

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 17 members of the Adult Basic Education Group under the leadership of Mr. Bob Walmsley. This Group is from the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

We also have 26 students, Grade 5 standing of the Riverview School under the direction of Mr. Roch. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

And we have 10 students from the Stevenson Junior High School from the Constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James; and 60 students Grade 9 standing of the Isaac Newton School under the direction of Mrs. William Ferens, Bill Glitnak and Harvey Rosen. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows, the Minister of Colleges, Universities and Education. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I understand that perhaps sometime this afternoon we'll be going into the Estimates of the Department of Highways in Room 254. I'd like to just make the point that the Highway Program could be distributed now to all the members of the Chamber so that those that will stay in the Chamber can have the program with them.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements? The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement to the House. I have copies for the different groups in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it's the government's intention to introduce legislation reducing the pari mutuel tax rate for 1976 from 10 to 7 percent. This amendment will be included in the Omnibus Bill which will be introduced in this House shortly. Because it will not be possible to have the bill making this change passed before the beginning of the racing season on May 7th, the legislation will be retroactive in order that the taxpayers will have the advantage of the tax reduction from the opening of the racing season.

The reduction in the pari mutuel tax is designed to (1) increase the return to the bettor; (2) Simulate higher purses thereby benefiting both horseman and horse breeders; and (3) provide a more equitable price for consumers of horse racing which is one of Manitoba's foremost recreational activities; (4) Provide the industry with a more equitable share of the revenue generates; and (5) increase the tourist potential of the industry.

Because of the projected increase in the handle it is expected that the net ready accruing to the province will be equal to or greater than the revenue received in 1975. Of the 7 percent of handle received by the province it is expected that the province will pay an amount of approximately two percent of the handle back to the horseracing commission to improve its administration and regulation of racing and for distribution to the horseracing industry in the form of purse maintenance grants, breeders' incentive awards, and assistance to rural racing circuits. I've equally included Mr. Speaker, to the release the proposed amendments that will be contained in the Omnibus Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to express my appreciation. I've been following this and listening to many of the horse people both

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) standard bred and thoroughbreds over several years, and this is something that I know they have desired so they can run more or less run their own affairs without having as in years gone by, having to come to the Minister and really sit down at a tough bargaining session and get back so many hundred thousand dollars for their purse structure and all this. And now it gives them great encouragement to promote their own program, to set their own purses, and hopefully - it was rumoured that the Racing Commission had recommended maybe a little bigger discount from not 10 to 7 but 10 to 6. However, hopefully this meets the Racing Commission's approval and I will be speaking further when this-when we see the Bill presented. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Government Benches. I'm not sure which Minister it should go to, but - perhaps it should go to the Minister of Highways. I wonder if he could indicate whether the threatened cancellation of highway transport rights to the CP Transport in Saskatchewan will not first of all adversely affect industry and trade in Manitoba but cutting off the Trans Canada Highway; and secondly, I wonder if he could give any indication as to whether or not this sort of prohibition of travel on the Trans Canada Highway by a Province can in fact be undertaken by a province outside of federal participation in such a decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: To go to the last part of the Honourable Member's question, I am not sure, I would think that that necessitates a legal opinion. I personally at this point would doubt very much if another jurisdiction can overrule, one jurisdiction can overrule another jurisdiction in this respect. I would doubt it. However, as I say, I'm not in the position to answer that exactly.

On the other part, I am not quite sure just how long this may take. I think that from the report that I heard it was for a couple or three weeks I believe. Now how this will affect the Manitoba portion of the industry, I'm not able to indicate at this time. I don't think it will be to any great extent, that's only off the top of my head.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder if the Minister of Highways, or whoever the proper Minister is that would be in charge of this, can indicate whether there is a problem being experienced in Manitoba with servicing of rural communities by CP Transport, the removal of services that has initiated this action by the Saskatchewan Government. Are we experiencing the same or similar problems in Manitoba?

MR. BURTNIAK: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that I would have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the same Minister. In view of the announced wish of the Federal Minister of Health, is the Minister going to bring in legislation for mandatory seat belts in automobiles this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, here again that is a matter of policy, but for the honourable member's benefit and for all members' benefit, I would suggest that we have taken the view, Manitoba as well as the Federal Government and one or two other provinces in Canada, that we should run an educational program first before any legislation is attempted in this respect, and we are doing that in the Province of Manitoba this year, as well as the Federal Government advertising television, we in Manitoba as a province carrying on an advertising campaign on seat belts with daily papers and local radio stations.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a second question. Is the Minister considering legislation to lower any of the speed limits on our provincial trunk highways this session?

