant of any kind. In fact, the long delay in putting the tax revenue in our hands - and I'm speaking of our tax revenue - putting it into our hands simply means that we pay the interest on our own money, our own taxpayers' payments, while we wait for this remission, and obviously, this is not really additional federal support at all. However, we are glad to see the principle recognized in that the Federal Government has conceded the fact that provinces ought to receive their shares of joint tax collections sooner, and that will of course give us additional or sooner availability of the monies payable to us by our own taxpayers.

On the third proposal by the Federal Government to give added cash support to the provinces, that dealing with vocational capital for school building, again it has to be carefully evaluated before we can say precisely what advantage might lie here. The approximate amount involved is \$12 million in federal capital support for vocational school construction, and the proposal is that Manitoba can have this money earlier and this may well be helpful, but we will have gained little real advantage if, when we put our own provincial share in and the schools are built, the Federal Government fails to expand its other training and social and support efforts which very materially affect the vocational school programs.

For example, if the Federal Government continues to restrict the adult training programs, which operate through provincial vocational schools, then the capital assistance has obvious limitations. Indeed, the people involved will not be helped and the Provincial Government, and municipal governments as well, will have the added cost burden of facilities that are not being effectively utilized. And then there are other programs of federal-provincial shared responsibility which bear on our training and educational effort. In the DREE undertakings, as in the FRED and related community upgrading programs, unless people are assisted by support and training allowances, unless the affected communities are given support to house and transport and maintain the people involved, unless the economic base and opportunities are also expanded, then the vocational building program cannot be made truly effective. Our Minister of Youth and Education will be meeting with other educational ministers in the next few days, I believe, and he will certainly be looking closely into this federal move and I expect he will have more to say to us in due course.

However, Mr. Speaker, we do sincerely welcome the positive - if limited - acknowledgment by the Federal Government of Manitoba's prime argument. The need now is for positive program support and costs support for essential programs to help people and regions improve their conditions, their capacities and their opportunities. Only in this way can we really beat the penalty of inflation or the more substantial root problems in the lives of so many of our people.

Finally, just a brief comment on the Benson White Paper, which I must indicate was not discussed to any length at all during the meeting. A few provinces presented further papers on the White Paper, as did Manitoba, but since they were so voluminous and so late in arriving, they were not really discussed and they will be discussed yet with the Federal Government; but with the documents that I propose to table, I will also be tabling the specific tax reform proposals that Manitoba has now offered as alternative methods of giving more effective equity and productive balance in a revised taxation structure for Canada. These specific suggestions by the Manitoba Government are for consideration by the governments involved, and they follow directly from my policy statement of April 28th last, given to this House on Tax reform. In no way do they block further discussion or alternative ideas from this Chamber, or from any committee consideration, or the people of Manitoba.

May I indicate that as soon as they are available the papers then will be tabled and will be distributed to members, which will include the following: The news release of the Prices and Incomes Commission of June 5, 1970; the press statement which I issued on Federal

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Proposals for Wage and Salary Guidelines; the understanding among the Ministers of Finance and Provincial Treasurers on Costs of Health Insurance and Higher Education, which was prepared at the conclusion of the hearings; a statement made by me on Cost Control of Joint Programs; the specific reply which the Manitoba Government gave to Federal Proposals for Joint Program Cost Limitation; and the, what I referred to last, a statement and specific propositions in respect of the tax reform paper - that is, Manitoba's reaction thereto. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all thank the Minister of Finance for his report on the Meeting of Finance Ministers held over the weekend in Winnipeg. May I say at the outset, the first thing that surprised me was that the Minister of Finance appeared to indicate that he was prepared to table copies of the federal statements and the summary of the Province of Manitoba statements. I would think, Mr. Speaker, right off the bat, that if there was a full statement that might be able to be offered, it would be the statement of the one of the Province of Manitoba, that we might have the full statement rather than a summary of statements concerning the conference.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if . . . permit me just to interrupt for a moment to explain that what I said I would be filing that was prepared by the Federal Government - I didn't quite put it that way. It's the news release which was issued by the Prices and Incomes Commission - and that's by the Prices and Incomes, it is a news release that's available but we're making it available - the understanding made among all of the Ministers of Finance that was agreed to, but we have no authority to file the Federal Government's own position papers.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I must have misunderstood what my honourable friend said in the opening page of his statement, not at the tail end, when he was talking about what he would table, where the note that I made was that copies of the federal statement would be laid on the table of the House and summaries of the provincial statements, but it'll come out in Hansard in due course and if I've made an error in sorting it out, then I've made an error in understanding my honourable friend.

I note that he has indicated that the Province of Manitoba has encouraged some **further** consideration on behalf of DREE and housing and the urban interests, educational training in the Province of Manitoba, and as long as my honourable friend isn't indicating that this is new from the Province of Manitoba's standpoint, where we've been attempting to encourage things of this nature over quite a number of years. I think probably before the government that I led, probably before my predecessor, and maybe even before that, Manitoba has been encouraging things of this nature.

I don't intend to go into any detailed discussion because it was a fairly lengthy statement and I may have had more misunderstandings than the one that I appear to have had in the opening page of the statement, but I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we would hope that if there is a difference in the re-estimate for the adjustment of equalization, that we would have a further statement from the Minister at the time we're having a discussion in the Committee of Ways and Means when we're actually discussing the revenues of the province for the current year and where we can have that easy discussion that may be necessary to arrive at a conclusion between the Minister of Finance and ourselves on this side, and I'll be quite happy to carry on the discussion at that stage of the game rather than at the present time.

I note that he indicates a tax payment acceleration of the two months delay rather than the three, and I'm very happy to see this because I think it is a more reasonable period of time. If the administrative efficiencies are what they should be at the federal level, there isn't a reason in the world why they shouldn't be able to live within this kind of an arrangement without penalty to them, and certainly it improves the cash flow position of the Province of Manitoba. It's a kind of a one shot deal once you get the circle going, and I would only ask the Minister of Finance if he and the Minister of Youth and Education would give some consideration of improving the cash flow that exists for school divisions in the Province of Manitoba, because if you recognize the grants that go by the other way, and some of the reasons that they've been this way for quite a long period of time is because of the restricted cash flow position of the province. Now as we see the cash flow position of the province improved, I would ask the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Youth and Education to see if there isn't some means that they can create an improvement as a result of their better financial cash flow position, to improve the cash flow position of the school boards and the grants and so on, so that the

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) interest rates that are being paid to ordinary financial institutions throughout the province by the school divisions can be reduced to a minimum through this period of time.

In terms of the lump sum payment, I interpret it to be of what is left in the Manitoba position and other provincial positions for technical-vocational education. I recognize only too well, I recognize only too well that the total capital expenditure in the technical and vocational field is only a small part of the expenditure in terms of technical-vocational education, and that on-going programs of a very current nature must be included within the estimates of either the province and the Government of Canada, or the province alone if the Government of Canada fails to participate, and that certainly this has been one of the concerns of the various departments of the government of Manitoba over quite a number of years - I might say, Mr. Speaker, almost as long as I have been in the Legislature altogether.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words and with the one suggestion that I would ask the Ministers to look after, I close by thanking the Minister of Finance for his statement, and we'll look forward to a further opportunity of discussing, possibly in a little more detail, the real sum and substance of whether there is an improvement of the Manitoba position or whether there in fact isn't. I appreciate the fact that the Minister may not be able to tell us today.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I too join with the Leader of the Official Opposition in thanking the Minister for his statement. It was brief but it gave us the gist of what took place on the weekend.

I was interested in a statement when I read in the paper where the Manitoba Minister of Finance suggested that there could be nothing meaningful in wage restraints if restraints were not either voluntarily or coercively placed upon the profits and professional fees and interest payments, dividends, and rents, items of that nature, and I think that most people would be inclined to agree with the Minister's thought in that regard. I've noticed that he wasn't able to tell us of any responses received from the other provincial Finance Ministers or from the Federal Government when he made the suggestion. I think it's a very interesting one and one that should be pursued. We hardly think it's fair to ask only the wage earner to bear the brunt of the fight against inflation, although I notice in the description given by Mr. Young of the Prices and Incomes Commission, that it would not apply to the low wage earners under \$2.00 an hour or under \$350.00 a month; that they would not be expected to hold their bargaining position to a six percent on an annual scale. So I wonder if the Minister has any indication of the federal stand on his suggestion about being more inclusive in the battle against inflation rather than just the suggestion that wages be held to a six percent line.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I respond, Mr. Speaker, just briefly to the questions asked? I don't want to make a speech; I just wanted to answer the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe there were questions asked.

MR. CHERNIACK: I sort of took it that under Orders of the Day they were asking me questions.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, so far as I was concerned, I was responding to a statement and I would have reserved any questions until a proper opportunity. Now, I can't speak for other members of the House.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a question. Has the Federal Government had any response to my honourable friend's suggestions?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, without breaking confidence of what was said, the understanding appeared to be in these closed sessions that one can quote oneself extensively, but not others. So may I say that through much of the meeting I felt rather lonely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question, I suppose, to the First Minister, but in respect to the allocation of federal funds to designated areas within the province, does the province itself advise where this money should be spent, or how . . . ? That's the federal funds for designated areas within the province.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is referring to DREE federal grants in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion - or is he referring to additional funds coming out of the Consolidated Revenue of the Federal Government without any particular designation to them?

MR. BEARD: Well, right now I was interested in the designated area program.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the payment of federal moneys under the Designated Area Program, or DREE program, is made only after the entering into of a contract or agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments, and the agreement specifies quite closely, and in considerable detail, what the moneys shall be spent for, the kind of programs that shall be paid for with these federal moneys. I hope that that answers my honourable friend's question.

MR. BEARD: One subsequent question then. Does the province suggest the program and then the federal authority authorize it or turn it down? Or how does it . . . ?

MR. SCHREYER: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. The province in the initial instance makes a proposal to the Federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion and the proposal is -- the requirement is that the proposal be made in considerable detail, that it be carefully planned out. The federal authorities then analyze the proposals closely and suggest certain changes, insist on other changes and the like, and after several weeks, if not months of negotiation, an agreement is arrived at and an actual project program is agreed upon and moneys are advanced.

MR. BEARD: . . . this year then there'd be approximately \$6 million left, is it, in this year's program?

