

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 1, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 40 Members of 4-H Clubs from all parts of Manitoba. This group is under the direction of Group Leader, Miss Trudeau. We also have 15 members of the 44th Cub Pack. This group is under the direction of their Leader, Mrs. Empey. This Cub Pack is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we in the Conservative Party are not prepared to receive the Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for the reasons cited yesterday by my colleagues, the Members for Morris, Lakeside and River Heights, and for several other reasons, Sir. The basic one is that we're alarmed at what is taking place in the economic atmosphere and climate of this province at the present time. We say, Sir, that the economic philosophies of this government demonstrably spell trouble for Manitoba, and if we needed any proof, the departures from the public service in the past few days of two distinguished servants in the persons of Messrs. Lorne Dyke and Rex Grose offer ample emphasis of that argument.

There are other reasons now that have arisen overnight for our refusal at this point to accept the Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development. They've arisen as a result of a story by Harry Mardon on the front page of last night's final edition of the Winnipeg Tribune, and although of course Mr. Mardon is responsible for what he wrote and I don't suggest at this juncture that the government is in any way involved or responsible in the manner which one might infer or imply in the incident in question from Mr. Mardon's column, nonetheless the report in the column itself cites a number of provocative factors and raises a number of very provocative and intriguing questions, questions that we feel, Mr. Speaker, deserve attention and response, satisfactory reply at the present time. There are, as I said, some very interesting allegations in that story and they give rise to some very interesting questions, and they make it all the more vital, Mr. Speaker, that the letter of resignation tendered by Mr. Rex Grose to the government be tabled without delay.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, here in part and in direct quotation is what Mr. Mardon had to say - and I quote, Sir, as I said, from the front page of last night's final edition of the Winnipeg Tribune. But I'd like to read it into the record and I believe that on the basis of the account as detailed by Mr. Mardon we have a legitimate right to ask the First Minister and his colleagues for direct and specific answers to provocative questions. Mr. Mardon wrote: "Rex Grose, who masterminded much of Manitoba's economic growth during the past decade as Chairman and General Manager of the Manitoba Development Fund resigned his post for three major reasons. (1) What he considered" - and this is in quotation marks - "political harassment of the fund." (2) That the MDF was being unduly pressured into advancing more than \$40 million to Versatile Manufacturing Limited. (3) That the Board of Directors of MDF, formerly a top drawer array of business and professional talent, was being replaced by many new faces."

Whether the term "new faces" is a euphemism for something else I don't profess to suggest, but in any event the inference is left to the reader. "Mr. Grose" - and here I'm continuing in direct quotation from Mr. Mardon - "who is in the United States on MDF business could not be reached by telephone to put these reasons in his own words. However my informants, long time friends of his, said Mr. Grose submitted his resignation in a strongly-worded protest letter to the Premier. That letter was a scorcher, one informant told me, and it will be interesting to see if the Premier makes its contents public." There is considerably more in that particular article, Mr. Speaker, but the cogent and relative points I think are those in the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) first few paragraphs, specifically the references to the reasons in Mr. Mardon's view why Mr. Grose resigned.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): What are your views?

MR. SHERMAN: And secondly, the reference to the description of the letter itself as being - and I quote again - "a scorcher and one which it will be interesting to see if the Premier makes public."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to these reasons cited for our refusal at this point or our unwillingness at this point to accept the report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development and our insistence at this point that the First Minister make good at the earliest opportunity on his commitment to the Assembly yesterday to table Mr. Grose's letter of resignation, in addition to those reasons . . .

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member says that I gave a commitment. I would like it clear that I said I was prepared to. I'm checking precedent to see if a letter of resignation of any Deputy Minister has ever been tabled before, either here or in the Federal Parliament. If it has I'll make it public; if it hasn't, I won't.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, is that a matter of complete privilege?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that I have served with the First Minister of this province in different legislatures of this land and have always taken him to be a man of his word. I have no reason to doubt that now and my inference from his statement yesterday was that the letter of resignation from Mr. Grose would be tabled in this House. Now if there are mechanical . . .

MR. SCHREYER: . . . the honourable member saying what commitment I gave, I can quote from Hansard if that will help my honourable friend. My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable member says that I gave a commitment and I am saying that my commitment was conditional and I am prepared to put it on the record.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I accept that, Mr. Speaker. I still say that the First Minister gave a commitment, and if it becomes mechanically and legalistically impossible for him to do so, I'll accept that.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): That's not what he's saying at all.

MR. SHERMAN: But within the context of the situation and the known formalities of procedure in this Legislature and in this province at the present time, I accept the First Minister's undertaking as a commitment.

Now in addition to that, Sir, among the reasons why we're not prepared at this point to accept the report there is the whole matter of the conduct of the two meetings of the Economic Development Committee itself. My colleague from River Heights made the point yesterday about our asking without success that the General Manager and Directors of the Fund be called before the committee. I'm not going to labour that point, it was made at the time very effectively I think, but I would say at this juncture, Sir, that from my recollection of the meetings of the Economic Development Committee, of which I was a member, that we sat there on our side and watched the Member for Crescentwood, the Honourable Member for Crescentwood really emerge as the economic spokesman on the government benches, and we're distinctly unhappy and unimpressed as are, I suggest, many members of the economic community in this province with the prospect that his influence may be considerable in economic and business planning. No one who attended the first meeting of the committee could have missed the significance of the role that the Member for Crescentwood played, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, I would say that it's basically the posture of the Member for Crescentwood that to a not inconsiderable degree prevents my subscribing to the call issued yesterday by my colleague from Lakeside for the resignation of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, because if the situation is bad now, Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of the horrors for our province if the present Minister goes. The problem as I see it, and I think it's rather widely shared at least in legitimate suspicion, that if the present Minister of Industry and Commerce goes we're liable or likely to end up with . . .

A MEMBER: He'll never get the job, that's for sure.

MR. SHERMAN: We're likely or liable to end up with the Honourable Member for Crescentwood as our Minister of Industry and Commerce, which would spell even worse economic doom for the province than already exists.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): He's an economist, you're not.

MR. SHERMAN: So I have -- there are many things that the Member for Lakeside said yesterday which I think had considerable merit and legitimacy, but his call for the resignation of the Minister of Industry and Commerce does not receive my endorsement; I fear for the consequences.

MR. DESJARDINS: Anybody got a pair of rubber boots?

MR. SHERMAN: The biggest reason, Sir, the biggest reason for refusing to accept the report of the committee is the damage that this government has done to the Manitoba Development Fund and the loss now of two top devoted architects of progressive economic development in the Province of Manitoba. It can be said at this point, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction that the fund is dead. The Manitoba Development Fund is dead. The Directors have all been changed; the former General Manger has been left under a cloud of suspicion . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: The Conservatives can't pull the strings.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . and the role of the Fund has been changed to one of simply a rubber stamp bankrolling the formation of Crown corporations to change the direction of economic development in Manitoba. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the members on the opposite side . . .

MR. PAWLEY: You forgot that.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . the members on the government side can hoot and holler in as much petulant derision as they care to, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Fund, the Manitoba Development Fund for all practical purposes is dead and you might as well get ready for the funeral. All that it's done -- (Interjection) -- All that it's done is to no avail or consequence for the future and I ask, do these people really, Sir, do they really know what they've done? Do they really know what they're costing us?

Listen to the partial record of the Fund's accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, and I take this from a report that's available to every member of this Chamber. I wouldn't be certain as to how many members have read it but the Manitoba Development Fund record and report for the fiscal year just ended: "Since the start of the corporation on December 15th, 1958" - and I want to put this on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I do fear for the extent to which this report has been read and digested by the government members of this Chamber. "Since the start of the corporation on December 15th, 1958, its chief contribution to the economy of Manitoba has been as follows:

"Several major industries, all new to the province, have through its instrumentality come into being.

"The corporation's borrowers have been responsible for the creation or maintenance of an estimated 6,174 jobs, representing an annual payroll in excess of \$34 million.

"Estimated capital investment resulting from Manitoba Development Fund participation, that is the MDF and borrowers, total \$188,328,412.

"Estimated increased annual factory production and tourist revenue of \$157,726,166 resulting from new facilities provided by borrowers with the financial assistance of the MDF.

"Participation in the financing of 133 new buildings encompassing approximately 3,432,277 feet of space.

"Thirteen loans have resulted in the utilization of approximately 528,900 square feet of formerly vacant buildings now employing approximately 1,074 employees.

"Loan applications of six local community development groups totalling \$184,750 were approved.

"Loans approved for projects in rural Manitoba represented 85 percent of total loans of Manitoba Development Fund and 49 loans totalling \$2,658,020 were approved to assist tourist operators in the province."

Since starting operations on December 15th, 1958, Mr. Speaker, the corporation has approved 417 loans totalling \$147,090,568.

In the report that the General Manager of the Fund, Mr. Rex Grose, himself signs in the publication to which I have made reference, there is a catalogue of the communities in the Province of Manitoba who have benefited and profited as a result of activities and initiatives undertaken by the Manitoba Development Fund. It's not my intention to belabour members of the Chamber with a recitation of that catalogue of place names, Mr. Speaker, because it would take too long. Suffice it to say that it covers something in the neighbourhood, at a random guess I would say, of three dozen or perhaps even close to four dozen individual communities

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) of all sizes in the Province of Manitoba outside the Metropolitan Winnipeg area which have benefited and progressed and profited as a result of initiatives undertaken by the Fund.

Now this is the kind of work, the kind of initiative, the kind of input into this province which I think is in danger of dissipation and disappearance today as a consequence of the attitude and posture and philosophies of the government opposite with respect to the directions that the economy of Manitoba is taking and is intended to take.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, indeed.

MR. PAULLEY: Is my honourable friend knowledgeable as to who first proposed to the Government of Manitoba the establishment of the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just let me say I'm not particularly interested in who proposed it; I'm interested in who did it. Is my honourable friend aware of who did it? Who put the Manitoba Development Fund into operation and who produced the energy and the initiative and the drive for this kind of program? We're willing to take good ideas from you.

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend is asking me a question, I will give him an answer. The government reluctantly did it at the instigation of the former Leader of our Party.

MR. SHERMAN: I haven't finished . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . in this House -- (Interjection) -- You were a babe in arms at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: I haven't finished my answer, Mr. Speaker. I'm prepared to listen to advice and counsel from my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: I haven't finished my answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry may continue.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm prepared to accept advice and counsel from my honourable friend, and I think if, it was his idea to begin with then I'd be the first to say give him credit for it. Take credit for it; go and shout it from the rooftops; I don't care. But why kill it now? That's what you're doing. -- (Interjection) -- You are killing it now; you are killing it now. You're emasculating it; you're effectively destroying it and the member, my good friend the government House Leader knows, Mr. Speaker, that the Fund is dead right now, April 1, 1970. Forget it! Get the flowers.

A MEMBER: April Fools' Day? Is that what this is?

MR. PAULLEY: I think you're all dead over there, particularly from the shoulders up.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in responding to remarks yesterday of the Honourable Member for Morris, the First Minister described them as nonsensical and bordering on the stupid. Well, he's entitled to his opinion but I would ask him, Sir, how much more nonsensical, how much closer to the borders of the stupid were the remarks later in the afternoon of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who displayed in one of his brilliant oratorical tours de force the kind of verbal footwork and vocal sleight-of-hand that we've come to accept in this Chamber now, Sir, as an excellent kind of theatrical performance but one that really smoke-screens the issues of the moment and the issues of the day. In words that are favourites of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources himself, Mr. Speaker, he made an excellent presentation yesterday afternoon, but to quote him: "It just won't wash."