MR. SPEAKER: Anticipatory. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie have another question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I didn't catch your remark, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I said it's anticipatory of legislation.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker. I'll rephrase the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: In view of the statement that came out of the media of the ten Provincial Health Ministers and the one Federal Health Minister stating that there was reason to hope that provinces would co-operate on the two matters that I've raised. I direct a question to the Minister in the light of the meeting that is on presently and just concluding . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Still a policy matter.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, I ask the Minister if this session he's going to bring in legislation to change speed limits.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered that question already, but here again I repeat, that it's a policy matter and of course if the decision is to go that way that policy will be announced in due course.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've a question for the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General, seeing as how we're rapidly approaching the end of the month, if the contract negotiations with the RCMP have been concluded satisfactorily at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the contract negotiations are not with the RCMP but rather with the Federal Government in respect to the contract renewals. They have not been resolved satisfactorily. The eight provinces together have presented a position to the Federal Government in connection with the cost-sharing. We are not satisfied with the gradual removal of the Federal Government from some of the costs which they earlier shared with the province to the extent that their percentage of that cost sharing is declining.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, because municipal councils are being pressed to bring forward their budgets, and the item dealing with police protection is an unknown quantity at the present time, will the Attorney-General make every effort to expedite such arrangements as are absolutely necessary for proper police protection in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly we have been doing all that we can to minimize the share that will have to be picked up by the municipalities, because under the proposals from the Federal Government they will be burdened with an additional cost percentage-wise that during the past ten years were not responsible for carrying.

The eight provinces have submitted their briefs to the Federal Government. The Federal Government has suggested that we have been unrealistic in our presentation to them, so that it appears, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to again meet because we refuse to be dealt with separately but rather to deal with this together as eight provinces in order to ascertain what further action is necessary.

MR. GRAHAM: A final supplementary. Would the province consider or be prepared to pick up any additional costs above and beyond the normal cost of living increase that has occurred over the last year?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will refer to the Budget just delivered within the last two weeks, he will note that there has been a substantial increase in the amount of moneys that are made available to all municipalities, 1,500 and over, for purposes of police and other services, so that already the province has advanced a program of assistance towards that purpose which it had not up until this year provided.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can inform the House when the government was informed that Doctor Briant had become President of Chemalloy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that Doctor Briant has become President of Chemalloy. I tell the honourable member that I am not involved with the internal relations of Chemalloy.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether the government has provided information, or given consideration and expressed it to the shareholders, that they would be prepared for additional investments in Tantalum dealing with the lithium mine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have not discussed anything with the shareholders of Chemalloy. We have discussed such matters with shareholders in Tantalum which includes Kaweck Berylco and the Chemalloy Corporation. But we have discussed such matters, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether any condition precedent to dealing in connection with Tantalum would be the solving of the shareholder for proxy fight in Chemalloy and a particular group being elected.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not at all. As a matter of fact it has been made plain that no matter who is the Director of Chemalloy, if there is a problem which is holding back the good development, or the need of the development of a mine in the Province of Manitoba, whether it's the Tantalum Mine or any other mine, through the democratic process we would see that that problem was resolved.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I only have another question. I wonder if the Minister then could indicate the proportion of the amount that Manitoba would invest in a new mine in Tantalum.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, depending on how good a thing it was, would be the extent of our investment. That is something that we would consider when the proposal for investment was made, and in considering it we would have to take into account all of the circumstances, and those can't be predicted at the present point. What I have indicated is, that there has been no delay on our part in the development of that mine as a result of the existing status of Chemalloy, and we have made it plain that if there is a legitimate proposal to proceed with and the existing status of Chemalloy was a problem, we would be able to deal with that problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Can the Minister indicate to the House if he has received the Tri-level Study Report on the Winnipeg International Airport, and can he confirm that the airport growth rate is lagging behind all of the other airports in Canada and the facilities for cargo and parking facilities are inadequate at the present time and by 1980 will be a serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): I have not received a report, therefore I cannot confirm any of the statements made by the honourable member.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It's the Tri-level Report in which the government is involved and he will be receiving a report, and I would like to know if the government will be taking any action. It was indicated in the report that airport . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Information is not necessary to be supplied. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I have not received the report referred to by the member and therefore I cannot make no comment on something that may or may not be in it.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister will be receiving a copy. Will be making . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: . . . will the Minister make the copy available to the members of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, first I have to see whether a copy exists and whether I'll be getting it before I can answer that question.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. I would like to ask him if he intends to put a freeze on the retail price of gasoline as announced by the Minister in Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Services.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, whether I intend to put a freeze on gasoline prices or not will really be something that I would have to defer to a Cabinet discussion and announce it when that policy has been determined. As you know though, Sir, we have already once in this province put a freeze on gasoline, to result in \$7 million in savings for Manitoba consumers.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked of me some days ago with regard to the supply in Winnipeg of protective eye equipment for hockey players. As a result of that question the Department of Consumer Affairs did survey some suppliers of that kind of equipment and did find that all the suppliers canvassed do provide both mask and visor for hockey players, and that of these the majority did have adequate stock of that kind of equipment but that two suppliers had encountered some difficulties in obtaining supply during the hockey season. So the equipment is provided locally, that is, the mask and visor is. I'm also informed now that there is no statutory provision, certainly not federally, and there are no standards that are set for the protection of eye equipment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Acting Premier. I would like to ask him whether collective bargaining parameters within the public service are under review at the present time by the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the province is presently engaged in negotiations with its civil service, and that's as far as I would like to go at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question the other day by the Honourable Member for St. James with respect to an oil spill into Truro Creek. I'm advised as follows: "A spill of 4,300 gallons of aviation fuel occurred at the Winnipeg International Airport on April 19th, 1976. The fuel apparently entered a storm drain system which discharges to Truro Creek. This spill originated at a federal facility. Monitoring of the clean-up operation was undertaken by the Federal Environment Protection Service with provincial personnel assisting in a support role. As of April 25, 1976 the clean-up operation which was carried out by the party responsible for the spill was essentially complete. Inspections by federal and provincial personnel showed the cleanup to be satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any damage, and I'm not at this point going to deal with that question, then the rights of persons who are damaged would be preserved by the common law with regard to matters of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, a moment ago in answer to the Member for River Heights I said that I didn't recall any advice with regard to Mr. Briant being the Chairman of Chemalloy. I repeat that now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that if that kind of information came through my office in a general way it would not have caught my particular attention because I am not involved in the selection of the officers of Chemalloy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, following along the questioning by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, I noticed the Attorney-General