MR. SCHREYER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

MR. BEARD: Is there approximately what? \$6 million left in this year's allocation? I understood there was \$12 million allocated to the Designated program this year.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there were various figures put forward as being the estimates of the amount of money that would be available from the Federal Government with respect to special area programs, but we have never been able to get a definite indication yet as to exactly how much money was available for use in Manitoba on special area programs from the Federal Government. I can tell my honourable friend that in the case of the special area program that was agreed on -- that is, The Pas special area -- that the agreement calls for federal moneys to the extent of \$4 million in the total life of the agreement, which could be over four or five years, and an amount of approximately 1-1/2 to \$2 million in the next twelve months. I believe that those figures are approximately correct. But the figure of \$12 million that my honourable friend refers to, I take it that would be an estimate of the amount available in total for all of Manitoba for special area programs. We have never been given a definitive figure from the Federal Government in that respect.

MR. BEARD: May I ask one other question then, Mr. Speaker? In respect to the development in the Selkirk area, would this come under moneys that were allocated last year to Greater Winnipeg in a program such as the fishery program. Could this come under the money that was allocated to Winnipeg last year?

MR. SCHREYER: Well it's necessary, Mr. Speaker, to explain one point in particular, and that is that the grants that were offered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation if they built their plant in Selkirk, were industrial incentive grants and were not the same kind of grants as are offered for community services development in the special areas such as might be selected -- The Pas, Churchill, Brandon or some such areas. Those are grants for municipal services development. What was offered by the federal department in the case of the Freshwater Fish location question were industrial incentive grants. That's the second half of this total program. The federal department offers grants for municipal services development and also for industrial incentives. It's the latter that were involved in the fish plant question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour based on a problem that was drawn to my attention over the weekend by one of my constituents. I would like to know whether employers are prohibited by legislation to prevent them from discriminating against people on the basis of age? For example, a man, some 55 years old, drew this to my attention. I'd like to know whether there's legislation which prohibits this in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in reply I would say that there is no precise legislation that prohibits an employer from employing whoever he may desire to employ. We attempt in the Department of Labour, and of course this is a policy of government that there should be no discrimination against anyone being able to be employed, by virtue of age, ethnic, race or religious inclinations, but there is nothing in legislation that makes it an obligation on an

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) employer to employ anyone providing it is not that the person is debarred as the result of discrimination.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister of Labour a question? Would the Minister of Labour be prepared to answer questions from any member of this House that are asking whether or not legislation exists in any particular field, things that are supposedly a matter of public knowledge, which have been turned down, Mr. Speaker, I may say, to many members on this side of the House but when there's a member of the other side of the House we get the answer?

MR. PAULLEY: May I reply to my honourable friend this way, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I'm concerned as a Minister of the Crown, I'm prepared to answer questions from any side of the House pertaining to the Department of Labour or Government Services, and if my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition is not knowledgeable, read Hansard . . .

MR. WEIR: . . . you'll find out that's not true.

MR. PAULLEY: I was asked a question. I wonder if my honourable friend would at least give me the courtesy of being able to reply to him, or at least of replying to my honourable friend. If my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, or anyone in this House, is not conversant with or knowledgeable of any legislation that I may be conversant with, I'd be pleased to answer any questions that he may have in respect of legislation under the aegis of my departments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Labour about 10 days ago regarding the employment situation for steamfitters, whether he could confirm whether it was true that 300 out of the 800 registered in the union were unemployed; and furthermore, would he provide information on the other construction trades, which he said he would undertake to get the information on and which we have not received yet. Could he provide it yet?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I want to apologize to my honourable friend. It's on my desk. If he will accept what I now say as sort of an interim reply - I have made inquiries insofar as employment of steamfitters, that there were about 150 or so unemployed at the time my honourable friend asked the question. According to the union representative, it was anticipated that they would be all back at work within two weeks and I believe that two weeks is just about up now. As far as the construction industry itself is concerned, there has been a rather severe curtailment in the construction industry this year by comparison with last year, so I do say to my honourable friend, I have the information for him on my desk; I regret that I haven't it with me at the present time. I ask my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, if he would accept this as rather an interim report and I will endeavour to have the precise figure that I have and reply in more detail to my honourable friend tomorrow.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a further question, to the Minister of Youth and Education. He indicated last week that he might have the information regarding the collective agreement negotiation status for today.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I do indeed have this information, as of June 4th. The number of boards, division boards and also district boards where there are no divisions, which are in process of arbitration or where arbitration has been applied for - 20. The number of boards or districts, or divisions or districts where conciliation is in process or has been applied for - 10. The number settled through arbitration - 22. The number settled through conciliation - 9. And the number not settled through direct negotiation or other means are 8. That's the information I have as of June 4th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BURTNIAK: Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to bring to the attention of the members of the House the rather major sport event that took place here in the City of Winnipeg during the weekend. I'm of course referring to the Davis Cup Championships that were held at the Winnipeg Canoe Club on the weekend. The Canadian players were competing against the Caribbean, and I might say that the Canadian team won, made a clean sweep; they won three straight matches. They will now meet New Zealand here in Winnipeg in approximately a week's time. This is one of the major sport attractions that were held here because of our Centennial, and I might say that this is the first time in the history of the Province of Manitoba that the Davis Cup Championships have ever been held here in this

(MR. BURTNIAC cont'd.) province. I also understand that the response has really been wonderful. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I speak on behalf of all the members of the Assembly in offering the Canadian team congratulations for the win over the Caribbean team and we certainly want to wish them every success in future games.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading, the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

CONCURRENCE

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would you go through the concurrences of resolutions on Page 4?

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Resolution No. 78, the amendment of the Honourable Member for Brandon West. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Minister of Finance was speaking on it.

MR. PAULLEY: No, the Honourable Member for Brandon West has the adjournment.

MR. GREEN: My recollection is the Honourable Minister of Finance had concluded his remarks in 15 seconds, something to that effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPIVAK: No.

MR. PAULLEY: Not on this one?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make. No, I did not speak on this resolution; I want to assure the Minister of Finance I did not. I would like to spend a few moments on the resolution because this will be probably the only appropriate time and probably the only time that I'll be able to, for the remaining portion left for the session, to refer back to something that should be discussed when we deal with the question of nationalization of resource development through the device of a Crown corporation.

Mr. Speaker we have an example before us that we were unable to discuss during the estimates of Mines and Natural Resources because the Minister was unable to present his estimates and there was not an appropriate time for discussion, and this has to do with the problems of the Fish Marketing Board, which is a Crown corporation set up between the Federal and Provincial Governments. We've had a year's experience in watching and observing the manner in which the Crown corporation, the Fish Marketing Board, has operated, and I think there are certain conclusions that we can draw as a result of examining their experience which would indicate the kinds of danger that can exist, or does exist, with Crown corporations that become involved in resource development that are not answerable to the Legislature and are not answerable to the people of this province. We accept that they are answerable to a Cabinet and that a Cabinet is responsible to the Legislature, so in that way the people of the province really know what is happening; but if we examine the Fish Marketing Board, Mr. Speaker, and examine the events that have occurred in the last little while, not only with the issue of the location of the Fish Processing Plant in Selkirk but generally with the whole problem of the fish industry, we can say this: that in this House no one has any familiarity with what has happened in the last period of time, that the questions that have been asked by members on this side have remained unanswered, and the argument that is brought forward is that it's a federal Crown corporation set up with provincial enabling legislation, with a provincial director who is in fact appointed by the Cabinet, and yet in spite of this there is no way in which we are in a position to deal with that Crown corporation, to be able to have the representatives in front of us so that we are in a position to ask pertinent questions, to be able to understand whether in fact, whether in fact . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of order. The motion of regret refers to corporations set up by the Provincial Government under the proposed Bill 17, which would be a corporation that was set up with provincial jurisdiction. My honourable friend is now referring to a corporation which is set up by virtue of jurisdiction, which I believe was arranged between the provinces and the Federal Government who are responsible for fisheries, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that this issue is irrelevant to the issue that my honourable friend is referring to, because the issue which he is discussing - that is, the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) answerability of that corporation to the Legislature - is surely one which would be answerable to the Federal Legislature at Ottawa, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, none of the corporations which the motion refers to would be answerable to the Federal Legislature at Ottawa, the Federal Parliament, but would be answerable to this Legislature, and I would therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that discussing a Crown corporation which is not answerable to this House is irrelevant in a discussion of whether Crown corporations should be set up which are answerable to this House.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. First, there's no reference in this resolution to Bill 17. There's an assumption on the part of the Minister that this refers to Bill 17 and we're going to have an opportunity to discuss Bill 17. Secondly, there is no suggestion in this resolution that a Crown corporation jointly sponsored with the Federal Government cannot be set up, so therefore it's pertinent to discuss the possible alternatives. Thirdly, if we want to be frank, Mr. Speaker, the manner in which the resolutions have been presented so far with respect to concurrence have allowed a freedom of expression on a variety of items referring particularly to the department involved as an opportunity for an expression of opinion either because the debate had occurred and was a matter of restating a position, or, in the case of Mines and Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker, simply because there was not a debate in the estimates.