The Minister's speech looked good and it was in fact a first rate theatrical performance as I have said, but in terms of content, Sir, it didn't make much sense. For one thing he challenged the acceptability of some of the statements of the Honourable Member for River Heights among the general membership of the Conservative caucus. I wonder what the Minister's views are with respect to the positions taken on a number of questions in the last - well, particularly the last nine months - but in the last several years by his colleague the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. Does he believe in, does he subscribe to, does he endorse everything that the Honourable Member for Crescentwood has said in the last nine months, and if he does, do all his colleagues? Does the First Minister? Does the Minister of Agriculture? Does the Minister of Cultural Affairs? I suspect the answer to those questions, Mr. Speaker, would be a resounding, collective and unequivocal "no" on the parts of all of them.

So for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to challenge our credibility and our acceptability and our responsibility on the grounds that we don't all always subscribe to all the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) things all the members of our caucus say all the time is utterly ridiculous, is utterly ludicrous and nonsensical and not worthy of consideration in debate. If anyone is talking nonsense, if anyone is on vulnerable ground, it's the member, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- if anyone is talking nonsense and if anyone is on vulnerable ground, Mr. Speaker, it's the member of that splintered, fractured, fragmented group on that side of the House, that divided caucus over there, Mr. Speaker, who stands up and points his finger at this side of the House and says: You're politically confused; you're politically illogical because you don't all agree with all the things that all of you say all of the time. What utter rubbish, Mr. Speaker. He sits there, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, two rows in front of the Member for Crescentwood who goes about the land making all sorts of outlandish, wild, irresponsible charges and statements all over the place, and he has the guts and the gall, Mr. Speaker, to say to us that we are politically illogical because we don't always agree with everything that my colleague from River Heights in a moment of exasperation might have said.

MR. PAULLEY: And that's about 99 percent of the time that he speaks. -- (Interjection)-- Oh, how true you are. I think you've lost the leadership right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: And then, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure it's not the intention of any honourable member to interfere with the Speaker's desperate attempt to hear the contribution of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to this debate.

MR. SHERMAN: And then, Mr. Speaker, there was a reference by my colleague from Lakeside to the diversionary tactics that were employed by the First Minister of this province. Well, I think he's being unjust where the First Minister is concerned. I don't think the First Minister of this province can hold a candle to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when it comes to diversionary tactics and smokescreening and obscuring issues. The First Minister, I submit, Sir, could take some pretty potent and effective lessons from his colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources. The Minister of Mines and Resources gave a tremendous show yesterday. He breathed fire and smoke all over the place, pointed his finger at everybody and he went through the usual dramatic routine that he has now adopted for moments of stress and drama in the House when he's got to obscure the issue and cover it with theatrics, and he ranted and he raved and he charged and he bellowed and he laid down the most effective smoke-screen that he could and he succeeded for about 40 minutes, Sir, in diverting the attention of this Chamber away from the central issue involved. And the central issue is this, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Development Fund has been strangled in its bed by that government; that it's dead, finished, and what that portends for the economy of Manitoba I shudder, Sir, to think.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, there was a question of privilege raised earlier and I had not given my ruling at the time because it appeared to me that the exchange between both sides that transpired had satisfied the member then speaking and others. But at any rate, the question has not been put so I feel it is quite proper for me to raise that matter at this time. I would just like to remind the honourable members of what constitutes questions of privilege, and I would refer them to Citation 113 of Beauchesne and I believe that there is an exceptionally clear definition of this matter: "Members often raise so-called questions of privilege on matters which should be dealt with as personal explanations or corrections, either in the debates or the proceedings of the House. A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy. There are privileges of the House as well as of members individually. Wilful disobedience to orders and rules of Parliament in the exercise of its constitutional functions, insults and obstructions during debate, are breaches of the privileges of the House. Libels upon members and aspersions upon them in relation to Parliament and interference of any kind with their official duties are breaches of the privileges of members, but a dispute arising between two members as to allegation of facts does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege." My hope is that honourable members will be mindful of this citation in the future before resorting to the question of privilege as so frequently has occurred in the past.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I listened with some interest to the last speaker, as did all members of this House, and I would like to take issue with some of the statements that he made. He talked about this government destroying the Manitoba Development Fund and I would like to take the opposite position and suggest to him that what this government

(MR. DOERN cont'd) is doing is making that Fund more effective. I would like to suggest to him that his major points seemed to be - or one of his major points seemed to be that by replacing the Board of the MDF we were in effect weakening the Board. I would like to remind him that some of the Directors of the Board, if my memory serves me correct, have served in that capacity for some nine years. There have been three year terms and some of those members have been reappointed several times, that I think some of the men, and I don't care to deal with personalities here, but I think if you examine the men who have served, and I think served well on that Board, some of them I think are getting on in years and I think there's a real need for some new faces and for some new dynamic business men and people from the academic community and the like to replace them and that is precisely what is being done. I think that the members of the Legislature will very shortly, perhaps even today, be given the list by the Minister of Industry and Commerce of the new people on that Board and I would like very much to hear the personal comments of the members of the Opposition as to their judgment on the ability and the experience of the people who are appointed, because I believe that they will be satisfactory to even the likes of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and his good colleague, the left wing of the Tory Party, the Honourable Member for River Heights.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that was raised again by the Member for Fort Garry was that we were in effect destroying the Development Fund. Well, I think that's totally false. The government is first and foremost expanding the role of the Fund to include Section 2, or Part II of the Act which was called for in the TED Report and which is being acted on by this government, and I think that's one of the major improvements that will take place in the lifetime of this government. The other government took the money of the people of this province, gambled it and had little to show in return. They acquired a certain percentage of jobs, acquired a certain increase in the gross national product or the provincial product, but did they, for example, get a share of the profits? No, of course not; they gave the money and allowed business men to use it. We are going to do something similar, with the very big difference of getting a piece of the action and retaining some of the profits and I think this is a giant step forward compared to my honourable friends who hesitated to do this, who were willing to put in a section in the Act but who were unwilling to act upon it. The same thing was done in terms of a lot of the recommendations of COMEF and TED. They were prepared to hear recommendations but they were not prepared to act on them.

Again on this point of government and administration, this government has changed, as far as I can tell, very few people if any. There have been of recent date one or two resignations, but let me make this point clear that the administration must take direction from the political representatives of the province. There's no question of this. I might point out to my honourable friend from Fort Garry - I think it was before his time - but in Ottawa some 10 years ago or approximately at that point, there was a clash between the Minister of Finance, the Honourable Donald Fleming, and the Governor of the Bank of Canada who was the Honourable James E. Coyne, and in the last analysis, in the last analysis, although the Bank of Canada is relatively an autonomous institution, the Governor had to go.

A MEMBER: The House of Commons did this?

MR. DOERN: And perhaps my honourable friend is right. The Minister suggested the House of Commons dismissed him. I'm not too clear on the details of that but I recall studying that as a case in Economics, and the question is what would happen in the event of a clash? And there was no question whatsoever, that in the event of a top civil servant disagreeing with a Minister, it's not a question of the Minister resigning; it's a question of the top civil servant adjusting to the Minister, or if worst comes to worst, then perhaps that member would have to be replaced or he would resign. There's no question of that.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): . . . a question?

MR. DOERN: Certainly.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is the honourable member saying there was a clash? --(Interjection)
-- With the resignation we just had in the Manitoba Provincial Government?

MR. DOERN: I think that question has already been answered, answered by the Premier. Maybe you could read his comments again. But it would seem to me . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You're making a comment now.

MR. DOERN: . . . it would seem to me that there is a different approach on economic development being taken by this government than the previous government. Surely that's

(MR. DOERN cont'd) obvious. And surely it's obvious that there may be some difficulties in terms of the adjustments of the civil service to that approach. I don't find that unusual; I don't find that wrong and I don't find that difficult to understand. The previous administration carried out their policies and implemented them through the Civil Service of this province and this government is doing the same and has full right and full obligation to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I think if we look at some of the policies, and I don't wish to deal with this in depth at all but the Honourable Member for River Heights has taken great consolation in the fact that there are going to be so many jobs provided or there were so many jobs provided under the administration in which he served, and I say that this ultimately must be boiled down to the question of, "At what cost?" If this government is going to put \$100 million at the disposal of a private corporation and this results in so many jobs and results in so much in the sense of service investment and so much of capital investment and so much in the sense of loans through subsidies, etc., then I think you have to figure out the cost of each job. If it turns out that you're spending ten or twenty, thirty, forty or fifty thousand dollars to provide a job, then it seems to me that one might question whether the investment is in fact worth it.

This government that preceded us spent a great deal of time, led by my honourable friend and his symbolic drummer, in creating an aura of hoopla in providing dinners and whistles and banners, and I think in terms of real economic development accomplished far less than the previous Minister himself believed. Mr. Speaker, in short I would simply say this, that rather than destroying the Manitoba Development Fund, which is the ridiculous proposition put forward by the Member from Fort Garry, this government is improving it. The New Democratic Government is first and foremost appointing a new board which I think will have some fresh approach and will have some new faces and some new dynamic younger business men on it. There will also be, much to the surprise of our honourable friends opposite, some reappointments on that particular board. Secondly, the Manitoba Development Fund will be expanded into equity which was one of the main recommendations of the TED Report. And third and finally, I think that they will make better investments and more careful investments than some of those made by the previous administration.

In a central part of the TED Report there was a call for a certain number of steps to be taken and certain groups and a certain approach that would be -- for instance I could enumerate some of these points that were suggested in the TED Report. There was a suggestion of a Standing Committee on Economic Development. Now we have only begun. My honourable friends are worried that we haven't done all the things that were already -- we haven't revamped a new economic policy and so on. That's primarily the responsibility of the government, but that committee was established, and although a beginning was only made, I think that that committee will continue to work. My honourable friends didn't appoint that committee. Secondly, there was a call for an Advisory Council on Economic Development and that has been established by this government, and other suggestions. A Manitoba Investment Corporation was suggested and I think that the government has suggested that the MDF will play that kind of role. The only suggestion that I understand hasn't been carried out out of five central points -- and the Honourable Minister may say something on this at a later date -- out of five key suggestions is the suggestion of an office of Manitoba Economic Affairs in Ottawa where senior personnel would work in Ottawa to attempt to get contracts and get information for Manitoba businessmen, etc.

So, Mr. Speaker, when you add it all up and you listen to the comments of some of the members opposite, you can see that their position cannot be substantiated and that this government rather than harming the Fund is expanding the Fund and improving its role in the economic development of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to say a few things on this motion. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to recall the fact that today is April 1st and today is April Fool's Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There was a motion to adjourn. Now I . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the member making some comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this morning the Detroit Red Wings announced that after many years of service, something like 22 or 24 years of service, that Gordie Howe was leaving the Red Wings. The reason given was that they were not impressed by the way that Gordie Howe skated, and after these many years of service and having received all of the accolades that are possible in the National Hockey League and the esteem, receiving the esteem of most people in the public and probably the antipathy of many of his enemies, Gordie Howe when questioned said that in fact he was not fired, he quit his job, and the reason he quit was that he found it difficult to keep up his scoring record now that his skates had been taken away from him by the club.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what happened to one of the top civil servants in Canada yesterday. This is what happened to Rex Grose yesterday. Yesterday should have been April Fool's Day and not today, because Rex Grose was the Gordie Howe of the industrial development world. -- (Interjection) --

MR. WEIR: Not with you to give him a game . . .