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. BILTON cont'd) is not present but possibly the Leader of the House could possibly answer the question. In the event of not resolving the cost problem with Ottawa on the RCMP contract, is the provincial . . .

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

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary to the Honourable the Acting Premier to the question I asked a moment ago. I would like to ask him whether the province is studying options with respect to collective bargaining in the public service that run parallel to the options reported to be under study at the present time by the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, it's been my experience that when you are negotiating collective agreements, any public statements as to what you may be considering or what you may not be considering are of no value to the status of the negotiations, therefore I don't intend to deal with that question.

I have an answer for the Member for Riel with regard to Lake Winnipeg Regulation, which he asked about perhaps several days ago and which I said I'd try to get a reply by today. "The only uncompleted component of the Lake Winnipeg outlet works is the Two-Mile Channel. When this channel is ready for operation late this coming summer, the designed discharged capacity should then be available. The level of Lake Winnipeg as of April 28th with the wind effect eliminated is 715.45 feet. It is estimated that if the Two-Mile Channel had been involved in the operation over the past winter level, the level would not be 65 feet lower." --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm reading it exactly as I have it here. It seems to me it should read "would be" but I'm reading the memo as it was given to me. "Or 714.8 feet." So I gather that it would have been at 714.8 if the channel would have been operational.

Mr. Speaker, I read a remark to the effect that water in Lake Winnipeg is 3 feet higher than it was last year. I know that last year we reached a level of 718.7. --(Interjection)-- No, 718.7 without wind set up. And that the level this year, although I'm not referring to the same periods, but I know of memory that the level this year is considerably lower than it was last year. But we reached 718.7 without wind set up last year. "And it might be noted that Manitoba Hydro with the permission of the Ominawin Pass and the Eight-Mile Channel succeeded in drawing Lake Winnipeg from its '75 summer peak level of 716.85 August 1 - 15 to the licenced maximum level of 715 by freeze-up and held the lake at 715 until April 10, 1976, when the spring runoff commenced. The discharge of the present facilities will be significantly higher under open water conditions and thus it is expected that the lake will be back down to 715 by the end of June."

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am reading what appears to be a contradiction, and I'm sorry for this: "Succeeded in drawing Lake Winnipeg from its '75 summer peak elevation of 716.85." I am certain that the summer elevation last year exceeded 718. I'll get that figure tomorrow, but I am certain that it went over 718 last year without wind set up. --(Interjection)-- Last year. The reason for my error appears to be that this was the year before that I'm talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement. My main question at this point is whether or not the current lake level is as a result partially of the operations of the Jenpeg site to bring it up to that height; and secondly, whether they're using it to now bring it down. Apparently he's answered the second part, but I'm still wondering whether the Jenpeg site was used, control was used to bring it up to the 71