I think it's very relevant, Mr. Speaker, on this point of order though, that the experience of the Fish Marketing Board, and I acknowledged in my opening remarks that it was a federal Crown corporation, are relevant to the issue of control of a Crown corporation, it's answerability to a Legislature or to a House of Commons or to a Parliament, and the problem generally of the ability of the Legislatures to be in a position to deal with issues that affect their constituents - that is the constituents within the province - and at the same time in which the Legislature has been involved in some creation of a body working in the economic activity of one particular segment of our society. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it's perfectly in order and I'd like a ruling on this so I could be in a position to continue.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, yes, I agree that there should be a ruling and it comes as a surprise to me to hear my honourable friend say that this non-concurrence motion doesn't deal with Bill 17 because the member of the Conservative caucus who introduced it indicated that he was referring - and I suppose he knew what he was doing when he made the motion - that he indicated that he was referring to what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was doing with regard to Bill 17, and if one looks at the motion, "this House regrets that the government is attempting to introduce a program of nationalization of resource development in Manitoba through the device of a Crown-sponsored joint stock company," well, Mr. Speaker, it's a well-known principle of law that when one is referring to something that a provincial Legislature is doing, one assumes and implies that they are doing something which is within their jurisdiction, and the Member for Brandon clearly indicated, if it needs any further indication (and I don't think it does) that he was referring to the bill that I am trying to bring to this House for the purpose of destroying free enterprise, I think, that this is the intended motivation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is using this as a vehicle to demonstrate legislative impotence with regard to a federal Crown corporation, and I suggest to you that it's irrelevant to the subject matter and should be ruled out on the basis of irrelevance. I suggest that we have not permitted a broad debate on this motion; that when the Member for Brandon West attempted to go beyond what his motion said, the Speaker ruled it out of order, and I said yes that it makes not quite as much sense, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the Canada Development Corporation or the CNR is something which is beyond the jurisdiction of the provincial Legislature, and therefore the provincial Legislature should not set up Crown corporations, and I submit that we have to stay within the rules of relevance.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, again on the point of order, may I just read the resolution again for the record: "that while concurring in Resolution No. 78, this House regrets that the government is attempting to introduce a program of nationalization of resource development in Manitoba through the device of a Crown-sponsored joint stock company." Mr. Speaker, we haven't reached the point yet where arguments to be made in front of you are arguments to be made before a Court of Appeal or before the Court of Queen's Bench; we are not here confined to a legalistic position that many lawyers as adversaries are bound to take in trying to argue jurisdiction before a court. We are dealing with a very broad resolution which I think enables me and gives me the opportunity to talk generally on the problems of a Crown-Sponsored joint

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) stock company, and I want to make particular reference, and I will only deal with it briefly, to the Crown corporation set up by this Legislature, by this Legislature through its enabling legislation with the Federal Government. Having said that, I am then going to try and deal, if I may, with the specifics of the resolution, but it has great pertinence, or the history and experience of the fish-marketing Crown corporation is very pertinent to understanding this resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, I might as well say, as well, that if I want to become more specific and deal with Bill 56 and the Crown corporation that's proposed there, which is provincial jurisdiction whose powers are -- where in fact the government essentially has given its powers to the Crown corporation, with no reference really . . . to this Legislature, except through the Cabinet, then I think I can as well bring that in and that's my intention, but I do not feel that I should be prevented at this point, I do not feel that I should be prevented at this point because of the legalistic position that the Honourable House Leader has taken.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to say a few words on that same point of order. I think we're discussing the matter of nationalization here, and certainly, if you bring in other matters in connection with nationalization, that this should be quite in order. If you can't draw examples or comparisons, what's the use?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that the honourable member who moved the concurrence motion indicated quite clearly the intent and the purpose of his motion in the motion itself and in the debate which followed on the motion, and I would urge honourable members to contain their remarks within that framework as indicated by the motion and as indicated by the mover as to what the intent of the motion is, and I would so ask the Honourable Member for River Heights to do. I do not believe that this motion opens up the subject for debate in its broadest sense but within certain limits, and the limits are as set out in the motion and as set out in the comments of the Honourable Member for Brandon West who moved it, and I would so ask the Honourable Member for River Heights to contain his remarks within those limits.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that this House has not had the opportunity and will not have the opportunity, and there's no way in which it can have the opportunity of being able to deal -- Unless the officials of the Fish Marketing Board allow themselves and permit us the opportunity to discuss the matters with them, there's no way in which we can determine or find out or examine or really understand what is happening with that Crown corporation which affects a significantly number of people in our province, and which affects a significant industry in our province. We know that -- (Interjection) -- it's not true. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has been asked a number of questions in connection with it. He does not know the answers and he has taken the position that "I can't get that information; I'm not obligated to get that information;" and so therefore, Mr. Speaker, that information has not been given.

Now, we did not have the opportunity of dealing with the estimates of Mines and Natural Resources and it's possible that the Minister may have something to say when I'm concluded on this, and, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that he would have something to say, but the truth of the matter is this. The Fish Marketing Board has operated for one solid year and in the course of it there have been complaints raised by the fishermen; there have been complaints raised by the fish processors who buy their products from them; there have been suggestions that there was a great deal of fish that was in fact stored and unsold; there have been suggestions that the market price was set up so that ultimately the consumers were paying for fish a much higher price than they would have under normal circumstances; there have been suggestions that the fishermen in Manitoba have been subsidizing the fishermen in Saskatchewan and Alberta because of the manner in which payments have been made. There have been suggestions as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Fish Marketing Board have in fact made advances . . .

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): On a point of order. I think that, Mr. Speaker, you've ruled this discussion out of order, and I wonder how long the Member from River Heights is going to be allowed to be speaking out of order on this matter.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm in order. There have been suggestions, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) --

MR. GREEN: I really believe that the member is merely trying to get on the record what the Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do not believe that there is a point of order on the Speaker's ruling. I was checking the estimates during the last couple of minutes to get a

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) better idea of the subject matter under discussion and I would again ask the Honourable Member for River Heights to limit his comments to the motion before the House, and I do not believe that the topic that he has ventured on now does fall within those limits.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have suggested, all the questions that I've posed or suggestions that have been made have been raised outside this House, they remain unsatisfied; and I suggest as well, one of the difficulties of a Crown-sponsored joint stock company, whether it be a company operated by the Provincial Government or of the Federal Government, is that there is in fact an inability for the people of the area and the people of the province, whether it be all of Canada or Manitoba, to get satisfactory answers. Now I have no intention of going through the Air Canada overhaul base issue again, but all the members in every party, all those who represented the parties, know that in the attempt to try and get information from a Crown corporation, the manner in which it was organized and set up, it was just impossible. And the information that was given to us at various times was quite unsatisfactory, and there is no doubt that in the rebuttals that occurred in the presentations that were made, there is some question of the accuracy and, to a large extent, even of the honesty of the statements that were made by some of the officials representing the Crown agency at that time.

Now, Mr. Speaker -- Mr. Speaker, is someone doubting my statement about the question of honesty? Is someone doubting . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . charge of dishonesty against the . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I'm saying that there was a question of honesty on the part of the officials who made the presentations on behalf of the Crown corporation, and, Mr. Chairman, I may say that I'm not the only one. I think that many members of the present government on the front bench made those statements, as well as others, at the very time the hearings took place and the various representations that were made, so there is nothing new in this and I don't think that this should have been so startling to the members on the opposite side. What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that a Crown corporation may very well be set up to accomplish a certain objective, and I'm not at this point quarrelling with that right, the right of government to set up a Crown corporation, to set up objectives, but if we're going to have a Crown corporation set up that is going to involve the nationalization of resource development or whether we're going to have it set up to operate an auto insurance plan, then I must say, Mr. Speaker, we must have the opportunity in this Legislature for full discussion, for full debate, and the opportunity to know all the facts. And all one has to do is examine what has taken place in the fish-marketing Crown corporation, federal corporation that it is, to know that neither the members of the House of Commons nor the Members of this Legislature have the facts, nor is there any way in which we are competent to deal with, not just the issue of the processing plant and whether it should be located in Selkirk or in Winnipeg, but of all the other issues that involve that particular industry. We do not know the facts and I don't think there is anyone who is going to suggest that we do know the facts. We do not know, and I'm not even sure whether there's any communication and I don't know whether there's a legal obligation to give information - there may be a legal obligation not to give information - but I don't even know whether the Director for Manitoba on this one Crown corporation has in fact transmitted that information to the government. I know that the original director appointed was fired and was replaced. Now having said this, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question? In his expostulation of the functions of a Crown corporation related to disclosure, would he care to comment as to whether or not the government, of which he was a part, was correct in their attitude regarding the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I anticipated the Minister of Finance's comments . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Just your straight man, Sid.

MR. SPIVAK: I beg your pardon?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm your straight man.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'm not Mr. Benson so I . . . Let me say this to the Minister of Finance. I think there's a great distinction between a corporation who in fact are in the business of loaning money and where confidentiality becomes an issue, I think that procedure is correct for the Manitoba Development Fund as it was correct for the Industrial Development Bank of Canada. I think there is a great distinction when the government gets involved in business - operating business; and I think that there is the great distinction. I think the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) distinction is very simple. When we get involved in the operation of a business, when we get involved in the nationalization of an industry, when we get involved in resource development, where you're marshalling capital, where in effect you are operating for profit - because that's what you are doing; you are operating for profit - then at that point I think there is a great distinction and I think that that warrants a full opportunity for a full disclosure, and I think . . .

MR. GONICK: Would the honourable member answer a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes.

MR. GONICK: When the San Antonio Mines decided to close down in Bissett, was there a public hearing to discuss the justification for that? And if the member would like to comment on other cases, can he advise us of one case, one single case where a private company decided to close down or lay off workers, where this became a subject of review through the general public?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not see the relevance of that question. The government in a sense -- no, the government was not in the business of operating the mines at that time and the government was not in the position of being the person or the organization that was funding it, and when the government becomes involved in the actual operation, when the government becomes involved in the operation of a mine, then they have a responsibility to the people of Manitoba to be able to tell them the facts, and that responsibility, that responsibility, Mr. Speaker, isn't discharged by telling the Cabinet, because the Cabinet will answer the questions like they answer the questions to us in the general way during the session - which is essentially not to give us any answer. Oh yes, it is true and, you know, you're kidding yourself if you are suggesting that in the course of our examination of the facts and information that you really give us all the answers that we ask for. That isn't true; and it's a game that we play, and everyone knows that game and this is part of our system and I'm suggesting that it's a game that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources . . .

MR. GREEN: No it's not.

MR. SPIVAK: It's as much a game, just as his answer right now is part of the game, so there's just no point kidding ourselves. What is important, Mr. Speaker, is that if we're going to enter into this area where we're going to have government involvement, in resource development where we're going to have government involvement in private corporations or in public corporations, whether it be in resource development manufacturing, that there has to be a mechanism in which there is an opportunity for full discussion and full disclosure.

MR. GREEN: That's right.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'm sure -- the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says it's right, but let him tell me why Bill 17 and Bill 56 do not provide it, because they do not. Neither one of them provide it. What they do provide is the opportunity for information to be given by tabling a report in the Legislature and for a report to be given to the Cabinet, and that information isn't sufficient, Mr. Speaker, because again, we have the Fish Marketing example and it's a terrific example. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa didn't know what was happening in the Fish Marketing Board, and that we know, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows that as well. He didn't know what was happening in his own Crown corporation, and if it hadn't been for the private representations made to another Minister from this province, to be able to get him to move, to try and find out what's happening, then they started to determine that maybe the Fish Marketing Board wasn't operating in a proper way.