A MEMBER: Don't lose your cool.

A MEMBER: Now now, nobody checking in there, Walter.

A MEMBER: I think it's a serious matter.

A MEMBER: What? Gordie Howe?

MR. CRAIK: They don't think it's serious, Mr. Speaker, they don't think it's serious.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Gordie Howe's had 24 years, that's enough.

MR. CRAIK: It is simply a clinical matter. The Minister of Mines and Resources, the House Leader showed us yesterday that the severing of the umbilical cord of a civil servant is a very clinical matter; you just go snip and that's it.

But let's, Mr. Speaker, look at the record that has been achieved by the man that I refer to, the man who members of the Economic Development Committee wanted called before the committee but who was not called before the committee. First of all, let's look at the development of Manitoba and the situation that has been over the years. Mr. Grose was brought to the Manitoba Government by a previous administration, the Liberal administration in 1940. He left the service of the Manitoba Government not as indicated by the First Minister yesterday when the Conservatives came to power, he left the services of the Manitoba Government during the tenure of the former Liberal government in the spring of 1958 and he returned to the Manitoba Government at some time upwards to a year later in the employ of the Manitoba Government with the elected party in power being Conservative.

Yesterday, we saw the first Minister made the statement here that this was quite a normal procedure for heads to roll when governments change, heads of civil servants, and he pointed to Mr. Grose as a prime example. It was either a misstatement or it was either deliberately, or non-deliberately, but it wasn't correct information. Mr. Grose returned to the employ of the Manitoba Government when he could see an opportunity to promote his long termed dream of greater economic development for the Province of Manitoba. If you go down and look at the various provinces, Manitoba was one of the first provinces that ever set up a development fund. Probably because it wasn't a "have" province. It had come out of a drought period following the boom of the twenties and the depression of the thirties, the war years when everything was active, the forties and fifties when Manitoba was at a relative standstill, and came into the late fifties with industrial development now having an opportunity to catch on.

He came in with the former Premier, Duff Roblin, who gave him the fresh air where he could actually employ and put to work many of the ideas which have led to industrial development in Manitoba. It's probably not a coincidence that the only other province at that time that had a development fund, or established one at about the same time, was the Province of Nova Scotia which was also in an area of Canada which was relatively not a "have" province. Other provinces have followed suit. The Ontario government has established a Fund since that is designed and patterned after the Manitoba Development Fund. Saskatchewan has done the same in recent years and Alberta has one that is somewhat similar although not the same as Manitoba's.

Now in the course of this Rex Grose picked up along the way for this province in 1964 a designation awarded by an international group for industrial development. This is not an award that is easy to come by. I imagine that many of the people in this Chamber may have well been at the presentation that was made by this predominantly American group for his efforts in industrial development, and about a year ago, a year and a half ago, Mr. Grose personally

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) was awarded by the all-Canadian group as being the top industrial developer in Canada.

Not only this, Mr. Speaker, the former head of the Economic Council of Canada referred to this man as the most dynamic industrial developer in all of Canada. And this is the person that we so easily and glibly shall dismiss from the service of Manitoba, or as the First Minister says, that this man sees fit to resign, with the only accolade that the First Minister could give him, the best accolade he could give him was that he thought he was a man of integrity. So he tied the CFI can to Rex Grose and said "thanks." And that effectively is what the First Minister did yesterday, a smashing thanks for a lifetime career devoted to the Province of Manitoba. "I think he was a man of integrity," and then promptly set about to associate him with everything he did not like about CFI agreements, making no reference specifically to the fact of what was in Mr. Grose's resignation, and now it does not appear likely that he wants to actually file the letter of resignation although he indicated yesterday to the House that he was in agreement with doing this and he indicated on the radio this morning that he was in agreement with filing the resignation of Mr. Grose.

And I think that we should have that to set the record clear, because, Mr. Speaker, the only reasons that we can legitimately take are the ones that are stated by one person outside this Legislature who said the three reasons for Mr. Grose's resigning were, first of all, harassment of the Fund; the political pressure to make basic political decisions in regard to a loan to a manufacturing company in the Greater Winnipeg area; and the fact that in his estimation the government was entirely overlooking the fact that the Board had made good and prudent decisions during their tenure on the Board and were being dismissed under a cloud and a new board brought in.

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask a question at this point? The honourable member is saying that we are dismissing the Board under a cloud. Does he realize that we have extended their term once and that this is their normal term of expiry?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this is just like the statement yesterday that was made by the First Minister and by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when they mounted the chorus that this government has not acted on the TED Report and therefore was not in a position to make reference to the TED Report and therefore there was no case. The TED Report, as I recall, was filed in April of 1969; the government changed hands in July of 1969. What a valid case. And now the First Minister makes the case that the Board's appointments were renewed at one time to bring them up to March 30th or whatever it is.

Now, we also find out upon questioning that neither the Minister of Industry and Commerce nor the First Minister has ever met with the Board. They don't know whether they are a good Board or not. Well, if you have nothing to go by except the Board's record, you can have nothing but admiration for the Board, and unless there is something that he has gained from personal interview or some personal dissatisfaction as First Minister, how can he legitimately criticize the Board as not being an effective Board in the interests of economic development in Manitoba. Was their growth too crude? Is this what he is saying? It has been the most effective development fund in the history of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on the topic of the TED Report, I want to refer to a statement that's in here. One of the concerns that was held by the TED Commission and possibly was held by Mr. Grose - he may have well been the person who wrote a great deal of this, I don't know, it's just possible - but he states, "Concern arises from the presence, although far from universally, of a nagging attitude of provincialism, inward-looking, fault-finding, querulous turn of mind and spirit linked with complacency among some, and with indifference and hostility among others." And that is exactly what this government is guilty of, and the First Minister, of all people, stands here and worries about the fact of these scurrilous rumours that are going round about Churchill Forest Industries and in the next turn is doing it himself. He is worried about the scurrilous rumours regarding Churchill Forest Industries and yesterday, by implication, tried to tag an aspect of CFI on to an outgoing civil servant.

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. CRAIK: And this gentleman, the First Minister, is the most guilty party in Manitoba of starting scurrilous rumours about CFI. Beginning with today he made the statement in The Pas that this was the blackest day in Manitoba's economic history. It wasn't the blackest day but it led up to the blackest day which was yesterday. From there on in that set the stage but good. What does he expect other than scurrilous rumours surrounding CFI?

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) The First Minister is as guilty of this turn of mind that is referred to in here as any member sitting on the government side of this House. This is one of the darkest days, Mr. Speaker, in the history of Manitoba. It is the darkest period and the member from Fort Garry is absolutely right and I agree with him. You have before you the possibility of having killed the Manitoba Development Fund.

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): It's a pretty black day when you lift the veil of secrecy over a deal like CFI, isn't it?

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): When you get rid of Rex Grose that's the blackest . . .

MR. MACKLING: No, that's what you are trying to say.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I might ask you in all objectivity I think, what would be the position of the International Development Bank, IDB, if it was in the position of having undergone the political harassment that has been undergone by the Manitoba Development Fund. Beginning when my honourable friend was in opposition, there were continual deliberate attempts to implicate the Fund as being one which was against the basic principles of democracy because they held in private, or secret, basic information which in his estimation should be public.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you, for any borrower going to any place where he could borrow money, bank or fund or whatever else it would be, does he not ask for a certain degree of privacy? Does he want to go to the political market - does he want to go to the political market to borrow his money? That is what is basically at question. This is basically the position that has been taken by the government on this side, that it is a relatively private matter. There is a degree of disclosure which is much greater than private banks or a degree of disclosure which is much greater than the IDB, but not the degree of disclosure that they have claimed should exist. But what has been attempted to do, Mr. Speaker, has been to take the degree of privacy that has been demanded by the former government surrounding the Fund to turn it to their purpose to show that there is something wrong in the loans that have been made to the likes of CFI.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable member a question if he'll permit me. Is the honourable member aware of any firm that resisted taking money from the Manitoba Development Fund because it was a public fund, or is he aware of any that would resist?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I could tell you of -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I can tell you of private companies . . .

MR. GREEN: Before the honourable member answers . . .

MR. CRAIK: No, let me finish. I know what you're going to ask so at least let me finish. If you think those people are going to come down here and make a statement you're wrong.

MR. GREEN: Well is the honourable member aware that one of the Development Fund's requirements, and I'm not listing this generally, but one of the things that they like to require in lending money to a private lender is that he not use the fact that he got the money from them to advertise the fact that he has a good credit rating because he got money from the Manitoba Development Fund, that this is something that the borrower wants, not that he dislikes. And that's part of the contract.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member let me finish. Let's not go down the sidetrack. The point I'm trying to make is that in the operation of the Manitoba Development Fund, and in the operation of any Board to which you're going to delegate responsibility, you have to put a certain degree of faith and trust in the people to which you delegate that responsibility and you have to assume -- you know that the elected official in the ultimate is responsible, but the public also recognizes the fact that the elected official has the power to delegate responsibility, has the power to delegate responsibility whether that power of delegation is the Manitoba Hydro or whether it is the Manitoba Hospital Commission, which can waste \$10 million and you wouldn't even know it. It depends on who you appoint on there - or the Manitoba Development Fund who is dealing directly in dollars - and this is what my honourable friends absolutely refuse to do.

MR. WEIR: Hire the private accountants.

MR. CRAIK: This is, Mr. Speaker, the stage that we're at now. We have hung a cloud, we've tagged with the CFI can a top civil servant in putting the government almost in the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) position to where they'll look justified providing in fact that they can find something wrong, and they're in the very embarrassing position of being in the government and doing it.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they've also put themselves in the position of now having eliminated all outside auditing from the Manitoba Development Fund. They now have put themselves in the position where the party, or group that is to audit the Manitoba Development Fund, is put in a line function rather than a staff function which you normally find auditors in. This isn't true also only of the Manitoba Development Fund but is true of all the other Crown corporations, and I ask you for all the dollars and cents that are involved, the saving, which I would guess is nothing, the saving is absolutely nothing, I would ask you whether this is in the best public interest because it is my firm belief that it is very definitely not in the public interest . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. WEIR: Sit down.

MR. CRAIK: . . . to have a government agency auditing another government agency, particularly . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question on the point that he's just raised insofar as the auditors . . .

MR. CRAIK: I'm not finished that point yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: All right you'll answer it after then.

MR. CRAIK: . . . particularly when they have shown as a government that they really don't believe in boards anyway, that they are going to follow their own philosophy of running everything from the top down - and politically.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question now? He made reference to the provincial auditors and the fact that they are now going to audit the books. Has my honourable friend no confidence in the auditors that were appointed by the previous administration and are competent to audit the books of the Fund?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence in the Provincial Auditor as well as the private auditors who were previously doing the Crown corporations. This is not the point in question though.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that there is. The auditors were appointed by the previous administration.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, is the suggestion in order? Mr. Speaker, the old rooster, the former House Leader, is his suggestion in order?

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. WEIR: You made a suggestion.

MR. PAULLEY: Look, you've still got lots to learn.

MR. WEIR: So have you my friend, and you've been at it longer than I have.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe honourable members are aware that questions are allowed with the approval of the previous participant in the debate, but many speakers are not . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The question was allowed to elicit an explanation of the material that was contained in the speech, not a bunch of new stuff that the honourable friend might intend to throw in.