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member is asking a legitimate question, which is not answered here, as to whether at any time they were holding back water to bring it up to that level. I can't give you that answer right now, I'll get it again for you tomorrow, but I am certain that the level this year is much lower than it was in previous years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House of any meetings or correspondence he's had with the Federal Minister of Health regarding the alcohol advertising and the abuses it's coming for, and the need for labelling of all those alcohols that will affect one's driving.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, no I haven't, not personally. Officials of the Liquor Control Commission may have had but I did not receive a communication directly or indirectly through the Commission.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister will check with the staff of the Liquor Commission to find out if in fact they have had some meetings with the Minister of Health regarding the so-called abuses of advertising linking drinking with the good life, and also the fact that there's need for labels on those drugs which includes alcohol that may impair one's driving habits.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I could check when the occasion presents itself. I'm quite sure that the officials of the Commission wouldn't meet with the Federal Minister of Health and Welfare without my being there, or advised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa asked a question in regards to PTH 24, the opening of the road, and I presume that the reason that the road was closed and still remains closed is because of the bridge at Rapid City. I was told that this bridge was constructed sometime in the late 30s probably '39, '38, somewhere in there, and probably will have to be replaced. The bridge section is working on the design for a temporary structure, probably a Bailey bridge is necessary, in the event that major repairs or replacements are required. I want to point out also that the water level at the present time is still too high to make any proper assessment or do any work which may be required. However, as soon as it is practical, steps will be taken to restore normal traffic along PTH 24.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the House Leader as the Acting Leader. I return to my first question, Mr. Speaker, regarding the restriction of travel in Saskatchewan. I wonder if the government will take into consideration as to whether or not any province that intercepts interprovincial travel, if they will look into whether or not this is acceptable to a neighboring province where interprovincial trade such as transport by a major carrier such as CP or any other major interprovincial carrier, whether this would not be a violation of provincial rights to intercept interprovincial transport; and secondly, whether they will give consideration in that case to the impact it's going to have on Manitoba and whether or not they'll consider raising their concern to the Province of Saskatchewan if they are seriously contemplating such a move.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The first part is asking for a legal opinion, the second part may be answered by the Minister. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, without giving any legal opinion, I would indicate to the honourable member that I am unacquainted with the subject matter that he is raising with us and that I will have to look into it, that if there is a violation of what is a constitutional limitation to provincial actions we would take the appropriate steps. I'm not sure that the honourable member has outlined the appropriate steps. I believe that we are all Canadians and that if there is an attempt by a province to violate constitutional limitation, that it may be that the appropriate steps are other than he has suggested. But nevertheless I admit that I am unacquainted with the subject matter of what he is referring to and I would have to look into it further.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can only put it in the form of a question. The question is really whether the government will not be prepared to protest in fairly loud terms if there is serious interference with interprovincial trade because I'm not aware of a precedent of this nature being established before.

MR. SPEAKER: His question again is partly hypothetical. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the province would try to select the best means of dealing with the matter consistent with the protection of its interests, and I am not sure that that is registering a loud protest. If registering a loud protest was the most effective way of dealing with it, then I suppose we can be as loud as anybody. But there might be better ways of proceeding than merely the registering of a loud protest, which is not hard to do. We would try to protect the interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba. I see, Mr. Speaker, that I'm quickly corrected and I give this to my honourable friend. The year we reached 718.4 and not .7 as I indicated was 1974. I guess I have never forgotten that year and that's why I continue to think it was last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the same Minister in his capacity as Minister in charge of water control. With respect to the plight of the farmers who have been flooded at the north end of the Portage Diversion, is it quite clear that they will not be bound by the general flood control awards scheme that has been announced by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the position taken by the government in previous years was that this was an artificial bringing of water to an area which never had water before and did not fall within the normal problem of people who experienced water from flood damage where floods would normally have occurred. And the exception was made. I see no reason why we would not adopt the same formula as we adopted in previous times.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the Minister for restating that principle. Could the Minister inform the House what is being done at the present time or in the very near future to financially reimburse farmers who are so affected at the north end of the Diversion at the present time. In other words, I am asking, will he consider immediate compensation in part rather than waiting six months or a year before settling the final bill of each farmer?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to normal flood conditions, I suppose that that can be looked at. With regard to the type of losses that are being claimed by the people concerned, much of the income that they are talking about from these losses comes from the sale of grain which would not take place immediately. Those claims will have to be settled in due course and we will not merely pay. As much as we would consider them to be fair claims they will be scrutinized. There may be arguments about whether they have lost as much as they say they lost. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the runoff this year may take place in such a way that they will be able to put in full crops and earn the money, which I am sure that they would prefer to do, rather than getting compensation from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RONALD McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for River Heights asked me a couple of questions about the Northern Affairs Management Development Program that is presently under way. The department has conducted management training for 80 staff members within the department. It's been a very productive program in terms of improved efficiency and better management, and the cost per person of this program was \$315 for a 5-1/2 day course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs, responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. A report that was tabled just yesterday indicated that in '72 and '73 very small portions of the funds allotted were used. Can the Minister indicate, will the funds that are allotted to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for housing for this year from the present programs that are under way - can the Minister indicate; will all the funds be claimed or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, certainly it's the desire that all the funds be drawn down; whether or not that will take place depends a great deal on what projects are gone ahead with, what projects can be gone ahead with.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would proceed with the Order Paper, second reading of bills.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING
BILL NO. 30 - THE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines, Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I'm delaying my remarks on this particular piece of legislation to enable the Minister of Mines and Resources to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Could we pause for a moment and get Royal Assent to one of the bills before the honourable member proceeds? I think that would help the procedure.

ROYAL ASSENT

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed a Bill which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bill I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent, Bill 19, The Rent Stabilization Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's Name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill.

BILL 30

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. His time will start as of now.

MR. JORGENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hardly thought it would be necessary for you to clock me that closely because it is not my intention to take up all of the time that is allocated to me on this particular occasion, to put on the record the few brief remarks that I would like to make in connection with the principle of the bill that is now before us.

Before I do that, Sir, I don't think that it would be inappropriate, inasmuch as this is a bill that deals with conservation of resources and water is considered a resource under this bill, if I made a few remarks about the work of EMO and the Water Resources people during the recent flood. If it may not be stretching the imagination too far, I will take advantage of this opportunity, and I hasten to add, Sir, that my remarks are going to be complimentary, and that may be a rare occasion in this House but for that reason honourable members opposite may want to hear them. I am one that has been involved in flood fighting on a number of occasions and I know the kind of work that goes on in preparation for a flood and how disastrous a flood can be when preparations are not made. I therefore would like to extend to the government, and I hope they will pass it on to their officials, my congratulations for the manner in which they conducted the combating of the waters along the Assiniboine River just recently.