And so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is extremely important and is one which must be considered in a different perspective in view of the announced policies of the government to enter into Crown corporations for resource development and in other areas, and so therefore it would appear to me that if we are going to have it, having examined and looked at the experience of the Fish Marketing Board, we cannot have that same mistake duplicated in our provincial area.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think that our party should express their stand on this particular resolution because it may be misinterpreted if one of the three of us did not speak. At first glance the resolution seems to be reasonable, but when one looks at what is going on in Manitoba in the lack of development in certain areas, there's no other alternative

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) except for some degree of government intervention in certain areas of the province. We have waited 100 years now, officially as a province, and the wait would go on indefinitely. It would go on until someone in another country or another area decided to come there and invest some money, to take his chances, and I don't think that some of these people should have to wait that long if there is another tool or another instrument can be used to help out certain of our people.

I notice in the Northern Task Force recommendations that have been fondly quoted by some members, there's about four of them, or perhaps five, that some of the recommendations could be answered through — and I presume the members of the Conservative Party are worried about Bill 17 because they came out very strongly against all forms of the bill; they do not see anything good at all and they see all the possible bad things that are there. We see some rather strong powers given to Ministers in Bill 17 but the principle we are somewhat in agreement of. But we do think, though, that there should be some amendments there that will cut down on some of the powers of the Ministers and also some of the amendments should spell out how and when a Minister may or can act when he goes to exert some of the authority that has been given to him. So, when my friend the Member for River Heights said a few minutes ago that there is a danger in a Crown-sponsored joint stock company, that their sole purpose is there for profit — and he used the word "profit" two or three times — I disagree with him. I hope that some of the companies

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I did not say there was anything wrong with a Crown corporation whose object was profit. I simply said that that was one of the objects and that's fine, but at least we should have some examination. There's a distinction between that and a Crown corporation that's a lending institution

MR. G. JOHNSTON : Well I apologize if I used the word out of context but I got, as one of the reasons, that because it was profit the government really shouldn't be in it. But also there's the matter of jobs, and if some of the people in these isolated, remote communities can be put to work through a blend of their own capital and their own initiative and some government help, well then, I think it should be done. I don't see that this bill, or Bill 17 which I keep thinking that the resolution alludes to, I don't think that Bill 17 is half as bad as giving 95 percent of the operating capital to a private company like CFL, where we have no control whatsoever and we have to sit by like peasants and wait to see what's going to be the outcome. At least over this there's a control. If members of the government overstep their responsibilities, or they abuse their responsibilities, well in two or three or four years they will have to make their excuses and take their chances with the people.

So I'd say that, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I will not be supporting Resolution 78.

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

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In going over the motion and in stating that this House regrets that the government is attempting to introduce a program of nationalization of resource development in Manitoba through the device of a Crown-sponsored joint stock company, it really leaves it wide open, because in my experience I have found that resource is actually something that is usually referred to, by politicians particularly, as almost anything, and if it's there it's a good resource, and if it isn't then I guess it becomes what? — pollution or something like that. But I think the time has come now that we've got to change in some respects, and I think that we've got to change our thinking in respect to economy and also to re-assess the position of government and business, and while others have gone on to refer to Bill 17 and others, I think that I look at it, and as I look at government today, probably it is through the eyes of being just about as much a northern Socialist, I guess, as our farm people can be called agricultural Socialists, so I'd say that I think there is a position which government can take in the development of resource area, or resource development as this refers to, and I think that if we stick to the resource, then I won't have to say to government, "For goodness' sake, don't take another Bill 56 and put it into Northern Manitoba anyway. We wouldn't want to end up with that." But I think that there are many other areas in which they can enter into this.

So I have my doubts in respect to this resolution, because nationalization — what does it mean today? It means that government has to get involved a little more, and we can stand here and argue as to what is actually a government service and what is not a government service, and I think that probably we are coming very much closer to it when we talk about government services rather than resources. I will only say that my disappointment at this

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) time is the fact that we are taking so much time as members of this Assembly, and certainly it appears that the government and the government caucus is taking up so much time in trying to make a government service out of the car insurance industry, when in my mind this is certainly private industry and should fall within that area in which it was first developed.

I think that government industry and the development of a northern tourist trade, for instance, is something in which government has to be involved and in which government has to invest a great deal of money, and whether government today can continue to accept the fact that they must wait for their funds to come back through an indirect system or through a direct system, is what we have got to debate, because if they wait for the indirect system then it means that they have to rely on the figures of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation in saying that so many more people visited here and they spent so much more money so we have money in capital funds to look after development of this type of a trade. If this is so, then he is going to continually have trouble in getting Cabinet to accept his request for the money that is needed to develop a northern water system. And I think the northern waterway system is one of the more enchanting things that we have in the North to offer the people, not only the people of Manitoba but of course to encourage that lucrative tourist dollar from all over Canada. So I say that here is a place where government should be into the provincializing of waterway systems and the money that is needed to develop a resource, such as tourism camps, etc. I think there is a place where the local native people can be very much involved in this. If this is the case, then, Mr. Speaker it's not only transferring funds, or could be assessed as transferring funds from social development to industrial development and there isn't much more than a half a step difference between those two because your industrial development of your province and your social development of the province must go hand in hand, and if it does then I think that government are in the position where they must help both. You can't help one without the other. That has been proven in many of the areas in the North already, that industrial development has not filtered down through into the social development of the local areas; and if this is the case then government must go out and will be chased out, actually, into these smaller locations to look after the problems such as starting wilderness camps, such as starting wilderness tours in which we're spending millions of dollars in your urbanized areas trying to reclaim the wilderness area and which you have already got it established in Northern Manitoba. All you've got to do is find a plan and introduce it into the North, and of course it requires funds. Those funds are best coming from the government because if they come from industry and the private sector, in far too many cases you find that the social people are not being involved, in other words the Indians themselves are not being involved in that program to the extent where they can really see the difference between working, trapping or fishing and operating a lucrative tourist business which certainly our Minister of Tourism and Recreation and the Minister of Tourism in any province, and in fact in the Federal Government will say this is one of our fastest growing industries, I believe it's what - second? Classed as second? This is the area in which I think there's a lot of places that can be looked into. I say that you can't just say, don't nationalize resource industries; you've got to get in there and jointly contribute towards this if it's going to become of any use to the people that are living in that area itself.

I note that I have a note on it and I'm not going to dwell too much on the Fish Marketing Board but I have asked the Minister prior to this and I'm not very optimistic, I don't feel very optimistic in the answer, but in just one small field, in the provision of sturgeon fishing nets for fishermen, is one in which government or government Crown corporation such as Fish Marketing Board should be providing and renting out, because this is only an experimental basis, it's only maybe a one-year deal. If it's a one-year deal the fisherman is never going to make any money out of it and he is never going to be expected to get any returns out of it by the time he has purchased his fish nets. But on the other hand, government are able through their bureaucratic process to spend much more than that money just going out and surveying and spending time and money on planes and people to diagnose the community in which sturgeon fishing is going to take place, the waters and such on, and I'm sure that this is a great deal more money than would be spent in providing the fish nets and then in turn renting them out to those that want to do that type of fishing. So there is one case where government could become more involved than they apparently feel they're willing to do.

In fact I could go back and say this is what really industry did at one time when Tom

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) Lamb started his muskrat ranching at Moose Lake. This was a deal where everybody involved got a third of the proceeds, and this worked out and I think it could work out with a Crown corporation if they wanted to take hold of it.

I believe that there has to be more imagination, I think there's got to be more finance and there's got to be more confidence in the development of the small industries in Northern Manitoba. It's the small specific Northern industries in Northern Manitoba that bother me because there was a statement a while ago, I saw in the paper which said, that a meeting that was being held here - somebody said it doesn't mean that there's going to be a smokestack in every northern community, and I say there doesn't have to be a smokestack in every northern community to make it successful. There are many other ways in which government can become involved in the industry of the north and of course this does not necessarily make it a nationalizing of that industry but it does require not only the confidence and leadership but the imagination that government and the people themselves put into these small industries. They're cottage type industries; I won't bother going over them, but they are proving a success in Winnipeg here. They're opening the stores in Churchill - they have two of them. The product is selling. Even on the handicraft itself, Hudson Bay Company are importing over 90 percent of their native handicraft products from Ontario; we can't get anywhere near producing what is required in our province ourselves. This requires the injection of money. I think that it's best if it's left in the hands of those people who have brought it this far and that is the Indian people, but they require more money to get it going and they require the suggestions of the people that are going to buy it and the marketing assistance and somewhere along the line government has to be involved in this. I'm afraid, if we're going to expect the Indian people to get a fair amount back for the work they're putting into these things. But this is guidance.

I've become particularly interested when I see this resolution and ask just where does government stand in respect of the nationalizing of their own jurisdiction and of course I think of the Port of Churchill, the Harbours Board which is the Federal authority in which the House Leader has said, I have no jurisdiction over that. And this is right. We have no jurisdiction over it. They took much of the jurisdiction away that Premier Bennett tried to take over at B. C., but there has to be some sort of gathering point in which two governments can get together and certainly if we follow through this and say that the program of nationalizing resource development in Manitoba through Crown sponsored joint stock companies are wrong, then I would agree that if you were talking about taking over the International Nickel Company that this would be wrong - or Sherritt-Gordon or Hudson Bay Mining - but I say where there are areas where government haven't looked into, then this is where they should be designating some of their money because it is classed as a designated area. Mr. Chairman, if it's a designated area, then it's money being put in by government, and if it's money being put in by government then it's either nationalizing or it's a Crown corporation or whatever you may wish to call it; but it is money that is required and this is where I suppose that people are going to have to continue to look for the things that government takes on themselves and will not give out to private industry, nor will they give it out to the Provincial Government. So you must look at it and say, Well, where do you go from there? There has to be a strong government that is going to accept the responsibility of and provide the leadership in the nationalizing of an industry that is lying dormant for over 40 years; and this is the fault, I suppose, of Manitoba Governments in the past. Maybe it's because of technical breakthrough but when you see how slow they're moving, then I think that we should be urging government to take a look and to come back as a party, or the other political parties that are in this House, and make that division as to what should be nationalized in our resource development and what shouldn't be and let them declare openly at election time just what is going to be expected, what will be nationalized or what people can expect them to take over and nationalize because there are areas, there are just as many areas that government should be looking into as those that government shouldn't be looking into. So I think that the public themselves must be aware of which should be nationalized and which shouldn't be. I don't think we can condemn them on an over-all type of attempt such as this to say that they shouldn't use the device of Crown sponsored joint stock companies. Possibly it's good, but it has to be used with a great deal of reserve, but there are many areas which belong to the Crown itself now which should be considered.