MR. PAULLEY: You do have a lot to learn my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I've just indicated to the honourable members that mini-speeches are not allowed. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member submit to a question? I'd like to ask two questions in fact. First, he read a quotation about this nagging provincialism and narrow-mindedness and so on. I'd like to ask him first of all who that referred to in the TED Report; and secondly, whether as a result of that there wasn't government action called for and government participation.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know specifically who it referred to but I know who it fits very well.

MR. DOERN: Businessmen, in case you're not aware of the fact.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Honourable Member for Riel, bearing in mind the guidelines of the Leader of the Opposition and staying within them. I'd like to ask the honourable member whether he would confirm or deny that the Federal Government Auditor, Mr. Henderson, does in the normal course of his duties audit the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) accounts of some of the Crown corporations at the federal level.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to either confirm or deny it, but on the same point, I might ask the First Minister if the IDB is put in the political focus that the Manitoba Development Fund is put in.

MR. SCHREYER: I wonder if my honourable friend would care to say whether or not it is not a fact, whether it is not a fact that the Provincial Auditor, Mr. McFee, is a servant of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CRAIK: I'm well aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: You're not aware of it?

MR. CRAIK: I'm well aware of it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, the motion before us has to do with the recommendations that are being submitted by the committee dealing with the rules. When the committee was appointed it was charged with certain duties and I would briefly restate from the report. "The committee was appointed to examine and review the rules, standing orders, practices and procedure of the Assembly, with special reference to improving the functioning of the committee system, expanding the role of the private member and bringing about a closer relationship between the Legislature and the general public, and generally strengthening the role of the Legislature in regard to the executive arm of government." In going through the various recommendations that are being made and contained in the report, I do not intend to dwell on all of them, not by any means, one reason being that I do not intend to support the report as such. Not that it does not contain many good items in it, but I've gained experience from past precedents and past experience that if a report of this type is brought before the House and you approve of it and it might contain certain things that you do not approve, that at some future date it is held against you. I've experienced this in past elections, especially some years ago, and I certainly while opposing the report do not say that I'm not also agreeing to certain other recommendations. But I will be opposing the report for certain reasons, and I want to dwell on these in particular because I feel that some of them are restricting the privileges of certain members of this House.

I should probably go through some of them that I wish to comment on. I feel quite strongly that a certain point has been missed or that the committee should have taken cognizance of, and that is that bills appearing before public committees such as Law Amendments or whatever committee is dealing with certain bills where the public can make representation, that it should be mandatory that such bills are advertised over the news media and that people in the province will know about it. At the present time the press and the news media I think is doing a fair job in advertising this but it's not incumbent upon them, it's not mandatory as far as they're concerned to do this, and I feel that this committee should have brought in a recommendation to that effect, that it be mandatory, that the people of this province be advised when certain legislation is before the public committees, the standing committees of this House that are dealing with the legislation. That is the only time that they can make representation to the committee as such and they should know about it.

Now we find ourselves sometimes pressed for time and it doesn't work out too well, that notice is very short, sometimes only twelve hours or not even that, and therefore some members might feel that by imposing such a matter into the rules that it could work hardship. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that even though there might be hardships on occasion, I still feel that this should be put into the rules and that it should be made mandatory that people in this province would know that such and such a bill or such and such legislation is coming forward and that they can appear at such and such a time. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. DOERN: . . . reading of the bills, after consent of committee.

MR. FROESE: Not necessarily. The Honourable Member for - I forget the constituency - Elmwood mentioned that this can be done at second reading. Well we know from past experience that this is not always done, in fact it's not always mentioned as to what committee the particular bill is referred to. And I think here's another omission that could well stand improvement, that when the bill is referred to a certain committee that the committee be named at the time that the referral is being made.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

I was sorry that I could not attend some of the meetings. I wasn't advised of the first meetings; I was advised of the later meetings and I did attend some of them, but I was avoided of attending the last one because of sickness. But I would have liked to be there when Mr. Rutherford made his presentation to the committee in connection with the regulations, and recommending that the basic principles in connection with regulations be incorporated into our rules. These recommendations are found in the Journals of 1962 on Page 16, and I don't intend to read them, but I think these basic principles are very good indeed and I certainly would endorse that these be placed in the rules so that members would know as to what is governing the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee as to when they go over the regulations and have them checked, as well as the senior law officer, whether they are in line or not.

On another matter dealing with documents being tabled in this House from time to time, these become sessional papers. I would just like to know from the House Leader when he does reply whether -- is there a list or a catalogue of the sessional papers being made annually or not that the members can refer to? I recall wanting to find out -- this is quite some time ago -- in connection with the arrangements that were made by this province in connection with International Nickel at the time that they came into this province. You could find nothing on the statutes. The statutes didn't show, yet some arrangement was being made and naturally you had to refer to sessional papers. But I still failed to find any record as to a catalogue or a list that is available to members that members could check from time to time and check back in order to avail themselves of certain information.

We find that one of the recommendations is that Ministerial Statements and tabling of reports will appear if accepted as an item on the agenda daily. I do not take objection to it, but at the same time I think we could take a recommendation from the federal procedure that we have in some fashion a report of the disposition of all resolutions and questions and so on. I find that the federal House is doing this and certainly this is something worthwhile and I think this is something that we should in some way incorporate into our rules and into our proceedings that we could check back quite readily and get the necessary information when a member is looking for it.

Another matter which I think is of great importance, especially to certain members of this House who do not belong to the recognized political parties of this House, and that is the changing of allocation of time for private members. This is going to be a very considerable change. Presently, Tuesday afternoon and Friday afternoon is being spent on private members' business in this House. From here on, if the recommendations go through, this will be discontinued and we will spend one hour a day on private members' business. This does not only apply to Rule 19 (2) but Rule 26 comes into play as well, which is Item 15 of the Report, and which designates that from here on, if accepted, the members will only have 20 minutes to speak instead of the 40 minutes on private members' business. I do not like this. I think already it's a restriction, it's an inhibiting factor, and therefore I do not agree to the proposal that is being put forward in this way.

Then too, I think it will prevent or bring itself into the situation where less matters will be brought to a conclusion. By setting aside one hour each day this means that probably only one motion will be discussed or just one or two and they might not even be brought to a conclusion and that they then fall to the bottom of the Order Paper for the next round, and in this way, I think we will find that work will be progressing slower instead of faster as far as private members' business is concerned in this House.

Another matter I feel that I cannot support and that has to do with deleting the words "leave of the House to proceed" and inserting the words "the support of the House," which means that you have to have active support to bring a certain matter forward. By asking for leave, this consent, tacit consent may do, but when you have to ask for support of the House, this means that members have to rise and sometimes they may be hesitant to do so. I am sure that the Member for Churchill, myself and probably the Member for St. Boniface, although he is in with the larger group so that this might not apply to him, but certainly this could mean that we might be restricted at certain times in bringing forward certain matters. This has to do with Rule 26 subsection 3 and members can look at it to see whether this is not the case. At least I find it that way and I feel that this is a very great change in my opinion because it no longer means that there need be no objection but you have to have active support and it's a completely different matter from between the two.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

The matter of having amplifying facilities for committee meetings in Room 254 apparently was discussed by the committee and a report was made by the news media, people from the news media. If a report of this type is available I would certainly like to get a copy of it to find just what was reported to the committee on this matter and why certain recommendations are being made the way they are. I think this is Item 22 of the report and there's four sub-headings listed underneath it. I do not intend to go into it any further at this time. I do hope to have further things to say when we deal with the concurrence motion if it does come forward.

Secretarial assistants - and this is spelled with a "t" - are to be provided to the recognized parties. I'm just wondering - there is also mention made, probably as an afterthought, that provision be made for the other members. Is this going to be of the same standard as that being provided for the recognized parties, or will this be more or less an imposition on our part, members of this House that do not belong to the larger parties, that we might have to impose on certain people for certain work done? I would hate to be put into such a position where a certain service was provided for members that are party to a larger group and not have the same service apply to us. I'm happy though that the matter is being considered and that some assistance will be made available in this way, and I do hope the same applies to the matter of research which is also mentioned in the report so that something good can come out of it.

As I said before, these are some objections that I raise and I'll have to vote against the report because of them, because otherwise it can be construed later on that I voted for the report and therefore I endorsed the report as a whole.

On the matter of radio and TV media being used in the House, I think this is a subject in itself that should receive debate and discussion before any action is taken. No doubt it will. I'm not prepared at this time to state my views on it because I would like to know a little more about the discussion that took place in committee and what the effect might be.

So, Mr. Chairman, with these words, I conclude my remarks.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, before the Orders of the Day, just announce to the House. In order that the Members of the Assembly are aware of the activities of the Department of Government Services, I would like to announce to the House that the Government of Manitoba has informally entered into an agreement -- I say informally because the documents have not been processed -- informally agreed with the City of Winnipeg to purchase the Winnipeg Civic Auditorium for the sum of \$1 million for Province of Manitoba use and purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: A question then to the Honourable Minister on the statement. I wonder if he would indicate when possession is to be taken?

MR. PAULLEY: Possession will be taken, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the property is concerned, as the facilities are vacated by the City of Winnipeg. They have commitments at the present time to a considerable portion of the Auditorium, to different groups such as the Arr Gallery, the Museum and other commitments, and the price to be paid to the City of Winnipeg will be contingent on the Government of Manitoba taking over the facility. In other words, it will be on a prorated basis; as also, Mr. Speaker, will be the question of payment of taxes to the City of Winnipeg, prorated as the occupancy is taken by the government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, a supplementary question. Is it likely that the government will take complete possession of the Auditorium within a three-year period?

MR. PAULLEY: The period actually is a two-year period but there is a general understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the commitments presently given by the City of Winnipeg for the use of the facility will be honoured. We're hopeful that the Province of Manitoba will have full

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . possession of the building in a shorter period than the three years referred to by my honourable friend.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder then if the Honourable First Minister would indicate whether there is any other commitment been given to the City of Winnipeg in connection with a convention centre?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the two matters are hardly relevant, one to the other.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question again. They may not be relevant but the Premier is in a position or the Minister of Government Services is in a position to say they aren't. I'm asking whether the negotiations and the finalization of this agreement, that party to this or a portion, or connected with it, is the government's negotiation or involvement with a convention facility in Winnipeg?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say to my honourable friend as far as the announcement that I have just made and the take-over of the Auditorium, has no relationship to a convention centre.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I'd like to ask two questions of the Minister. The first one is: Does the proposed use of the Auditorium fit in with the downtown development plan? And a separate question entirely: Did the Land Appraisal Board have anything to do with the setting of the price of the building? I understand when government makes purchases now of land or real estate or buildings that the Land Appraisal Board is called upon to set an appraised price. Was this done in this case?

MR. PAULLEY: There was consultation, Mr. Speaker, and the agreement will be finalized between the Government and the City and that certainly will be there.

As far as the downtown development is concerned that's a separate matter. The use of the Auditorium is under consideration, will be under consideration of the Government Services Department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech and various other announcements in the House have made it clear that there will be legislation introduced during this session involving the suspension of elections, municipal and . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. After a Minister has made a statement, I thought members had the privilege to question the statement. I had a question to the Minister in connection with the statement he made. Is the building going to be renovated in such a way that it will no longer be suitable for the functions that it has been used for up until now for public meetings and will it just be offices?

MR. PAULLEY: That decision has not been reached - a conclusive decision by the government Mr. Speaker, at this stage. Requests have been made since I -- this matter has been under consideration as to what the future of the Auditorium itself will be and I say to my honourable friend, no firm policy has been arrived at in that regard at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs may continue.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I'd like to ask one further question of the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I had interrupted the Honourable Minister previously to allow the Honourable Member for Rhineland to ask a question in regard to the Minister's statement.