I took advantage of the opportunity to go down into the area, particularly as it affected my constituency, and watched the preparation, to be briefed by the officials of Water Control as well as the EMO, to understand just precisely what they had in mind and the work that lay before them, and I think that one should pay tribute to the kind of organization that took place, the efficient way in which the preparation for the flood took place. And although there were breaches of the dike that was not unanticipated, I was told that they fully expected that water would be flowing over the dikes and on occasions they had hoped that they could control it as much as possible so that the minimum amount of damage would occur. I think they were successful in doing that, not only from the point of view of the engineering ability that went into the construction of the dikes, but

BILL 30

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) the marshalling of the forces, that is, the manpower that was available in the community and putting it to best advantage. Everybody contributed to assisting in controlling the river, and I think with the help of good weather they succeeded in doing precisely what they had planned to do. And I think that it should not be overlooked the kind of organization and the kind of work that goes into making preparations of that nature. The staff of Water Control, Mr. Newton and his crew, as well as the director of EMO, should be extended the thanks of the entire community for minimizing the effects of what could have been a very disastrous flood.

Now, Sir, in connection with the Bill that is before us, I don't want to reiterate or repeat the remarks that were made by the Member for St. James. But there are a few points in connection with the piece of legislation that I think I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister in the hope that when he closes debate there may be a possibility that we can have on the record the answers to those questions so that when the decision is made as to how we are going to vote on this Bill we can do so on the basis of information that is provided in response to legitimate questions that we believe have not been answered in the introduction of the legislation. I say first of all that the amalgamation of two Acts, The Water Conservation Districts Act and the Resource Conservation Districts Act is a move which we on this side of the House would and should support. And I say that in the hope that it will reduce some of the administrations costs, and although that is never always guaranteed, as has been demonstrated in the amalgamation of the City of Winnipeg Act, it does seem to me that the amalgamation of these two pieces of legislation dealing with a resource rather than separate resources makes for a better type of administration. However, one of the disturbing features that I'm not sure the Minister dealt with or that he was even called upon to answer or the officials who drafted the legislation thought of, and I presume they have, but we find in the passage of the Planning Act, opportunity was provided for the setting up of a Planning Commission which would assume the responsibility of providing for the planning of land resources and the establishment of planning commissions that would ensure that those resources would be put to best possible use and not wasted.

Now the introduction of this legislation sets up another organization that in essence will be doing what I consider to be essentially the same thing and I'm wondering if some sort of conflict will not occur, and if the Minister could explain precisely, if not generally, in what area each one of those Acts will work and how they will dovetail. It does seem to me that one would complement the other, but the setting up of two separate organizations is going to first of all create additional expense, because both Acts provide that the cost of setting up of such an organization is to be borne by the municipality and we've had experience, Sir, with one group assuming the responsibility of spending the money and then passing on to the municipality the authority for raising the money to be spent. We have it now in school divisions, essentially it is the principle that is embodied in the Planning Act, and again we find that it is the principle that is being incorporated into the Conservation Act.

Now one of my fears, Sir, and has been for some time, that so much of the services of those people who essentially volunteer themselves for public service on the municipal level, their remuneration is very small and they put in long and tedious hours ensuring that the work of conducting the business of the municipality is carried on with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of expense. We find that one councillor is going to be on the Planning Act, one is going to be on the Conservation Districts Act, and first thing we know we are going to have councillors that are going to be occupied such a large part of their time that it will be difficult to expect them to carry on those responsibilities without further additional remuneration. If that's the case, Sir, we're going to find that there will be a tendency, as there has indeed been in the City of Winnipeg, to put those people on full-time paid basis. And I think that, Sir, democracy suffers when instead of people offering their services, their talents, for the public service, as indeed they do on the municipal level, that there is something lost when they suddenly become full-time paid servants of the public. There is something lost in democracy in that the person is not offering his talents for that particular community

BILL 30

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) but he is becoming nothing more, and I don't say this in a derogatory sense, but a public civil servant. And there's certainly nothing derogatory about being called a civil servant but it does appear to me that there is a possibility that the additional burden that will be thrust upon these people is going to make it very difficult for them to carry on that additional responsibility without now being paid. That of course is going to fall on the municipalities to raise additional taxes. And as every one in this House need not be reminded, the burden of raising taxes on the municipal level falls on the property owner and there has been enough debate, enough discussion and enough concern in this House over the past number of years over the additional burdens that are being placed on the shoulders of the property owner, that we should legitimately have some concern in what the possible effects of the implementation of this legislation along with the Planning Act will be.