I think that the basic Northern transportation industry for one should be one in which we should be taking a good look at, whether it be federal or provincial; and again I fear that if the province has to do it alone it is going to be too expensive. The Federal Government have too

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . long sat back and said this is as far as we are going to go and this is as far as we are going to get involved in it and we're going to withdraw and we're going to reassess, because one of the members started to talk about Air Canada and it bothers me that Air Canada seems to be more interested for one thing, as far as I'm concerned, about servicing those areas outside of Canada than it is about looking after the regional and isolated areas within Canada itself and I'm sure that must have been the reason behind having the system in the first place, was to see that Canada itself was being serviced by up-to-date type of programs. I think that in the transportation industry we must see to it that there has to be some guidance so that the small communities are serviced just as much as the larger communities are serviced, and be it nationally or provincially owned, it has to provide those basic government services which are offered and were offered to not only western Canada but to eastern Canada in their early days.

I think it has to be either government owned, it has to be government directed or else the laws have to be such that private industry can operate within the guidelines government set up, but certainly those guidelines should make sure that the communities which industry is supposed to look after are in fact looking after those areas and that is why I come back to the fact that two things - first of all we should have a Northern Affairs Department to look after the whole of the development of the North. This would in fact make them more aware of the need for Crown sponsored companies whenever it was necessary, but also it would, of course, in its own identity, make sure that the people that are living in those areas are being serviced properly. I would hope that even the one minor step could be taken next year and see to it that for instance that you had hearings made by government. You could have a hearing on transportation in the north each year because it changes, and if you have a public hearing where the press and the news media can be there to listen to the complaints of a growing national area, then certainly I think there would be more pressure on the Federal Government to produce policies that are more in keeping with what they have accepted; for instance, in the Northwest Territories where it is entirely under their jurisdiction but when it seems to come to a province they want to shove it off on somebody else's shoulders.

The only thing I would add, and I'll sit down very quickly, is that when ministers such as the Honourable James Richardson comes out and suggests western authority be set up, or western provinces be set up, I think that he should say the north and the west should be under one jurisdiction so that you will get probably a balance, an imbalance between the west and the east in both financial and raw resources. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think before we let this motion come to a vote I would like to make a few remarks.

In discussing the motion before us we have been drawn into discussing Bill 17 to some extent because this is what is more or less proposed in the resolution when we are speaking of nationalization of our resource development in Manitoba, and that is what Bill 17, in my opinion, is striving to do. But I would like to question to this. Have we really come to that point in Manitoba where we can no longer get private industry to come in and develop our natural resources in Manitoba? Have we reached that point and has this government exhausted all means in the first 11 months of its holding office, in reaching the decision that quickly that we have reached that point that we must do this, have joint ventures in order to get development in Manitoba? -- (Interjection) -- No, I realize that you've never been against it but have they really tried in inducing the private companies to come in and . . .

MR. GREEN: We didn't offer them \$100 million, Buster.

MR. FROESE: I'm not recommending another CFI, I'm sure of that. But it seems to me when other provinces can get people in to explore and develop their provinces that we should be likewise able to do the same. I would like to know just what holds it back or what are the things that hold us back from getting those people in. We know there is very many problems involved once you get into this kind of a business as a province. Immediately the matter of how much money are you going to spend in a development of this type? And then the matter of priorities comes in. Is that development to take first priority in this province ahead of some of the other services that we are now giving? These are questions that no doubt would come to play as soon as we're in this type of business.

I am certainly not satisfied with the amount of revenue that we're receiving from our natural resources in this province and have been receiving all these many years. Certainly there is nothing to brag about. I think we have had a very poor showing in that regard.

Then, too, I think Bill 17 certainly can be improved upon because as has already been pointed out by other speakers that unless we do have a revamping of our government structure that we would need to have more disclosure guarantees in the Bills, otherwise the government side of the House has all the say and we can sit here and try to fetch out some information by bits and pieces from time to time and that's about the size of it. I feel that since risk capital is involved and will be involved, that we have to take great care when we do bring in special legislation of this type to bring about development of our resources, be it completely by government or in the way of joint structure by individuals and the government, that the necessary safeguards are there. I am at this point not convinced that we have reached that point and I would certainly like to hear from the government benches whether they can convince us and whether they can show us that this is absolutely necessary that we have to go into this type of project at this time.

There are quite a number of other things that I would like to question, such as the present claims that have been staked out over these years by the people who have these claims. How long are they running? Are some of them indefinite? How often do they have to be renewed. And why cannot we just place some onus on those people that development does come about unless, and if they don't that they then return to the Crown so that if we put a little pressure on these people so that we get development if they lay claims on those resources. These are things that I would like to hear from the government first and see what is being done in this direction and what the future holds in this direction too.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I do feel obliged to make some remarks, particularly because I think it would be inappropriate since the motion is made and no answer is made even though it may well be that no answer is necessary.

MR. FROESE: . . . order. I think it's quite in order for the Minister to give some reply because we haven't dealt with his department estimates at all.

MR. GREEN: That's the principal reason that I feel that I should make some comment because frankly I don't believe that the points that have been raised are of such substance that a comment is necessary, but it is true that we did not reach the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and members have raised certain questions. I believe that the questions that they raised are ones which demonstrate an abundance of fear rather than abundance of reason, and I

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) intend to deal with some of those questions in a few moments.

I note that the Member for Brandon West in introducing the resolution made what I could consider an innuendo that possibly the department was somehow purposely delayed because it had once appeared on the Order Paper prior to the Industry and Commerce Department and then it was changed. I want to assure the honourable member that the reason that took place is that the day that I would normally have come up was a day which for one reason and another I was not able to proceed. The Honourable Member for Brandon West will, I hope, learn that I have no hesitation whatsoever in participating either in normal debate or in debate on the estimates, so I ask him to accept me on faith that I did not try to keep my departmental estimates from the discussion of the House. That is something that has happened; it is not a unique situation. I think for the most part, we don't get through the departmental estimates and that this is one occasion on which the Department of Mines and Natural Resources did not receive a thorough evaluation in the House and I again ask the honourable member to accept me on faith that I rather regret that situation and I hope that it would not occur not only with my department or with any other department in the future.

I want to say just a few words on Bill No. 17 because that bill will be coming before the House and will receive greater scrutiny at that time and I'll have much more to say on it at that time.

First of all I'd like to say that the term that is used by the honourable member and he chooses his terms - I'm in no position to choose terms - the term that he uses, that is "nationalization of resource development" is a very loaded term which doesn't really describe what is either provided for or anticipated by the government in presenting this legislation. You are using the word "nationalization", and I take it that this would be a normal thing for the Opposition to do because it's the most emotion packed word that can be chosen and it is hoped that this will produce some negative reaction on the part of the public to what the government proposes, and that being the job of the Opposition I have no difficulty in accepting that this word will be used to describe a situation which it really doesn't apply to.

As I've indicated to members in the House on a previous occasion, nationalization of an industry can take place without public ownership, and as a matter of fact I would say the most nationalization that has taken place in North America, by far the greatest nationalization of industry, has taken place under the aegis of private ownership. Certainly the pseudo nationalization of the railways in the late part of the 19th century was done with the aid of the government for private enterprise. Certainly the nationalization of the oil industry in the United States was done with the assistance of the government for the benefit of private enterprise. Nationalization means making an industry national in scope and national in power and the Province of Manitoba would have no way of doing that either for private enterprise or for public enterprise, because Manitoba is merely a province and nobody except -- my honourable friends opposite have chosen to use the word "nationalization" for the development of even a public owned monopoly within a province; just not the nationalization of an industry.

But let's accept the fact that they chose to use the word "nationalization" because they would hope that it would scare more people rather than use the word "public ownership"; let's accept the fact that what they really mean is public ownership. You know, I've never heard anybody speak of Mr. Bennett when he took public ownership of the power industry that he nationalized that industry; or when he had ferry boats travelling between Victoria and Vancouver nobody said that this was the nationalization of an industry. And nobody talks about the telephone system in Manitoba or the power system in Manitoba as a nationalized industry. Or in any other province in the country. They talk about the fact that the public has taken ownership of that industry in the Province of Manitoba, and really what the honourable members are arguing about is not nationalization, although if they choose to use that word because they feel that it communicates fear into the hearts of the people of Manitoba, I have no objection to them using it, because I think that the people of Manitoba are more sensible and more courageous than to be intimidated by that kind of fear-producing attempt.

But let's talk about public ownership, because I really think that that's what my honourable friends are afraid of and that's the bogeyman that they hope to knock down. By the way, I was very pleased to hear that there are some pragmatic people in the House. The Member for Churchill indicated that public ownership in certain areas is a very good vehicle to use; the Leader of the Liberal Party indicates that a Crown corporation established to accomplish certain

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) things, if it can do it best, is a good vehicle to use. Therefore we are not alone in urging that where a matter can be done best through the public getting together and deciding to do it, that there is no hang up, there is no doctrinaire rigid reason for not proceeding on that basis.

What the members of the Opposition, the Official Opposition, say is that Bill 17 is going to destroy free enterprise and create the nationalization - and I'm going to use their term even though I know it doesn't describe the situation, but it seems to describe the situation to them - that there's going to be wholesale nationalization of all of the free enterprise areas of our economy. Mr. Speaker, I speak only personally, I'm not now representing a government view, but my real criticism with this Bill is that it doesn't do anything like what my honourable friend says it does, that there is nothing in this Bill which nationalizes or takes public ownership of anything. I would feel much better in introducing this Bill if I said that the Manitoba Government has found a sphere in which they can develop the natural resources of our province, create thousands of jobs or hundreds of jobs, if we are going to be a little less optimistic, go into a viable operation and get revenue for the people of the Province of Manitoba. If I could get up and say that, I would feel much more confident and much happier about this Bill than I do feel. But actually this Bill does nothing. This Bill says that you "may" develop an industry or develop a natural resource through the aegis of a Crown corporation, and as the former Speaker used to say to me - and I think he picked out the right person to say it to when he was talking about my addresses to the Legislature - he said, Mr. Green, or the Member for Inkster, or Sid, the rules say that you "may" speak 40 minutes, not that you "must" speak for 40 minutes. I would indicate that this particular piece of legislation says that the government may do something, not that it must do something; and I would further indicate that the Bill doesn't do anything toward setting up any corporation.