MR. PAWLEY: I believe though, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wishes to address another question to the Minister of Government Services on his statement and if that is the case I'm prepared to yield.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes. My question is going to be directed to the Minister on this particular subject that was raised as a result of his statement. I was going to ask the Minister if the intended use of this building is going to be for, as has been stated previously, for government offices and if that's the case has there been any evaluating of the amount of money that would be required to renovate the place?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention, of course, to use the building for government services in general although not specifically at the present time. It is estimated that a complete renovation for office accommodation over a period of time could conceivably be in the neighbourhood of a million and a half dollars for complete renovations,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) providing it is just turned into office space and other accommodation. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, say to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, and I am sure he would be most interested in this feature of the agreement to be formally entered into with the City of Winnipeg - there is no interest to be charged on the moneys to the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated, the Throne Speech and other announcements have made it clear that legislation will be introduced this session dealing with the suspension of elections within the Greater Winnipeg area in respect to municipal and school divisions. This is in order to permit the restructuring of urban government in 1971.

Municipal officials have indicated recently some concern as to exactly which local authority areas will be included within this suspension of elections. This is the time of year that they are generally involved in the commencing of preparations for enumerating. I would like to indicate at this time that the legislation that will be introduced in this session providing for no elections in the fall of 1970, will be the following: The Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg; the City of Winnipeg; the City of St. Boniface; the City of St. James-Assinboia; the City of St. Vital; the City of East Kildonan; the City of West Kildonan; the City of Transcona; the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry; the Rural Municipality of North Kildonan; the Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan; the Rural Municipality of Charleswood; the Town of Tuxedo; Winnipeg School Division No. 1; St. James-Assiniboia School Division No. 2; Assiniboine South School Division No. 3; St. Boniface School Division No. 4; Fort Garry School Division No. 5; St. Vital School Division No. 6; Norwood School Division No. 8; River East School Division No. 9; Seven Oaks School Division No. 10; Transcona-Springfield School Division No. 12.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): . . . if I may ask a question of the Minister. Included in that list were the R. M. 's of East and West St. Paul?

MR. PAWLEY: Included in the list was the School Division of River East but not the R. M. 's of West St. Paul or East St. Paul.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister in connection with this statement. Does he intend to add the Province of Manitoba to that list?

MR. SCHREYER: For 1970? If my honourable friend is asking about 1970, it's my own personal view that this will be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in connection with his statement that he just made. Will it be optional for other municipalities to make it applicable to them as well?

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

. Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement with respect to the composition of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund as it is constituted as of today, April 1st, 1970. I've just completed a two-hour meeting with the board, and of the board as it is now constituted there are six new members who have been appointed for a three-year term. They replace six board members whose terms expired on March 31st. I want to publicly thank those former members who have served in the past. Mr. D. M. Rodgers, Assistant General Manager of the Manitoba Development Fund, has been appointed as Acting Chairman and Acting General Manager. Mr. D. K. Friesen, President of W. D. Friesen and Sons Limited, Altona, has been re-appointed as a board member, and Mr. A. K. Rogers, President of Canadian Rogers (Western) Limited, Winnipeg, whose term does not expire until next year, will also continue to serve on the board. The new board members are: Mr. Alex Cham, chairman of the board of Cham Foods Limited, Winnipeg; Mr. Hans Denne, Investment Officer with Doherty, Roadhouse and McCuaig Limited, Winnipeg; Mr. David Harding, Secretary-Treasurer of Interprovincial Cooperative Limited, Winnipeg; Mr. Vincent Poloway of Dauphin, a former field supervisor with Manitoba Pool Elevators; Mr. R. A. Kipp, President of Kipp-Kelly Limited, Winnipeg; and Mr. Sid Parsons, President and General Manager of Huggard Equipment Company Limited, Winnipeg. In addition, I would point out at this time, under the Act the government may appoint four more members and it is possible that within the next few weeks we will see fit to announce the appointment of some additional members to the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, if I may, on behalf of the Conservative Party, reply to the statement that was made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I may say that I think we on this side note with interest the change that has occurred in connection with the Manitoba Development Fund, and we're happy now at least that the information is being supplied to us in the Legislature. In the past week, bits and pieces of information on this and other matters appear to be given to some members of the press and seemed to be publicized -- (Interjection) -- Well I frankly do not know who on this side and who on this side, including the Liberals and the Social Credit and including the independents and possibly the Independent Democrat, did know . . . knew about it - I don't know who knew what the government knew. This I don't quite understand. It was published in any case, and I think if I'm correct this probably is the same list that appeared in the paper last night. Now I don't think that's too important. I just say that it's regrettable that it had to be handled this way and it's regrettable again that this information comes out in the way in which it has. Now, may I say a few things about those whose term expires. I'd like to say that I'm aware of the individual. . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I really urge the member that within the limits of a Minister's statement, the practice and the rules are clearly that a Minister makes a statement with regard to a matter of public interest to the House and that each member is not then permitted to debate or to open the issue. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not debating, I'm replying to it; and I wish the Honourable Leader of the House would sit down and allow me to continue.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll sit down. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm not out of order and there is no reason at all for the House Leader to have risen in this case.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was merely making a point which I believe I'm entitled to make, that when a Minister makes a statement the other parties are permitted to then make brief comments on that statement but it is not to be a forum for a debate, a Minister's statement. And if the honourable member was going to limit himself to that definition, then I apologize and sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm certain -- I do hope that all members are aware of the extent to which comments can be made on occasions such as this and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for River Heights will contain himself within those limits.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Before I commence my few remarks, I may say that I regret very much that the House Leader has taken it upon himself to stand up before he even knows what I'm going to say and try to lecture me. I don't need that

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . lecture from him. I have sat in this House and I have heard the Opposition Leaders of the parties stand up and reply to statements by Ministers, and I know that what I am saying is perfectly in order. I'm just as aware as he is of the rules and I think it's time that he learned that insofar as the conduct of the House is concerned, it's up to the Speaker and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member be kind enough to return to his prime purpose for rising to his feet.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, first of all, I would like to on this occasion express the thanks of the members of our party for the years of contribution and service given by those who served on the Manitoba Development Fund. Much of what has been accomplished in Manitoba is due to their efforts and it's regrettable that the new members who have been appointed - and I have no quarrel with their qualifications - have been appointed under, I would suggest for lack of a better word, a cloud of suspicion; a cloud of suspicion which has in fact been developed, not by this side, but by the members on the opposite side when they were both in opposition and now in government. Now no-one, but no-one quarrels with your right to select others for an appointment to a board. No-one quarrels with that.

MR. PAULLEY: Hear, hear.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, that's right. Hear, hear. And no-one is quarreling with that right, and I'm not and no-one on this side is, but the Fund from the moment that you've assumed office has been subject to a political discussion and harassment -- (Interjection) -- It's not argumentative, it's a fact; and it has been subject to that discussion for the months since you've taken over office.

MR. PAULLEY: Keep within the rules, eh?

MR. SPIVAK: And, Mr. Speaker, it was regrettable that the appointments - it was regrettable that the appointments that were allowed to expire, in fact were allowed to expire without an opportunity for a full discussion with either the Premier or the Minister of Industry and Commerce as to the manner and the way in which they operated as a Fund and as a Board of Directors over the past ten years, and it's regrettable as well that those who had given so much of their time and energy for Manitoba were not allowed the opportunity to have appeared before the Standing Committee. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable as well that the appointments that are now being announced come at a time when we have the resignation of the Chairman of the Fund, the former Chairman of the Fund. It's regrettable because, in effect, whether the government wants it to appear this way or not, there is only one conclusion that can be drawn. First, that the Chairman of the Fund resigned for reasons best known to himself. We only have the statements so far of the Premier and they may very well be the correct statements, but we have no statements from anyone else. We do not even see the letter of resignation or have not seen it yet. Secondly, we at this point find that the former members of the Board whose time expired are going to be allowed to leave the Fund and we know that there has never been a full discussion with them.

Now again, I do not in any way want to take away from the credibility or the sincerity or the capability of the people who have in fact been appointed, and I wish them well and I hope that they will be able to continue and do a job that is as good a job as those members who are retiring from the Board of Directors, and I sincerely hope that Mr. Rodgers, whom I have faith in and who I hope will in fact become the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Fund, will be able to continue and do as good a job as Mr. Rex Grose has done. But it is regrettable and it has something which has tarnished, I think, the whole concept of the right of the government to in fact make appointments when appointments expire, that the whole manner in which this announcement, the announcements of Churchill Forest Industries outside this House, the manner in which it has been presented in the House, that all of this takes away from the very real contribution that the men whose terms have expired and Mr. Grose, who has resigned, have contributed to the economic life of this province, and I suggest that a charge can be laid against the government for being extremely inept.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our group I want to thank the Minister for the announcement that he has made today. I think that it was urgent that the names be published so that the whole discussion and the whole cloud that was over the situation be cleared up. I want to say, and quite openly admit, that I am one of the members in this House who frequently has stood in this House and asked questions about the MDF, and I never did so, Mr. Speaker, in

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... any way critical of the individuals. -- (Interjection) -- My friends would like to discuss Grand Rapids and I'll be happy to discuss Grand Rapids. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to stand in this House or outside this House and defend anything that I have ever said because anything I've said I've said in complete earnestness in the interests of Manitoba. And those questions that I asked in the past were not critical of the individuals concerned in any way, and I want to say that I think that the individuals on that Board undertook a most difficult task. We owe them thanks for the hours of work which they put into it and the devotion to the problems of Manitoba unpaid by the province. They did their job and I don't question the individuals at all. I think that Manitobans do owe them a debt of gratitude, and this goes as well, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say it now although I was going to say it in another debate, regarding Mr. Rex Grose. I've known the gentleman for many years and I know how hard a worker he is. I don't think we could have found a more devoted and hard-working individual than Rex Grose. Hours didn't mean a thing as far as he was concerned. He was devoted to his work and we certainly thank him for that. I don't want to enter into the reasons for his departure; I presume that we will be getting the letter the Premier has promised and we can discuss it at that time, but we certainly owe him thanks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are told the new members of the board. They are facing a difficult task as well, and I would say to the government that one of the problems, it seems to me, in this whole situation has been the secrecy surrounding the operation, and this was undoubtedly one of the difficult things that the previous board laboured under and which this new board will also labour under unless there is a change made in the whole structure. I can see no reason why there shouldn't be openness.

Mr. Speaker, I am a businessman. That was my occupation before I became full-time in politics. I'm now no longer full-time in politics and back in business. I see no reason why, if I were to obtain a loan from the government, that I would have any objection to having that known. I don't consider that it's in any way detrimental to my business operations to know that the government has sufficient faith to be involved with me in a business venture. In fact I would prefer to have it known. I see in the papers regularly, Mr. Speaker, that there are statements made regarding the grants, for example, that are made under the federal programs, straight grants to enterprises. There were a whole list just last week and that's no shame to the corporations that got them. I see no reason. And so I say to the government now that if these members are going to be given a chance to operate properly, I think, and that the discussions that have gone on in the House -- I think it's unfortunate that it did go on but I don't think anything else could be done in the way the thing was being handled and I don't think it helped the operations of the Fund, I agree to that. I think it was unfortunate for the members but I think it was the Act that was wrong. That's why I spoke here on many occasions in the past for a change in that Act for openness. So I ask the government now, give these people a chance to do their operations. In fact, maybe we should ask them to appear before one of our committees and discuss with them this whole question of openness. And let's do it openly. I agree with what the Minister said, or the past Minister, regarding having the previous board appear before the Economic Committee. These people have a contribution to make and I think we should hear from them. In the meantime, I wish these gentlemen the very best of luck. I know a good number of them personally. I have faith in them and I think they'll do a job for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to comment very briefly. First of all, as has already been done by other speakers, I certainly want to thank those members of the board who no longer will be serving and who have given years of service to this province and on this board. Having been involved in a credit institution myself I can well appreciate the work that they've done and sometimes the anxiety that they might have had. This applies to the former Chairman of the Board as well. I'm sure I do not know Mr. Grose as intimately as some of the other members do because they have been in closer association with him, but I too would like to personally thank him for the work and the devotion to the cause that he has shown over the years.