Sir, I simply raise these points in expressing some concern as to the possible implications of the passage of this piece of legislation in addition to the Planning Act. I raise the additional concern as to how the two acts will dovetail, how they will operate in practice, and what possible consequences we can expect from the full application of the two pieces of legislation that I have mentioned. It does seem to me, Sir, that they are legitimate concerns that the Minister may want to answer and, if he does, then perhaps he can give us some reassurance that the fears that are generated as a result of the introduction of this legislation may not be materialized and hopefully can be taken into consideration when the Acts finally become legislation and we go about the business of planning in the sense that our resources, whether they be land, water, or whatever, will be used to the best advantage, not only for generations that exist today but for generations to come. I do not quarrel with the principle behind the Planning Act or the principle behind the Conservation Act that is now before us, I simply wonder if there may be additional burden placed on taxpayers in this country that may make the operation of these two Acts extremely difficult on those people who they are intended to serve.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've but a few comments to make and I'd like to ask the Minister for some of his views on how this Bill will affect certain things in my particular riding. No. 1, cause of concern for the municipal councils in the last little while has been the Crown lands and the lands in local government districts bordering municipalities. I think the Minister has been made aware through the Water Resources people of the different problems such as erosion and drainage that we are having with regards to this area, and I wonder if the Minister could inform us if the setting up of these districts will mean that there will be a better liaison possibly with his department involving these types of problems of Crown lands and local government districts. As the Minister realizes that many of these lands that do border the rural municipalities are unoccupied lands because of roads being built in, either for purpose of fire guards and different things, there is a certain amount of drainage that has taken place and this drainage is now coming across the municipalities and is causing the citizens and the farmers of that area a certain amount of problems.

Now I'm wondering if the setting up of this board will make for better liaison with the people from the local government district, the people from the municipalities, and also the people from his department. I think any steps that can be worked out to try and alleviate some of these problems I would support.

As the Member for Morris has already pointed out, the other concern that I would possibly have is, that as far as the authority of this Board, will the proposed capital construction and the formulas as set out in the Bill, be subject to the ratification by council; or as the Member for Morris pointed out, will the council be forced to add on the real property taxes any amount of money that the district board decides that they would like to pass on to the ratepayers of the area. These are a few questions and I'd appreciate some clarification on them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines will be closing debate on this matter. The Honourable Minister.

BILL 30

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to risk closing now on the assumption that I may be able to convince the honourable members to vote in principle for this Bill even though I won't be able to answer all of the questions that were posed by the Member for St. James or the Member for Morris. The Member for Morris indicated he would prefer that I be able to answer some of the questions so that there would be a sort of easier passage of the Bill through. I think that he agrees that the principle is right. And I'm going to be able to answer enough I think to then let the Bill go to Committee and at Committee I undertake to answer every one of the detailed questions that was posed by the Member for St. James, the Member for Morris and the Member for La Verendrye. I'll try and deal with some of them now but I think that it might expedite the matter if I proceed in this way.

I also want to speak now because I want to thank the Member for Morris for the remarks that he made with respect to the people who are working in the Emergency Measures Organization and the people who are working in the Water Resources Division. I think that the Member for Morris can make these remarks without any sort of political sensitivity at all. I really can't take credit for the efforts that have been put in by the people in my department, I think that they are conscientious people, that they recognize the flood situations and that they do to bat for them and would do so for any Minister who occupied this position. And I think that the same is true for the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization. But the Member for Morris is quite correct, both with regard to our own staff and with regard to - in particular, and I single them out: the Armed Services personnel who came on a called basis and really outdid themselves. That's the only way I can express it at this point, that they outdid themselves in the service that they gave to the people of the Province of Manitoba. If I can be slightly political, Mr. Speaker, I may say that to me this proves that people working in the public service, not necessarily with any great profit in mind, do not sit around on their shovels as the Member for Wolseley said and do nothing and have 10 people performing work that could be done for one. Indeed the reverse was true, we had one person performing the work of three. And that was done in the public service for the public and in the interests of the community as a whole. I don't think that there is any stronger motivating force, Mr. Speaker, and when that motivating force is marshalled, it will beat the profit motive every time, it'll beat the profit motive every time.

--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, yes I think that the Honourable Member for Lakeside makes a point. He says that people rally that way when they feel that there is a problem, and the fact is that they are more concerned to rally that way for a problem that affects the entire community than they would rally in the performance of personal services for themselves. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that has been true in this case and can be documented in numerous other cases.

So at least, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members will permit me, at least it's an argument that one can't always say that the only thing that will motivate people is the prospect of their immediate self advancement. As a matter of fact that is one of the lesser motivating forces that traditionally has motivated people, mankind, in its more super human efforts. I will indicate to the Honourable Member for Morris that I second his remarks. I hope that his and my remarks on this question will not be the only recognition that will be given to those people and I take the honourable member's remarks in good stead. I don't think that they were completely relevant to the debate, but I think that relevance is always demonstrated when you have complimentary things to say. That is the definition of relevance.