I would have been much happier if I could come to the Legislature without this Bill, which you could legally do, without this Bill and say there are 10 areas in which the people of the Province of Manitoba can gain great benefit by developing a natural resource, employing Manitobans to develop that natural resource and obtaining a revenue for the people of the Province of Manitoba, without this Bill. Because we could do it. There's nothing in the existing law of the Province of Manitoba which would prevent us from going and operating a business publicly on that basis, and provided we could get capital supply passed by the House we could go ahead and do it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we can't even take the credit for this, the government of which I am a member; the previous administration went ahead and did it without this Bill. They developed exactly what we want to do or what this Bill was intended for, they developed the Moose Lake Logging Corporation. May I advise the honourable members that that corporation not being a corporation but being a business operated by the public and owned by the public, has been in existence I believe for over a year, that it was conceived and developed by the previous administration without Bill No. 17, because there's nothing, nothing in the law to prevent the government from doing that.

Can I tell you again that the previous administration, the Conservative administration which says that the government going into business is going to wipe out all private enterprise, that they also operate without this Bill, they also operate McKenzie Seeds as a Crown corporation, as a publicly-owned Crown corporation. I don't think that they particularly wanted to do that

MR. FROESE: Would you permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Sure.

MR. FROESE: How did the previous government go about in acquiring the necessary funds for that operation?

MR. GREEN: With regard to the Moose Lake Logging they put it right into the departmental estimates and the estimates were voted upon by the Legislature.

MR. FROESE: Giving the necessary information?

MR. GREEN: No. Mr. Speaker, the previous Minister got up in the House, as I recall, you know, and I don't want to make a mistake in this connection, but he did indicate that they were developing a Moose Lake Logging Corporation to do these things, and the fact is that either under the Manitoba Development Authority - and I say without the Manitoba Development Authority that the Province of Manitoba being a corporation itself can do all of the things that a human being can do, which are not specifically excluded by a fact of Charter or by the BNA Act, and one of the things that it can do is operate a corporation or operate a business, and does do so.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. BILTON: The McKenzie Seed, was it not bequeathed to the Province or to the University, some arrangement of that kind? Could you explain that?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't explain McKenzie Seed, how we got it. All I know is that the Crown operates it, that the Crown without legislation -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, if somebody else wants to give us a corporation -- the member says it was given to us. I don't know how we got it. I'm not sure. The Member for Swan River asked me to tell him. I don't know. All I know is that without Bill 17 we are operating that Crown Corporation, we are operating the Moose Lake Logging Company, we have helped to set up, and on this my facts are not as clear cut, but we have helped to set up what eventually is to become a fishing co-operative in a part of northern Manitoba. All of these things we have done with our general power, and there is nothing to prevent anything being continued to be done, with general power.

I want to try to impress my honourable friends, with this simple fact - that if the province as has been alleged by the Leader of the Opposition, wanted to destroy free enterprise by going into all kinds of businesses - and I suggest to you that that is not the case - but if it were the case, we would not need this bill - this bill is superfluous. If on the other hand, the province did not intend to destroy free enterprise; if it did not intend to go into all kinds of corporations for the purpose of developing the natural resources of the Province of Manitoba, then this bill wouldn't help it. There really is no effect in terms of this bill except to provide another means of doing something that the province can already do, and in this respect, again the Leader of the Opposition is obsessed with the fact that there are a sinister group of people on this side of the House who are dreaming up all kinds of ways of trying to destroy what he believes to be the way in which this province should operate.

Now ordinarily, Mr. Speaker, it would not be appropriate for me to talk about how something comes before the House, because I have to accept responsibility for what is before the House, and I accept responsibility for Bill No. 17. I'm the Minister who brought this bill to the Legislature and asked it to be passed and therefore for all formal purposes, for all legal purposes and for all purposes of the people of Manitoba I want to disclaim no responsibility. It is a bill brought forward by my department for which I accept full responsibility. But I want to tell the honourable members that I personally, and I hope that this is not a disclaimer because it is not intended to be, I personally had nothing to do with the drafting or bringing forward of this bill. And the Member for Crescentwood, if that's the other sinister force that's over here, he never saw this bill until it was brought to this House. When I say before it was brought to this House, I'm talking about before it was being proceeded with, it was dealt with yes, but I don't want to make a mistake. The fact is that neither the Honourable Member for Crescentwood nor any other sinister people, if the Attorney-General is one or the Minister of Municipal Affairs is one, none of these so-called sinister people had anything to do with this bill. You know I don't say that to congratulate myself, I merely say that as a fact. There was some confusion and I hope I could clear it up because I don't like to leave a wrong impression with the House as to how it got here. When I introduced the Bill I said it was in the works and at the moment that I made that remark, I confessed to members that it was my understanding that the bill was entirely prepared and ready to be presented before July 15 of 1969. Now I never said that, I said it was in the works, but I want to confess to honourable members that my own understanding was that it was entirely a bill that was prepared under the previous administration. I now find that my understanding, not my information to the House - my information to the House is correct that it was in the works - my understanding is now that what was previously brought forward, or was intended to be brought forward was the same bill but limited to forestry, not limited to one company, but limited to forestry and that under the aegis of the new administration - again not me personally, but I accept full responsibility for what's here - that under the new administration it was thought, well why should we have to, if we wanted to do it in another area, why should we have another bill prepared, so let's extend it so that it can be done in any of the areas where this might come up in the future; and again I emphasize it might come up. So that was the extension. So if you are looking for the sinister people, and I suggest that there were none, the sinister people have to be the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the staff of that department, who I never knew, or it had never been suggested to me beforehand that they consisted of a bunch of Bolsheviks, the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I have indicated what I believe has been his extension, but as far as I

(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) am concerned and again I make no disclaimer, because I believe that I am responsible, and furthermore, I think it's most absurd for me, if I have made a mistake, it is this mistake, but it is most absurd for me to hold as a recommendation for legislation that it was proposed by the previous administration, because that is not a good recommendation for legislation. If anything, it is a bad one. But the fact is that the germ of it, the idea of it and essentially all of the terms of it, were things that were intended to be established with relation to the forestry industry in the Province of Manitoba.

I try to make these three points: first of all, the bill in no way permits the province to do something that it could do without the bill being in existence. Secondly, that if the province did not want to do what the leader of the opposition suggests, then the presence of this bill would not permit us to do it. That is, and I'll give you an example which should be more clear cut than I have already put, if this bill had been passed by the previous administration, that it would not mean that anyone was talking about taking public ownership of a whole segment of the Province of Manitoba. Thirdly, it has been represented that this gives the province a carte blanche. Mr. Speaker, this representation must be made with the full knowledge that within the bill there is a statement that no monies can be advanced to such a corporation without a bill of the Legislature. Now as I understand it, that means either current supply, capital supply or a separate bill, and that without one of these three ways, that we couldn't set up anything, we couldn't set up a hot dog stand; so the notion that after we pass this bill we can climb back into somebody's office and start giving wholesale money to Crown corporations is not so. At least that's not what the bill says, and again I didn't prepare that part of it, but it's in the bill that any monies advanced in order to get such a corporation going, must be authorized under an Act of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard many, many attempts, particularly in this session and I'll deal with them in due course, by opposition members to frighten and use scare tactics in order to try to advance their own position but I hardly think that this bill could scare anybody. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't please me to the point that it should scare you. If this bill was what you say it was, I would be much more exuberant about the presentation of it than I am because this bill doesn't do anything. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this bill doesn't do a blasted thing, it merely says that where you wish to have the Crown involved in the exploitation of a natural resource, that you can do it by means of a corporation under Part 2, and there's nothing to say that you cannot do it now without establishing a corporation under Part 2 of the Companies Act. So all of this hysteria is ill-founded, Mr. Chairman, and is another opposition ploy -- and let's face it, the opposition has to do its job and this is one of its jobs, discrediting the government's position, and to the extent that they think they have been able to discredit the government position they have made the proper remarks on the bill. But I suggest to you that they'd better find another way, because it just won't wash. What is being done here is neither a destruction of the free enterprise system nor is it an advancement of the free enterprise system. It's sheer status quoism, and until something is done there is no effect whatsoever on the economic status quo of this province. -- (Interjection) -- Not nearly as good.

My honourable friend, who again tried to talk about nationalization. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in my particular view as to economics, and my view as to the meanings of the term of nationalization, and if we take the province as a national unit, which it is not, so the term doesn't appropriately apply, that the previous administration more effectively and with much worse effect, nationalized the northern forest industry than any other thing that the province has done. Mr. Speaker, they nationalized it in such a way that the province had nothing to gain and everything to lose, and they further did it, so that the nationalized corporation which they created and said would not belong to the people but would belong to some private firm, is in no way answerable to the Legislature, and my honourable friend the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, talks about who is and who is not answerable to the Legislature. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company which is a nationalized company insofar as the distribution of gas in the majority of the Province of Manitoba is concerned, and I refer to Greater Winnipeg, that it is not answerable to this Legislature. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you know, you say take it over. Are you saying that seriously? I mean I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege. I think that if I'm correct the Hansards will show in the past that the Premier has suggested that.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not reject my honourable friend's suggestion, I merely asked whether he made it. Does he make the suggestion -- if this company is thought to be taken into public ownership, can I at least say -- and again it's not a very good endorsement, and I should have learned before -- that the Member for River Heights said we should do this? Because that's what he is now saying.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister permit one question?

MR. GREEN: Two if you like.

MR. SHERMAN: He has gone to some length and some detail to explain that Bill 17 is really in keeping with and in maintenance of the status quo. My question, Mr. Speaker, is why then if the bill does nothing, if the bill doesn't alter the status quo, why then does the government go to the trouble of introducing a bill of this kind at this time in this session?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did explain that when I introduced the bill, I said that I didn't think it does very much but it does make it more flexible as to what you do with a Crown corporation when you have set it up. In other words, as to how many shares you will own and as to whether you can convert the shares and what happens. It does have the benefit of giving you some facilities. But if my honourable friend wants to know the real reason, the real reason was because when I came to the Department I found this bill which, it was my opinion, was prepared by the previous administration, and I thought well, I certainly can take responsibility for it and here's something that they surely will not argue against. Now other than that, I don't think that this bill is vital. I repeat that. That the province can do anything that is in this bill without the passing of the bill and that the province, if it did not wish to, could not do anything which the opposition accuses it of, even with the bill on the statutes. That is a fact. Therefore when you asked me why I introduced it, it was introduced because I thought it was a good bill. I have to give that answer. I accept responsibility for introducing the bill. I thought it was a useful thing, but not nearly as useful as is indicated by the Leader of the Opposition. If I thought that it was that useful I would be much happier about presenting this bill, but it is not that useful.