Then, too, I think congratulations should be in order to those people who are now appointed as the new board to work with the Fund. I do not know all of them. I do know some of them; in fact I've worked with one of the individuals for some years in a credit granting institution on a credit committee so I have a good knowledge of his workings and his understanding, and I'm sure that as such he will be an asset to the new board. Then, too, we find that there are some members who were on the previous board are re-appointed and I am sure that they

(MR. FROESE cont'd.).... will also be a great asset to the new board as such. Certainly I wish them well and I hope that the Fund as such will be a success in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I was unable to catch your eye when the report of the Rules and Standing Orders Committee was received. By leave, I would like to introduce a motion now, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that the report of the Special Committee of the House appointed to examine and review the...

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of just what we are discussing at this point.

MR. FOX: Well, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, when a report is received, normally in the case of rules it has to be discussed by this House and a motion in order to have that done has to be introduced. I was unable to catch your eye for the moment and that is why I am asking leave to have that motion made now. The motion would only deal with the fact that at a later date we would go into a Committee of the Whole and deal with the recommendations of the Rules Committee, and then make any suggestions or amendments to them in order to be brought to the House to be dealt with. That is the motion I wish to make, Mr. Speaker. That is the point of order I am speaking on.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: We give leave.

MR. WEIR: Leave granted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I move, seconded by the Member for Crescentwood, that the report of the Special Committee of the House appointed to examine and review the rules, standing orders, practices and procedures of the Assembly, be referred to the Committee of the Whole for the consideration and thence report to the House for final adoption.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, may I now go back to the first report that was presented by the Minister of Labour and ask a further question of him?

— (Interjection) — I would direct this question to the Minister of Government Services then. With respect to the statement made that the province was taking over the Auditorium from the City of Winnipeg, is the province willing to negotiate with other municipal corporations throughout the province for the purchase of auditoriums in the various municipal corporations?

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, knows of any municipality that would like to negotiate with the Department of Government Services or the province, they only have to ask us and we will give the matter our consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the Honourable Minister with respect to the same matter. Can the Minister be in a position to give the House information or the name of the firm that prepared the cost study in respect to renewal and rehabilitation of the Auditorium renovation before it can be used for offices.

MR. PAULLEY: At the present time there has been no outside organization that has forwarded any estimates. The Department of Government Services and members of the staff of the Government Service Department gave me an approximation of renovation costs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he could tell us whether the City of Winnipeg in selling the Auditorium advertised in accordance with its policy so that it would secure the expressions of interest and the best possible price for the Auditorium.

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable member is addressing her question to the wrong party. Maybe she would like to communicate with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge - a supplementary?

MRS. TRUEMAN: I had a feeling that they might have to have the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in this case, but perhaps I will redirect my question then to the Honourable Minister of Government Services. Did they advertise for expressions of interest and the best price for this parcel of land?

MR. PAULLEY: I am not aware as to how the City of Winnipeg conducts its affairs. I

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . believe that by and large they are fully capable people in general, not entirely in some respects, but this is a matter which should be directed to possibly the Council of the City of Winnipeg and its Aldermen and its Mayor.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Honourable Minister of Labour if he would care to repeat in the House today the statement that he appeared to have made outside the House yesterday relating to minimum wage, having refused to give the statement in the House before the Orders of the Day yesterday.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour made no statements in respect of the minimum wage outside of the House different than the one that he made inside of the House, to the effect that I hope to make a statement in the House this week, or early next week, in respect of minimum wages, and I think if I were as picayune like some, I would have on Orders of the Day asked the press to extend an apology to me because I did not talk to any member of the press in respect of any precise figure for a minimum wage advance.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Minister is denying the press story that I'm -- the statement that was really attributed to my friend yesterday.

MR. PAULLEY: There are lots of things appearing in the press that are attributed to many members of this House as my friend is well aware. I made no statement to the press in respect of any precise figure for the minimum wage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is in the nature of a supplementary to the Minister of Government Services having to do with the purchase of the Auditorium by the Provincial Government. Does the purchase of the Auditorium and its additional space reflect a natural growth in services or just a growth in government bureaucracy?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't think that is a pertinent question. My honourable friend is aware that there is growth in civil service due to the fact that this Assembly agreed in part to take over Medicare and other services as well. My honourable friend knows that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that you recognize the Honourable Member from Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Government Services -- or two questions. First, will special security measures be taken to secure this building and its grounds during the Lennon visit and other activities during the summer? That's the first question.

MR. PAULLEY: I am not sure whether Lennon is coming to Manitoba or not, and I am sure that whenever necessary, no matter who comes, even the member from Wolseley, we may even have to put on extra security guards if he comes down there and I wish that he would.

MR. CLAYDON: My second question, Mr. Speaker -- and I'd like to preface this slightly -- is that the Mounted Police are known throughout the world, and as we expect tourism here this summer I am wondering if the Minister of Government Services would tell us if a Red Coat will be on duty at this building during the period of Centennial activities for the purpose of photography by tourists. This is done in Ottawa and I am wondering can it not be done here.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . akin to the matter, Mr. Speaker, may I inform my honourable friend as we have just -- well not really taken over occupancy at all, I would suggest that as a member of the City of Winnipeg -- (Interjection) -- Oh, are you talking of this building? Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my honourable friend. I must say we have not thought of this but I appreciate the suggestion of my honourable friend and will take it under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, as a result of an earlier reply of the Minister of Government Services, might I ask if it is a fact that the present Auditorium is going to be used for administrative offices of the medical care organizations?

MR. PAULLEY: It could conceivably be, but I doubt it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate to the House if there is an improved "don't produce" program on the part of the Federal Government as a result of his visit to Ottawa?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I might say that the Department of Agriculture has undertaken to survey Manitoba's situation with respect to how it would be affected by the wheat inventory reduction program and we have some very interesting statistics which could be made available to members opposite if they so choose, indicating that - I think we assumed a lot of this at one point - that Manitoba has indeed made a substantial adjustment in its wheat production over the last two years and that we likely will be making a further adjustment in the current year. The indicators show that our wheat production will be down to about 1.8 million acres in Manitoba. This is down from 2.5 last year and last year was substantially down from the year before. There was a total of a 26 percent reduction in 1969 from wheat, of which 19 percent went into summerfallow and of which 7 percent went to other crops, the 19 and 7 giving you a total of 26 percent shift. So it does illustrate very plainly the fact that Manitoba farmers made substantial adjustments last year and the year before.

This is one of the points that I raised with the Minister in charge of wheat yesterday, to point out to him that his particular program, while it is designed to reduce inventory and designed to bring that reduction down to a level of one year's supply, that in effect Manitoba doesn't really fit into the picture because it is very doubtful whether we in this Province of Manitoba have much more, or will have much more than one year's supply of wheat on hand next August, so that in essence the program hardly is applicable to the Province of Manitoba.

There are a number of other points that I think are very interesting and that is that it is doubtful from our point of view, and this is something that I expressed to the Minister yesterday, that the program indeed will get off the ground based on the kind of incentive that is built into the program, that to expect people to withdraw land from production is a difficult task even with an incentive, but if the incentive isn't substantial enough then I think it is a gesture that perhaps won't work, and my suggestion was that if they maintain their policy, if they don't shift from that position, that they should at least consider a substantially upward revision of the incentive portion, that \$6.00 an acre is certainly not sufficient to (a) cover costs, and (b) allow for one's bread and butter for a year.

One of the key questions which I think is of concern to the farmers of Manitoba is the question of the changes in the quotas that have been announced in conjunction with the program. I did get clarification of that point, and that really the elimination of the unit quota for example was sort of incidental or coincidental to the wheat inventory reduction program but really not part and parcel of it. I took some pain to point out that this will have a very detrimental effect to the income position of the farmers of Manitoba, recognizing that we have a lot of farmers that are mixed farmers, a lot of farmers that are small farmers, and that the unit quota does mean something very substantial to them, and that as far as Manitoba was concerned we couldn't see where we could accept this kind of proposal without some alternate solutions to offset the situation or the effect.

And I want to say that the hearing was very sympathetic. We had a very long discussion on the points raised, one of them being, of course, the fact that because of Manitoba's substantial summerfallow acreage that we really would be discriminated against through this program and that consideration might be given to allow, for quota purposes and payment purposes, the idea of going back or using either of the option of 1968 as a base year, 1969, recognizing the substantial shift which took place in 1969.

But by and large my position was that we expressed a great deal of concern that this is not something that is most desirable for the Province of Manitoba and the hope that the Federal Government before very long would see fit to make adjustments, either in the program or other adjustments, to make sure that Manitoba's best interests are looked after. And to that of course I naturally didn't expect a flat answer yes or no, but I want to indicate that the hearing was sympathetic and I am hopeful that the Minister in charge of wheat, and indeed the Minister of Agriculture when he consults with the Minister in charge of wheat, that they will take recognition of Manitoba's peculiar position and how this program will indeed affect our position.

Now I anticipate that at some point, and I would hope that in the month of April, long before our farmers start getting into the fields, that Ottawa will have considered fully representations that have been made not only from Manitoba but from other areas of farm organizations, and that they are indeed flexible enough to accommodate certain situations that appear inequitable, and that perhaps we may have some further discussions sometime this month to clarify what our position is and what should be recommended to the farm community of this province.

I think that members opposite will agree with me, and after they see some of the

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)... statistics, that that is the only position that Manitoba can take, notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Government has indicated that other measures are going to be introduced. Now this is one of the points that I think is very important. They are talking in terms of a broad approach to agriculture in Canada as a whole, a complete shift in policy, or maybe the development of policy for the first time if you want to be quite truthful about it, and that they will be introducing measures from time to time that will more fully deal with all problems related to agriculture and that this is merely one measure of a number of measures that will be forthcoming.

I want to say that my position in Ottawa was that while I appreciate the difficulties they are having with surpluses in grain production and I appreciate the need for some action, that I would hope that where their program may be detrimental to certain areas because of their peculiar circumstances, that these other measures that they are talking about would be implemented to offset these detrimental effects whatever they may be from area to area, region to region, and that we have a more comprehensive approach to the over-all question of the economic crisis on the prairies and that the government of the prairies be more adequately, more fully consulted and long in advance of any announcement of any other measures.