Now Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Act. The Honourable Member for Morris has made a very strong point with regard to the Planning Act, and may I say to him that the Attorney-General expressed almost identical concern when the legislation was being dealt with. I say this without revealing any confidential matters, because the Attorney-General was concerned and did indicate the concern. The thing that I think should relieve the honourable member of his concerns, is that these two statutes are now in existence. It is not as if we are passing two statutes on the back of the Planning Act. Rather, the Planning Act was passed after these two statutes. There is

BILL 30

(MR. GREEN cont'd) a Conservation Districts Act, there is a Watershed Districts Act. The fact is that his point that the Planning Act should take care of many of these problems is well taken, but the Planning Act is the administration for the Planning Act and the Committee for the Planning Act is being set up. Watershed Conservation Districts and the other conservation authorities are already in existence, and what we are trying to do is bring them together, have them operate, and then I hope that the Planning Act will perhaps make unnecessary some of this administration which is already being tidied down. Or if it is necessary, at least it will dovetail, that the planning authorities, and don't forget there are going to have to be the setting of planning authorities, will perhaps coincide if possible - and I don't want this to be taken as a policy statement - but that where possible the planning authorities will take cognizance of and try to deal with the existing Watershed Conservation District. If the planning authorities go further and set up planning bodies, then it may be that we will have to stipulate that where the planning authority is set up, that these things will not be dealt with by the other districts. That will not happen. At least I do not see how it can happen with Watershed Districts. The Watershed Districts are physical districts. The engineers can tell us approximately what constitutes a watershed. The honourable member will realize that those are not consistent with municipal boundaries. Perhaps it would be better if they were, but I'm not going to say that it is a principle of government policy that future planning authorities will be consistent with municipal boundaries because that creates other problems. And we will have these difficulties. I look to this legislation as being a means of trying to overcome rather than compound these difficulties. I indicated - the Attorney-General is not in his seat, but I will repeat that the Attorney-General made almost the same questions about this Act, what the relationship will be with the Planning Act, as and when that Act comes forth, and I have no hesitation in saying that the Planning Act will eventually deal with many of these problems and certainly will take cognizance of any districts that are created by this Act.

So I ask the honourable member to accept the fact that however he may think this step creates some ambiguity between the planning authority and this authority, the ambiguity would be greater if I did not bring in this legislation. The ambiguity would be eliminated perhaps if I repealed both the Conservation Districts Act and the Watershed Authority Act, but I cannot do that. Some of the watersheds are in existing operation and doing a good job. I ask the honourable member to recollect that the Watershed authority legislation was brought in somewhere in the neighbourhood of the early 1960s, but not a single watershed was created until 1969, and we can neither have the blame or the credit for that, put it any way you want. We said that we would create watersheds even though there was not unanimous consent on the municipalities for the watersheds. I really believe that that is the only way you will create watersheds, because the municipalities on high ground in the watershed, don't want the watershed. It can only result in an expense for them, the water runs off their fields down into the municipalities on low ground. The first watershed district that I spoke to was in the Member for Gladstone's area, and some of them said, what do we need the watershed for, it's just an expense for us. So I said, well all right, we're going to build a dam at the edge of your municipality so we won't get your water and then you don't have to be in the watershed but you'll keep the water. Well, they changed their minds about watersheds and said maybe there was something to the proposition, and they are now in the watershed.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the concept that we are now introducing will to some extent reduce the administration. It will make it easier to sit in the planning authority legislation, and I think it's rather comical that I'm bringing in two Acts this session other than that Mosquito Act as it's been labelled. One is dividing an administration, and the reason I'm doing that is that the administrations are divided: and one is bringing together two administrations, and the reason I'm doing that is that is because we are trying to create conditions which make it unnecessary for us to have the two. The honourable member is concerned that there will be an authority that can make a rule but doesn't have to raise the money. In the Act there is a provision that

BILL 30

(MR. GREEN cont'd)the board of the district shall consist of the chairman, appoint the co-ordinator as Chairman, Section 9, where the district involves a single municipality for persons appointed by the council of that municipality, not more than two of whom shall be councillors thereof. So the members who will be appointed will either be councillors or appointed by the council, and I think that there is a certain amount of protection there. As a member, I think I, without intending to provoke, brought in the business of the city, but that didn't say costs. But the very problem that he is relating with regard to this authority was a problem that was had with the Metro Council. The Metro Council elected by the total body had the authority to tax the municipalities and the municipalities had no choice but to pay those taxes. Now that was forgivable because they were elected representatives, and I'm not now going to debate, although I'm not unwelcome of the opportunity of doing so, the benefits of the previous system that we had in the City of Winnipeg as against the existing system, and I hope even the benefits of what may be the future system, but certainly the existing benefits as against the old benefits.

With respect to the Crown lands and erosion, I would think that this would provide a better opportunity for the authority to deal with problems arising from the existence of Crown lands. I am not able to hypothesize specific examples at the present time, but I know that the Watershed authority has resulted in a better relationship vis-a-vis drainage, between the authority and the provincial government as against between each of the municipalities and the existing government. So, to the Member for La Verendrye, I'm not sure, but I hope that it will do so, if it doesn't then we'll certainly try to put in such provisions as would clear that up.

I am not adamant as to any features of the administration of this Act. I'm prepared to listen to any suggestions that could make it read better than it reads, and therefore would welcome whatever kind of proposals you want to make at Committee. I didn't deal with all of the problems. I want the honourable members to know that I have taken the existing speeches and asked them to be reviewed by the department, and I'll do the same with the speeches that were made today. I don't think that I'm asking a great deal that you approve now and get those answers at Committee, because the Member for Morris has indicated that you agree in principle and therefore a positive vote on second reading should be forthcoming.