You know there is not great use in declaring principles. I tried to indicate this to my honourable friends so many times that for me to declare for socialism or for you to declare for free enterprise, doesn't mean a damn thing. It's what you do that's important, and you people on that side, whilst declaring for free enterprise saw it necessary to have a Hospitalization Corporation; saw it necessary to have a Medical Corporation; saw it necessary to have a Manitoba Power Corporation; saw it necessary to do many things which run contrary to the professed declaration for free enterprise and those of us who are on our side -- and there are some and I have not been one of them -- who declare for socialism, don't thereby do anything, you still have to say that you are going to take a particular problem and deal with it, and therefore when we deal with the automobile insurance legislation in a certain way, we do far more than by passing Bill 17. If we went through this session and passed Bill 17 and didn't deal with automobile insurance, this would be a namby-pamby session. We would have done nothing. But if we would have gone through this session and passed the automobile insurance legislation and didn't deal with Bill 56, everybody would say that the socialists are invading Manitoba. So that I am trying to indicate that the declarations that are flying back and forth across the House regarding philosophical theories don't mean anything and that what really counts is what you do. And what has been done, what the Member for River Heights makes a lot about, the big socialist step that was taken in the last 12 months, was taken . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege Mr. Speaker, I never, at any time that I know of, ever suggested a socialist step -- never.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't believe the honourable member has a point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: That's not a point of privilege. But I am suggesting to you that the big socialist step that was taken in the last 12 months was the step to set up the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation; that that was the biggest Act of Socialism that has yet been perpetrated -- (Interjection) -- I'm saying it, I am saying it. But, Mr. Speaker, that was something that was done by the previous administration, we can't even claim credit for it, -- I would like to, but we can't claim credit for it, -- it was done by you people and I think you did a good thing.

Now having done it, you have the Member for River Heights getting up and saying that this corporation is not answerable to the people. That's not correct. It's true, it's true that it's not answerable in this House, or to a very limited extent in this House, because even we can discuss it, even we can deal with it. I'll tell you something. If the Fish Plant, if somebody had got together and organized those ten fish plants, and said we are going to have one

(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) fish processing plant in the Province of Manitoba -- which by the way it may have taken ten years, it may have taken twenty, it may have taken thirty, but they would have done it -- nobody in this House would be able to talk about where it should go, as to Selkirk or Winnipeg, because we would take it as an accepted fact that it is the divine right of those who set up the plant to say where it would go, and it would be the height of presumption for us in the Legislature to argue about where Mr. Fitchman should put his processing plant. So the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we have, by the very fact that my honourable friend gets up and raises this question, indicates that Crown corporations are far more answerable to the people than are the other kind, and in the House of Commons, and maybe this is a demonstration, by the way, of the effectiveness of the democratic system because what has happened obviously is that in the House of Commons it has been not looked upon as being the crucial issue that it is to the Government of Manitoba, and we may not like that; we may wish that they paid more attention to us; but the fact is that all of the members for Manitoba could get up in that House; they could go after the Minister; they could -- and this has been done before -- eventually require him to dismiss that board if they're not following policy decisions of the government, and under no other circumstances is this kind of democratic process possible.

The honourable member says that the Crown corporations are not answerable. Well I know that we do have committee-meetings and we talk about the Telephone System; we talk about the Hydro system. Members are permitted to ask a lot of questions. They don't ask very many -- (Interjection) -- Well, of the officials of the department. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge is responsible for producing people who can ask questions. The members opposite and all members of the House have a right of attacking that Minister, of attacking the person who is there to answer questions, and in the last analysis -- and this is what you people should know very well -- they have the right of removing that Minister.

Now they can't do that with the head of Bell Telephone, and they can't do that with the head of the Churchill Forest Industries which is nationalized by the previous administration. They can't do that. Well, you know, you say that everything is nationalized. I'll say to you -- (Interjection) -- I'll say to the member for River Heights -- I will say to the Member for River Heights that he can -- you know, he wasn't in the House but I will refer him to a book by Ida Tarbell. The name of the book is The Nationalization of Business. It was written at the end of the 19th century and it refers to all of the businesses in the United States that were nationalized -- not by the public but by private enterprise, and with the help of the public. And I say to the Member for River Heights that if he knows how business operates, and I believe I have some understanding of it, that as the business becomes more and more sophisticated and as it becomes more and more mature, it tends to nationalize, and that 200 years from now the important businesses, the important industry in this country as well as in most countries, will be nationalized; and all we're arguing about is whether it's going to be nationalized for the public good or whether it's going to be nationalized in the interests of some private individual. But they will be nationalized, and that word I know doesn't -- you don't like, but the fact is that that is the way in which business grows, and if my honourable friends choose to ignore that, they can ignore it, but history has shown that that is what occurs.

The honourable member says that these corporations are not answerable and I say to him that they are, and I say that we do not -- I'll concede to the honourable member that we do not do a very good job of getting answers; that we don't sit long enough; that the fact is that we don't have as intensive meetings as we should; that we don't look hard at the balance sheet. But, Mr. Speaker, that's a fault that has been developed by the perpetration of the honourable members of what they say the system of government should be. They say that the public should not be involved in looking at what these things are doing, and I say yes, let us do more things and let the public become more involved. Let's sit here for 12 months a year. Let's operate -- indeed, if we're going to go into important things, then let's operate in an important manner. Yes; let the people of Manitoba elect a group of people who intend to deal with a four hundred or if it's going to be a five hundred or a six hundred million dollar budget, on the same basis as businessmen deal with a similar business. I have no objection to that and there is nothing in the existing rules which prevent us from doing that, but there is something which will prevent us from doing that if we don't involve ourselves, and that's the approach that honourable friends opposite would like to take. They would like to say that the Legislature shouldn't be involved in these things, shouldn't have to look at where the money is being spent, and shouldn't do the things that are necessary to maintain the well-being of the people of this province,

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) through being involved in this industrial development. So that is apparently the bridge that lies between us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do want to tell the Honourable Member for Rhineland that when he says, "have we looked into all of the ways" we do know from historical observation that industry has a reluctance to locate in a certain province unless it obtains huge concessions. We know that from the forest industry in Manitoba; we know that from the chemical plant that was established here; and we know that different provinces, believing that this is the only way to get industry, are bidding for the purpose of getting the most that they can out of a province, and what we are saying is that we're giving ourselves one more option; and Mr. Speaker, that is never a bad thing, to give yourself one more option. We have the option of letting somebody come in here and develop and industry by himself and making money, which nobody has taken away. We have the option of saying that we are going to attract industry by giving them some sort of industrial incentive, which we lean against, and we have the option of saying if we can't do it another way the public will do it themselves. Now how could anybody be contrary to that type of position, because that's the position that we are taking with regard to this bill. So when my honourable friend says are we desperate, no we're not desperate, but because we are not desperate doesn't mean that we don't want to explore every avenue, and Bill 17 merely gives us one more way of exploring another avenue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this particular amendment. Can I first -- I'm sorry, does somebody have a question? I want to speak on this particular amendment. I first of all want to take the argument of my very eloquent friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and explore his justification for the Crown corporation serving the public better because it's answerable to the Legislature and to a Minister rather than another corporation, that is a very large corporation that may answer through some other means but not necessarily to a Minister of the Crown, and before coming back to the particular amendment that I want to get at, I want to explore this for a moment.

Now the particular case that the Minister has used here to justify his example is the case where he says let's look at the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company or the Winnipeg and Central Gas - Greater Winnipeg Gas Company I believe it's called now - it is not answerable to the people of Manitoba; and as the example of the one that is, he would use I think as his prime example the Manitoba Hydro which is answerable to the Minister, and he says if Manitoba Hydro does not operate satisfactorily you can get rid of the Minister, which I presume would be the Minister of Finance, but you cannot do this in the case of the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company.

Well, perhaps we should explore this and see if, realistically, if the good operation or the bad operation of the Crown corporation that reports to the Minister of Finance is in fact going to bring about the Minister's downfall, and I submit to you that it will not. I submit to you that the Minister's well-being, the Minister of Finance's well-being is going to be much less dependent on his financial capabilities than it is on some of the other capabilities or incapacities that he may have that forms his public image, and it's going to have very very little to do with his ability to handle or not handle a Crown corporation which reports to him. Now I think we have to look at the political process that takes place. The backbenchers for all intent on the government side take the word of the Minister or of the front benches or of the treasury bench; there's very little questioning is done.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Will you permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: No thanks, not right now, Sir, I want to complete. So the argument can be mounted, but the members of the opposition are free, free-ranging, wide open to ask questions of the government to bring out all the issues. This assumes of course that the members of the opposition or somebody in government at some stage of the democratic process is expert in that field and can ask the right question, but the fact of the matter is that for Hydro or a gas company or the other utilities, you're expecting an awful lot to expect the elected member who has to cover the size of water front that he has to cover in representing his people to come in here and ask questions which are penetrating enough that you can get to the heart of the matter within the operation of a Crown corporation. And then in fact when it is done from the opposite side of the House - and we can look at a good example in the operation of the Public Utilities Committee here - you've got just as good a chance as not of having the government put up enough flack that the proper questioning is not carried out, so that in effect the net result, the net result is that the questioning of a Crown corporation through the Legislature through its Public Utilities

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) Committee is not serving properly the interests of Manitoba that would be defined in the hypothetical argument of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. His argument is fine except that it just doesn't work that way.

Now let's go back to the gas company. The gas company reports to the Public Utilities Committee; the Public Utilities Committee is vested with the responsibility by this Legislature by appointing people on it who can, if they don't have entirely the knowledge, they can develop it, they can use the consultants necessary to back them up or the staff necessary to back them up, they can do the proper questioning and they can cross-examine the corporation to make it comply with what they think are the best interests of the government's wishes. This is how it works and these are the facts of life, and I'll submit to you - and I don't see how some members opposite can take the opposite attack - I'm convinced now that the best method of a Crown corporation operation, or another corporation that is in a monopoly position in a utility, is through the Public Utilities Board rather than reporting directly to the Public Utilities Committee of the Legislature, and I think in the final analysis that we're going to get better operation and better cross-examination and better investigation. The argument that a Minister can be elected out of office if it doesn't operate correctly is nothing more than a hypothetical argument. It might work in the odd case

MR. GREEN: I worry all the time.