MR. WATT: I risk a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Minister for his statement and for his speech on agriculture. I ask him if he could supply Opposition or this party members with a copy of the submission that he made to Ottawa if such a submission was made; and I ask him a further question, Mr. Speaker, before he gets up to reply. Is the Minister still satisfied that the Federal Government, after a meeting in Ottawa yesterday, is still satisfied that the Federal Government's policy recently announced is a step in the right direction insofar as it applies to the Province of Manitoba?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to go back a long long way, a long long way, because my honourable friends opposite seem to insist, seem to insist that the Province of Manitoba has endorsed certain ideas or certain programs, which is indeed not the case. I think that I have to say, and I repeat it again, that the whole question of bringing production much more in line with market capability is a reasonable question to be asked and to be put and to respond to, and it's a reasonable approach, Mr. Speaker, to expect that we ought to gear our production in all commodities more to what the market will accept. That in itself is a very logical and ideal goal, and only a good system of market intelligence will eventually help us to key that in. -- (Interjection) -- It certainly was. I want to remind my honourable friends opposite that I had accused them, when they were on this side of the House, that they had done very little in the development of national agricultural policies and had done very...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I'm certain the Honourable Minister well appreciates that this is not the time to make statement which would tend to provoke debate.

MR. WATT: A further supplementary question, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I ask the Minister, did he not indicate in his first speech under my first question, did he not indicate to the House that the Province of Manitoba was now doing what the federal policy says we must do?

MR. USKIW: I never indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba was doing what the Federal Government suggested we must do.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the practice has been that on a Ministerial statement which -- I'm not quite certain whether this in fact was or not. I take it that in a sense it was, because the Honourable Member for Arthur put a question re some activities and....

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared to put aside our opportunity to comment on the statement if we'd get an answer from the Minister as to whether or not he would be prepared to give us copies of the presentation he made at Ottawa, which was really one of the questions my colleague asked that was ignored entirely.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to say that a paper that I have before me here was the basis of all discussion. They were notes that I was using. We had a very free exchange of ideas and it was not done in a formal way with a formal presentation. As my honourable friends know, that isn't the case.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that we have heard that there is over a billion bushels of wheat in storage, was the Minister aware before he went to Ottawa that there is approximately 75 million

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.)... bushel of wheat in storage in the Province of Manitoba on the farms?

MR. USKIW: Well, I didn't take the trouble to count the kernels, Mr. Speaker, but I'm aware that there's an overabundance of wheat in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'm very sorry to hear that the Minister says that he did not go there with a document of at least some sort, but my question is at this time: Can he give us any indication as to what the new federal incentives might be?

MR. USKIW: What the new federal incentives would be? Well, I don't know. I think I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister in Ottawa was not in a position to say yes, no or otherwise, but he gave me a very sympathetic hearing, recognizing that Manitoba is somewhat in a peculiar position, but I don't think that you or anyone should expect that on a moment's notice a person who is being presented with a submission or a question is going to respond one way or the other. I think we have to give them time to respond.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table the 9th Annual Report of the Manitoba Water Supply Board, and the Annual Report of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources for the year ending March 31, 1969. Copies of those reports have been circularized to all of the members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would also like to clarify an exchange that took place yesterday between the Honourable Member for Arthur and myself, and, as is sometimes the case, there is a little bit of right and a little bit of wrong on both sides, and I'd just like to clarify the situation.

A lease was granted to the oil company in question, Samadan Oil of Canada, on June 14, 1968 by the previous administration, and that lease gave the oil company in question the exclusive right and privilege to drill for, mine, remove and dispose of oil and natural gas, and the land that is referred to is contained in the legal description of the lease. And then in the lease there was an additional clause, and I believe it may have arisen - I'm not sure of this - from the experience that my friend referred to in Oak Lake: "Notwithstanding anything contained herein, without the prior consent of the Minister drilling on these lands will not be permitted except during the months of December, January and February." In other words, during the months of December, January and February, drilling could be permitted without the consent of the Minister and the lease grants them power to drill. However, my honourable friend is correct; having the lease gives them the right to drill, and provided that they follow all requirements they are entitled, as a right, to a licence but they did have to apply for a licence this December. They applied through the normal channels, satisfied requirements, and by the way satisfied the pollutional requirements of the department, and were granted a licence which is what they were entitled to under the lease.

Now I did indicate yesterday that I thought that they didn't need anything more than the lease. I was incorrect, and I thought that -- when I found out about it was when they took the extra pollutional requirements. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't nearly as instrumental as I thought I was. They had taken these pollutional requirements when they applied for the licence. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, I indicated to my honourable friend - and I will be discussing it further in the House - I have taken action in this connection and I believe that I will have an encouraging announcement to make with regard to the fact that leases such as the kind that I now referred to, and the possible damage that people fear and which I'm not at all sure is present, will have some modification.

MR. WATT: I thank the Minister for his statement, and since I believe it was a statement if I could just comment. I won't ask any further questions at this time but I would say that when his estimates come up that we will be discussing this particular situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a short statement regarding the booklet tabled in the House on drug abuse last evening. This comprehensive booklet called "Drug Abuse" was produced by the Department's Education section. . . .

MR. WEIR: On a point of order. Apparently the booklet was tabled during the estimates. The Minister's estimates are still before the House and I would think that the proper time for him to make his statement would be during the estimates.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to members opposite that I would have the additional volumes of the Crippen Report available. Now what I would like them to do - and I

(MR. GREEN cont'd.).... ask the indulgence of the honourable members; I have one series of copies for each of the two official parties in the House but there will be copies available in the library - I would really appreciate it if they would take them, peruse them, see whether they really want them duplicated - I don't think they will - and if they don't, give them back. If they do want them duplicated, let me know and then I'll see what position the government will take.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, does that mean that the information will not be available to me?

MR. GREEN: It's in the library.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I must register my protest at this time because if information is available to other caucuses, I think the same information should be made available to other members, not by way of library because the information might not be there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I believe if the honourable member wishes to raise a grievance there is an opportunity of doing so.

MR. GREEN: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that to follow my honourable friend's logic, I would have to have 57 copies or at least one for every MLA in the House. Now the material will be public and I assure my honourable friend that it will be available to him. The only problem I'm asking him to deal with is one which is very close to him and that is the question of money, and I don't wish to duplicate them even for the official parties.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I still maintain and I want to register my protest; I don't accept the Minister's statement that he has to provide 57 copies because the precedent has been established over the years that copies will be made available to the different caucuses.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do not believe that this is the proper time to debate that issue.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, surely....

MR. SPEAKER: And I'm not going to engage in a debate with any members of the House.

MR. WEIR: On the point of order, if I may, which I believe we're discussing, I think that it would be true to say that the Minister made a statement. He made a statement in which he suggested a means of procedure by other members of the House, and it's quite acceptable to our group and I don't wish to participate by following with a statement. I think maybe, though, that somebody else that isn't being represented by us might be given the privilege of the House to make a statement in reply to the Minister's statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, I have already raised objection to this and I wanted to be on record that I do protest this type of tabling of reports where information will not be available to all members of the House, and when the Minister states that copies will be available in the library, this is not fact because I've gone to the library on different occasions and asked for copies of reports that were outstanding, that were out, and you could not get the information, so that the statement made by the Minister does not hold true and the information is not always available to members. And the second point, that precedent has been established long ago that information is made available to all the different caucuses.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have some further questions. I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Did the government provide legal aid to the people charged in the recent Shakespeare court case?

MR. MACKLING: I don't recall whether they were under legal aid or not. I can make inquiry and advise.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then. Is it government policy to provide legal aid in appeal cases as well?

MR. MACKLING: Yes. Some cases where they're indictable offences, the legal aid is provided up to the Supreme Court.

MR. FROESE: A further question, probably not directly related to the previous one. Why is one Gerald B. Hart refused such service? Does it mean that cases have to be favourable to the government in order to get legal aid or is each considered on their own merits.

MR. MACKLING: The basis of legal aid in the Province of Manitoba as conducted by the Law Society, is that the Government of the Province of Manitoba, as did the former administration, supply government moneys to assist in that program, but the policy is to provide moneys for people who are legally indigent, that is who have no visible means of hiring counsel for themselves. I don't believe Mr. Hart falls under that category.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I would like to direct to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, who is not in his seat. Is the New Democratic candidate in the provincial by-election for Selkirk still in the employ of the government or has he obtained leave of absence, or what is the situation? And if he did go off, when did he go off?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is making reference to a set of circumstances that does not exist. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas, I believe, was on his feet.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, this is very relevant, when I ask the Minister whether a certain employee who is running in an election is still in the employ of the government or not.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood the question to be with reference to a provincial by-election.

MR. PAULLEY: It's a federal by-election. Mr. Speaker, may I assure my honourable friend that the very capable candidate in the federal by-election in the constituency of Selkirk for the New Democratic Party by the name of Douglas Rowland is not on the payroll of the Government of Manitoba; he is on leave of absence and I am sure without pay, and I am sure he will be successful in his endeavours and will not be rehired.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal of statements today. I wonder if, by leave of the House, I'd be permitted to make one 60-second statement? (Agreed.)

Mr. Speaker, this is the difficulty that we have when we establish a reputation, Mr. Speaker. Today is April 1st - pardon me, have I leave? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, today, among other things, is April 1st, and I suppose April Fool's Day, but it is also the first day for the provincial Ombudsman to assume his duties. I am sure that the government had an opportunity at the time of the swearing-in to wish him success and good fortune in the responsible task that he is undertaking and I think that we would certainly want to make that a very unanimous wish from the Chamber, from the 57 elected representatives, that we would endeavour to support him in every way, and certainly want to have that expressed and recorded in the Hansard of this day.

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

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question presumably to the Minister of Government Services. Can the Minister advise this House as to whether or not the previously mentioned candidate in the Selkirk constituency is classified as a civil servant? — (Interjection) — I can't recall his name, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of clarification, he is an affiliate of the party representing the Government of the Province of Manitoba. (It's a bad day even though it is April 1st.) Mr. Speaker, may I suggest then that the individual could possibly be classified as the former Executive Assistant to the Premier of this province.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order of the Day. Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did . . . call Orders of the Day, the Honourable Member for Riel, and I think there is a limit to how long we can continue, and you did move to the next item. The Member for Riel is not here. I'm sure the honourable member will be able to ask his question tomorrow and we should move to the next item.

MR. PATRICK: Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Riel, may we have the matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 2?

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 2. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 2, an Act to bring into Force the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1970, for second reading.

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

HON. SAUL CHERNLACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing with the Department of Health and Social Services. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I was interrupted a while ago. I still want to say a few words on this booklet that was tabled last evening regarding drug abuse. This is a comprehensive booklet which was produced by the Department's Education Section in co-operation with the School of Pharmacy, University of Manitoba, endorsed by the Manitoba Medical Association and the Manitoba Pharmaceutical Association. It was designed to assist those concerned in acquainting young people with the hazards associated with the use and abuse of drugs. Thirty thousand copies of this booklet was produced on the initial printing in late December, 1969. Distribution was made to the school system through the Guidance Branch of the Department of Youth and Education and to the university population through the School of Pharmacy. Also, copies were distributed to all licensed physicians in the province and other interested agencies and individuals. Demand for the publication was so great that a second printing of 25,000 was made in late March of this year. By the way, the cost of this publication was approximately 15 cents per copy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like first to extend my congratulations to the Honourable Minister in his new portfolio. This is a real vote of confidence from his colleagues to be given responsibility for such a large department. I was interested last evening to hear him refer to it as the largest department and having the largest expenditures. I don't see this in the estimates that we received but perhaps at some future date he will explain in what way the estimates have now passed those of the Education Department. We will want to examine this department's estimates very carefully to be sure that the community is getting its dollar's worth and to establish whether a constructive approach is being taken to those enduring, stubborn and challenging social problems of poverty.

The Minister has inherited a department which has followed the most progressive policy and I'm pleased to see that the former Minister, Dr. Johnson's work, is being continued in the same direction.

However, the previous government did recognize some need for restraint and consideration of the public purse, and I see no careful weighing of needs and priorities or restraints here. My first reaction is not just awe over the astronomical expenditures for this coming year but the commitment in this budget for an even more greatly increased staff for the new boards, the health centres, juvenile detention centre, ten more community residences and so on, that are expected during the next year. The net staff increase for this year was 180. Now I wonder what it will be next year. I'm interested to know, as an example, what it costs simply to change the name of a department. I really wonder whether the difference in meaning of this new name makes the expenditure worthwhile.

It was gratifying to see that some of the recommendations of a Social Service Audit will be implemented. An objective point of view is essential in this Manitoba Social Welfare Board in order for it to be effective. I have taken exception over the years while the study was being conducted, to the arrangement that the members of the Manitoba Social Welfare Board would be appointed by the government. I would have preferred to see some of the appointments made by the community. Many of our most knowledgeable people in the community, people who have a very great contribution to make, do not wear a political label and I would like to feel that their expert views were going to be available. Now I will be watching with great interest, as I trust that the Minister will be impartial and seek to have a large representation on this board.

Regarding the Social Planning Council for Metropolitan Winnipeg, I think that just naturally follows and it's most desirable to have such a group carry out the programs of educational, economic and physical planning bodies.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)

The Bureau of Social Statistics will be most useful in the development of policy goals and objectives, social needs and priorities to assess results, and also in working closely with all the other planning groups.

The Health and Social Services Centre, I will be very interested to see what your plans are for these centres, what services will be available within them. They've been received in a somewhat controversial way by the public and undoubtedly the first ones will be experimental. The idea of integrated services certainly appeals to all of us. When the Members of the Legislature visited Gillam last fall, I thought they had an excellent example of what such a community health and social services centre could be, and I expect that most of you visited it. They even have their fire department and their police within the same building as the rest of the social services.

Now this study, the Social Service Audit, was initiated by the Community Welfare Planning Council, the United Way, Winnipeg Foundation and the former Progressive Conservative Government. I'm pleased to see that it is being endorsed and that it's moving into the implementation stage. I feel that the Social Service Audit is to the Social Services Department what the TED Report is to Industry and Commerce.

I had hoped for some announcement concerning government support for day nurseries, at the very least that we might have heard that a capital grant would be available to help to replace one which is going to have to close its doors because of poor physical facilities. Perhaps we could still hope to hear some favourable information. Also I would have appreciated hearing a statement from the Department concerning the foster day care program. To me, this is one of the most enlightened ways of looking after the children of working mothers, where the mother who lives perhaps only two or three doors away can take in a neighbour's children. It gives her a chance to earn some extra money without leaving her home and the first mother is able to go out and work, thereby enabling them both to become independent.

But apart from the working mother and the need for full-day nurseries, we also need half-day nurseries. These half-day nurseries, for instance, are useful to mothers who have to be under psychiatric treatment for part of the day, tired and exhausted mothers who are raising very large families, and also disturbed children benefit from the good group care within the day nursery setting. By not assisting these social services through capital and operating grants, the government in effect determines the policies and programs of these agencies. They are unable to expand in some instances and actually have to withdraw services when they are not able to finance them.

I haven't seen or heard from the Minister any real understanding of the problems of the sole support mother who does make up 50 percent of the welfare caseload. I wonder whether the government would consider conducting a cost-benefit study on day nurseries and learn just exactly what this would mean, not only to the working mother, but to the community which now is supporting her as more or less a prisoner within her own home.

The matter of nursing homes. I was pleased to hear that there is being considered the construction of perhaps another 1,500 to 2,000 beds. I understand we need something like 2,500 more, though it's difficult to know what the need actually is because the people who do go on the waiting lists often go on the waiting list of all the nursing homes and therefore there is a great deal of duplication. I understand too that somewhere up to a third of acute hospital beds are now occupied by people who could move out into a lesser care situation if they had the opportunity.

I was going to mention the problem of drug abuse. I haven't had an opportunity to read the pamphlet which we received last night but, quite apart from the pamphlet, I'd be interested to know what the Department is planning to do, whether they're going to attempt to educate the young people in the province as to the dangers of non-medical use of drugs. Detoxication centres have been under consideration for a long time to be used by alcoholics with problems as well as those that result from drugs. I'd be interested to know whether the Minister is considering a detoxication centre.

I rather felt there would be some mention in this Department's estimates of a proposed camping program for this summer, or it may be that we'll hear about this through the Minister of Education. But I think if this Department is not concerned in that program at the present time, that it certainly should be. A camping program must be handled skillfully. Amateur staff is a hazard to the welfare of the children. Apparently there is considerable room for

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.).... expansion within existing camps which do have skilled staffs and it's difficult for me to understand why this resource wouldn't be fully utilized first.

The Minister of Finance has spoken to us about his problems that he's still having with the Federal Government, and it is difficult to see the rationale behind Ottawa's pushing the provinces into shared-cost programs and then withdrawing their financial assistance. I'm glad to hear that the Finance Minister is resisting Ottawa's pressures to sign unsatisfactory new agreements. This withdrawal of funds is all the more reason to develop more techniques for getting people off welfare and into more constructive programs, perhaps with further extension of vocational rehabilitation to the sole support mothers.

I would like to hear a report from the Minister concerning People's Opportunity Services which was to be done on an experimental basis in an Urban Renewal area in the City of Winnipeg. I'd like to know how this is working out, whether it has justified its continued existence or whether it in fact is a duplication of some of the other existing services.

The Sanatorium in St. Boniface. Has it been completely converted into a home for the retarded? I've been given to understand that if it was fully used for this purpose and had a Board set up to administer it, that then this institution would be eligible for a sharing of funds with the federal government on this basis, that it would be a home for special care. I would like to be reassured that this financial arrangement is being pursued.

And Grace Hospital. I think our previous Minister had hoped that this hospital would be used for the elderly people who needed some psychiatric care and who therefore were not too welcome in nursing homes. Whatever plans are now underway for Grace Hospital, I'd be pleased if the Minister would share with us.

Regarding the Juvenile Detention Centre, I think it is unfortunate that it is going to be so far away from the Courts. However, I can see some advantage in having the additional land and the greater facilities for the young people.

There was really not much mentioned concerning the northern health services. We were given to understand through press interviews that an ambulance service to the north was being considered. I don't know where within these estimates that provision is made. I think in passing, we should compliment the doctors at Grace Hospital who have, on their own initiative, found a way to bring better medical services to the people in the north. I think this is not the first time that the doctors have been inventive or innovative. There are quite a few of us around who can remember back to 1941 when following the Depression, the doctors set up the first non-profit medical insurance scheme. Those of us who were around then can remember very well, too, that they were completely unable to sell labour on the value of this insurance, and in order to make it go at all they had to go to the presidents of the companies and ask them would they be a shining example and take on this insurance which meant a prorating of the fees, in order to demonstrate to labour that this was indeed a good policy to have. I think so much has happened since that perhaps the general public has forgotten that it was the medical profession that originally had this plan.

The medical hot line I think is going to be of some help in bringing better medical diagnostic facilities to the remote areas and I wonder whether some consideration is being given too, to reading X-rays on a closed circuit television arrangement, thereby reducing the period of time that a patient has to lie in a hospital up north waiting for a diagnosis while the X-rays are mailed down south, read by a specialist and mailed back.

I'd be interested too, to hear what the government is doing to recruit more doctors to this province. There's no doubt about it, they're beginning to work much longer hours and this is quite a sacrifice for their normal family lives. I think their working conditions must be equal to those anywhere else in order to keep men moving into the field of medicine. As of last July a third of the doctors in this province were foreign doctors, foreign trained.

Perhaps the Minister will give us more information too on the Health Service Co-ordinating Council and the effect that the ceiling on federal funds has had on this plan.

Also I think it would be useful if a policy could be developed and a statement made by the government regarding the requirement for hospital beds, how many beds actually are needed per thousand people.

I do take some exception to the priorities in your government. I think by reducing Medicare so drastically the ability to pursue such constructive programs as day nurseries has been lost. Major additional costs of education have been left on property tax and major health costs are still a burden on the Winnipeg taxpayer. All other health units, suburban and rural areas

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)... receive two-thirds of their costs from the Province of Manitoba but in the City of Winnipeg which has one health unit to serve a quarter of the population of this province, the grant is \$90,000; this figure should be 860,000. Before Medicare came in welfare clients received their drugs free from the Winnipeg General Hospital Out-Patients' Department. Now, because drugs are not included under Medicare and the patient is free to go to his own doctor, they do not necessarily any longer secure their drugs there and this has resulted on a new cost of between 75 and 90 thousand dollars for drugs which has been put on the real property tax. I think instead of pruning the Medicare costs judiciously and weighing the effects on ability to do other things—that perhaps for the sake of political interest this was done too quickly and too thoughtlessly. And I might say that during that last election campaign there were people in the Conservative Party as well as the NDP Party, including myself, who said that they thought Medicare premiums should be looked at and adjustments should be made. But with these extra costs placed on the real property tax, I think it's misleading to try to persuade the citizens of Winnipeg that their taxes have actually been reduced by the introduction of Medicare.

There was a brief mention of family planning services but no mention of the size of the program or the expenditures planned, but having placed an Order for Return, I hope that I'll soon have information which will tell us how far the department is actually pressing the family planning program.

Perhaps the Minister could indicate where in the estimates we might find the sums being expended. Controlling the size of one's family is a most important means of combating poverty. Education and making family planning sites available to all is reasonably considered a government responsibility. We learn that in the City of Winnipeg in order to cut costs and hold the mill rate, Winnipeg is planning to cut its Family Planning Clinic. Federal funds have been withdrawn, I understand. This clinic has served 400 women who have been on welfare rolls and has helped them to regulate the size of their families. Over the years, in their examinations eight precancerous lesions have been found. Now this is within its first year of operation. This is a very high figure, above normal for the general society and is probably related to the socio-economic class of people who appear and perhaps the poorer hygiene that goes with their standards of living. Surely a program that saves the lives of mothers and also helps to regulate their family size is worth rescuing. I think the province should certainly step in and help the City of Winnipeg to maintain this service and perhaps replace the federal funds that have been lost.

Last year the Progressive Conservative Government gave an additional \$5.00 per capita unconditional grant, relieved the municipalities of another 5 percent on the Foundation levy and enabled the City of Winnipeg to maintain its mill rate. This year, they've had to sell the Auditorium; they've cut not only worthwhile but essential programs from their estimates. I think Winnipeg is getting a shabby deal from this government. We are informed that welfare costs are up 32 percent, that 90 percent of the welfare client load for Metro lives in Winnipeg proper; where 49 percent of the taxpayers carry the burden. After certain conditions are met these people are eligible to be moved to provincial welfare rolls. There are seven to eight hundred cases that are now eligible for provincial social allowances and should be turned over to the province. Last year 300 were referred and only 110 taken over; and again the Winnipeg taxpayer has had to assume this burden on his property tax.

In trying to analyze the 32 percent rise in welfare costs without apparent comparable rise in unemployment, we learn that the unemployment figure is based on a spot check. I asked the Minister of Labour yesterday about this figure on unemployment that he gave us; he referred me to Hansard and it made quite interesting reading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out to the honourable member that we are nearing the hour and if she can conclude, that we will certainly be prepared to wait; otherwise perhaps we could call the end of the committee and you could continue.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I think, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that I would prefer to continue when we meet again.

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

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.