MR. CRAIK: Maybe it had -- but I suggest to you that the Minister of Finance over here is not going to lose votes over his business acumen that he displays to the electorate as much as it is some of his other distractions that he may have that may not entirely be related to his business capability, and I think that from that point of view, since we're asking a Crown corporation or any other corporation to basically carry on good business, that to say that a man can be kicked out of office if it doesn't is just a completely false argument; it just doesn't wash. It has to be done because that's the way our system operates, but to say that this is the optimum and to justify going that direction because this is what we should have, just doesn't wash.

Now I want to, Mr. Speaker, come back to the argument the Minister has built around Bill 17. I think it's revealing that he in fact has shot down almost every reason for the existence of this bill today. He started out by saying that -- he started out in the Legislature introducing this saying that he inherited this from the previous government.

MR. GREEN: No, no, Mr. Speaker, I'm rather sensitive on that point and I want to say on a point of privilege that what I said that it was "in the works". I never said it was inherited from the previous Minister. I want to tell the honourable member that I believed that it was but I never said that.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it was very clear when the Minister introduced it that he said this was in the works, it came from the previous government, and it was crystal clear, it was crystal clear that the Minister said that this was inherited.

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

MR. CRAIK: I don't think -- Mr. Speaker, I think you should interpret here whether there is privilege on this.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to state the point of privilege. My honourable friend is saying that I said it was in the works and was being prepared by the previous administration. Now, he will not find those remarks in Hansard when I introduced the bill, and I want to tell him, although I don't have to tell him, that I believed that it was so, but I never said that when I introduced the bill.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the implication was crystal clear, crystal clear that this was set up because of a Moose Lake project and this bill had to come in to cover it, and now we find out today that what was in the works, so to speak, was a bill that would allow the setup of a forestry project, and that is quite different

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

MR. CRAIK: . . . from what is in this bill now.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, he can complete it at the end of my -- there's no privilege here.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong but I do rise on a point of privilege and my honourable friend will have to hear the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable Minister's point of privilege if he has one.

MR. GREEN: My point of privilege is that the honourable member has just said -- now, Mr. Speaker, I've forgotten what he said.

MR. CRAIK: That's how much privilege there is.

MR. GREEN: He said that I now said that it was set up for a forestry project, and my point of privilege is that I did not say that.

MR. CRAIK: You said it today.

MR. GREEN: I said that it was set up to deal with forestry, not a project, anything involved in forestry.

MR. CRAIK: Forestry is made up of projects is it not?

MR. GREEN: Not a project.

MR. CRAIK: Well, what's

MR. GREEN: Not a project.

MR. CRAIK: What are we dealing in here, a high school class in semantics?

MR. GREEN: No.

MR. CRAIK: This is not even germane to the argument. The point of it all is that the Bill 17 covers the complete natural resource spectrum. It can cover forestry; it can cover fishing; it can cover mushroom picking; it can cover agriculture, a renewable resource; it can cover mining, all sorts of minerals; anything you like, the whole works.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. CRAIK: The complete spectrum is there. Now, the Minister today has retracted the original statement and said that

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

MR. CRAIK: No, let me finish

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: I haven't given him reason yet. I haven't given you reason for privilege yet. Let me finish.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The honourable member has said that I have retracted a previous statement. I retracted no previous statement, there's nothing to retract.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister said today that he must clarify his interpretation - right, we must have this exactly correct - and the interpretation correction was that the original design was to cover forestry but he has seen fit - now, I mustn't say "project" - it was to cover forestry. We must get this exactly right. But now it doesn't just cover forestry, it covers the whole works. You name it, it covers it, anything in the natural resources, and of course, Mr. Speaker, almost everything we do derives from natural resources.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. CRAIK: The term "winning" does not only include just mining, it can cover milling; it can cover smelting; it can cover refining, right down the line; it all involves natural resources. So, Mr. Speaker, this is a far cry from the introduction when he now says that originally the previous administration was thinking about this in terms of forestry. Now let me go back . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, my honourable friend insists that I said that the previous administration was bringing in the bill as it is now, and I never said that; and I will read my remarks to the honourable member so that he will try to be fair in his discussion, and I do feel that this is a point of privilege because I am a little worried and I'm worried about the very point that the member put. The words that I used were: "Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation that I'm advised has been in the works for some time." Those were my exact words.

MR. CRAIK: Right. Right, Mr. Speaker. Exactly right. Exactly right. The implication is crystal clear.

Now, let's come back to it. Let's come back. The Minister says today, "But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in here we can't already do. We don't even need this bill, but we'd like to have it. We'd like to have it. We don't even need this bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker," he said, "We can't do anything without coming back in here with another bill on the specific project."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know full well we're not supposed to be dealing in bills on this amendment, but we have to because the Minister has gone to Bill 17 . . .

MR. GREEN: The people have . . .

MR. CRAIK: Right. Let's look at it then. -- (Interjection) -- Okay. Fine. "With the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Minister may, for and on behalf of the government, enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada or any agency . . ." That's

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . the wrong one. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. GREEN: Read Section 8.

MR. CRAIK: I'm looking for . . .

MR. GREEN: Read 8.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the money provided for any project can come under here and I don't believe that he is going to come back with another bill that is going to say that we are going to establish the Moose Lake woodcutting project. And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, while we're on -- I don't believe that you're coming back with a separate bill to set it up because . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . in the estimates.

MR. CRAIK: In your introduction, if you wanted to do this, you would have come in with a restrictive bill of that nature.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member please know that we have to pass that in the estimates, Moose Lake Logging?

MR. CRAIK: All right, Mr. Speaker, we'll read passage 8 out of the Bible here then. "The cost of administering this Act, including any expenditures made under Section 3, shall be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund with moneys authorized under an Act of the Legislature to be so paid and applied."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this only gives the justification; it gives the further justification for what the Minister said - he doesn't even need this bill. So why does he bring it in? Because he can't make a move anyway, so he might as well come back in, explain his specific objective and move. He says now that he can, under Part II of the MDF he can go ahead and do what he wants to anyway. Well, Mr. Speaker, then what is the difference? The difference is that under this Act he can report directly to the Cabinet and under the MDF Act it reports to the Manitoba Development Fund, or Manitoba Development Corporation, as it may be re-named. So the major difference is, Mr. Speaker, then not that this bill doesn't do anything, as the Minister would proclaim it does, but in fact that it allows the Crown corporation to be set up and operated directly by the Cabinet, and under the existing legislation it would operate under the Manitoba Development Fund.

There's a major difference, Mr. Speaker. The major difference is that it provides a further shift in centralization of the power on to the Cabinet, and this is a major consideration to be taken into account in Bill 17.

I don't argue with the fact that moves are necessary from time to time. As a matter of fact, the Moose Lake project was one that was initiated when I was in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, but the intent at that time, the intent at that time was to set up a project which was going to have government support but be operated by the community itself, and did not in fact require a provincial Crown corporation. This was not the intent at the time. The intent at the time was not only to establish, not only to establish a wood cutting operation, but to be able to bring in training capability to train management techniques and other techniques that would make this a viable community interest, and of course you don't need a bill to do that. There's no bill required. It's not a provincial Crown corporation. It can be a cooperative; it can be anything else. Now he's going back, the Minister goes back to the argument that "you asked for it - you were going to ask for it."

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. CRAIK: Oh, well, we're not supposed to admit that. You're only supposed to admit it was in the works, you see. You're not supposed to admit that we were looking at it . . .

MR. GREEN: On a point of privilege, my honourable friend . . .

MR. CRAIK: There is no privilege on this, Mr. Speaker. You can ask a question at the end. Let me finish the story. No, I'm not sitting down any further, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister indicated that he was rising on a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: I trust it is.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege because the honourable member now alleges, although he sat here through my speech, that I said that this bill was not being dealt with by the previous administration. I indicated to the honourable member in the clearest terms that I knew how, which apparently can't penetrate through to him, that what was provided for by the previous administration was a bill almost identical in form but which dealt with forestry, so you were providing for a bill for that corporation -- (Interjection) --

MR. CRAIK: That's right. The Minister from St. Boniface has a very good point here. It was not my intent to get into this until the Minister saw fit to go into the details of Bill 17 and it could be better discussed at that time; but what is crystal clear, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Minister is trying to back-pedal so fast on Bill 17 and in including Clause 8, which he essentially is arguing now, requires that any move that is taken in this direction, requires another bill in the House anyway. So why bring in the bill? Why put in this provision? The fact of the matter is that if what he says now is true, not what he said when he introduced the bill but if what he says now is true, there's very little reason for actually bringing the bill into the Legislature.

MR. GREEN: Again, on a point of privilege. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, now suggests that I'm saying different than what I said when I brought in the bill. Again I would like to read him what I said when I brought in the bill: "Furthermore, it enables only such things as the Crown could now do if it wished without the setting up of a separate corporation." What I said today I said at that time, and I don't want you to say that I didn't.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, to complete the argument on this, the two alternatives that exist - and apart from the remarks that I'm making here I'm not in disfavour with the setting up of a Crown involvement in an operation on a particular basis, and it's the carte blanche provision that is in this bill that exception is taken to. We're quite aware of the necessity for the government to become involved in certain cases. The Minister today has mentioned the McKenzie Seed at Brandon, which was a particular case and in which the government became involved because it was, there was a vested interest of the government in McKenzie Seed because of the agreement with the University before that action was ever taken, and it was a logical move and in fact a move I think that has probably turned out to have been a good move on behalf of the University and in the interests of employment in that particular area.

Now the Minister has mentioned other examples here. But let me come back. To imply that Bill 17 was needed for the Moose Lake project or to in any way leave the suggestion that this bill was necessary to solve a particular situation at Moose Lake, just isn't so. The Moose Lake project was set up primarily, initially -- now it may well be now, but initially it was not envisaged as being a provincial project. It was set up to be a community project to allow the development, not only of mechanical or technical skills in the area, it was set up to develop further the managerial potential that may be able to evolve out of a community of that sort, and I know it has had a degree of success, much more so than one would get out of having it as a non-community project.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is now 5:30. Perhaps the honourable member may be able to continue at 8:00. I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.