QUESTION put, motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 37, The Corporations Act, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: May I have the matter stand please, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 39. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is away. Bill 47 proposed by the Minister of Highways. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 52 proposed by the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Bill No. 53, Birtle-Russell. Does the Honourable Minister wish to proceed with the other second readings? Introductions?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we can go with the Bill standing in the name of the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 56.

MR. GREEN: No, not that one.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, 51. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to in introducing this Bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Minister make the motion first?

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, I'm sorry. Moved and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that Bill No. 51, the Retirement Plan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister isn't in his seat.

BILL NO. 51 - THE RETIREMENT PLAN BENEFICIARIES ACT

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 51, the Retirement Plan Beneficiaries Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this Bill deals with Retirement Pension Plans, and under the present provisions of the Law Property Act, there are provisions in that legislation, specifically Section 43 of that Act providing for the designation of beneficiaries insofar as Employer Pension Plan Benefit Programs are concerned. But over the passage of years since those provisions were included within the Law Property Act, there has developed more and more what is commonly known as RSP, Registered Savings Plans, in which the Pension Plans are self-invested for future payment of annuities upon a certain age or upon retirement. The Law Property Act only makes reference to Employer Pension Plans in which there is employer - employee participation in that Pension Plan. Now, under the Law Property Act, with an Employer Pension Plan the beneficiary can be changed as a result of (a) reference in a will, or (b) designation of a beneficiary on a separate piece of paper, a separate means to the will. Two different alternatives. However, insofar as a straight pension plan is concerned, that type of pension plan which is not an Employer Pension Plan, there is no such method, so at the present time a pension plan that is not an Employer Pension Plan, the beneficiary would have to be designated by will. The intention of this legislation is to provide that in those instances as well, of which there are of course thousands of such plans in the Province of Manitoba, the beneficiary can be designated by way of a separate document, separate to the will, or by the will itself, by either means, in order to provide for consistency insofar as the designation of the beneficiaries in the same way as an Employer Pension Plan operates as per the Law Property Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 54. Does the Honourable Minister of Education wish to propose it?

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Could I have it stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56.

MR. PAWLEY: Stand please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Highways 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.

MOTION presented.

GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I have been moved by events in the last couple of days to raise a grievance in the House at this time. Basically the system, the Criminal system and the whole system as related to my area of Wolseley seems to be crumbling, spending priorities seem to be lost. The entire system of justice and law and order and the way it's going in this particular last short time has really been very very most upsetting to myself, and the last week has been very trying. I've been receiving a number of calls, and people are concerned. They're waiting for leadership and they're hoping that by raising some of these points that I may be able to at least have them recorded. Teachers and parents and businessmen and pupils have really raised concerns and today I received a copy of petition that was delivered to the Honourable Attorney-General, and I'd like to read it in the record if I could. It simply says: "We, the undersigned members of the staff of Gordon Bell High School, wish to express our shock and concern that two persons charged with assault

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd). . . . "last Monday, April 26th, of two students and one teacher from our school have been released from custody on bail."

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Attorney-General state his matter of privilege.

MR. PAWLEY: The information which the honourable member is relating is, first, incorrect. The two individuals referred to by the petition have not been released from custody. Secondly, it is a matter that is very much presently before the courts and I would urge the honourable member that we not engage in that area. But the very facts referred to by the honourable member are incorrect. The two individuals are in custody, have not been released from custody.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris on the same matter of privilege.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not going to argue whether or not that information just communicated to the House is true or not, but I would tell you, Sir, that the Member for Wolseley is simply reading the words of a petition and he's placing the words of that petition on the record. The Minister is at liberty to correct it if he chooses, but certainly it is not a question of privilege to deny him the right to read into the record that particular petition or to debate the issue that he wishes to debate concerning his particular area. It's a matter of grievance, and it's a legitimate one that he's raising at this present time.

MR. SPEAKER: There is only one caveat I would place and that is any matters sub judice, the honourable member should be aware of, whatever case it is, that is not for debate. If it's before the court then it's not for debate. That's one of our rules. The Honourable Member for Wolseley. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Relative to the point, Sir, may I just add that the particular case that you mentioned is not really the subject matter of the debate that the member is now embarking upon, it is the question of law and order in general. He's simply citing a couple of instances of what he means in order to illustrate his point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Continuing with the petition, Mr. Speaker: "Since both of these persons live within walking distance from our school, we feel that the safety, and indeed even the lives of our students are endangered when two such men in broad daylight were seen by many witnesses to viciously assault two of our students, are once again walking the street. We ask you as the person charged with protecting the security of the people of this province to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the safety of our students from further attacks." --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General have another point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: I don't want to be overly nervous as to the document that's being referred to, but the honourable member is certainly referring to a case in which he suggests that witnesses have seen certain actions in respect to certain matters which are very much before the courts, reading it into this House, and there's only one form that should deal with evidence submitted by witnesses, and that is the courtroom itself, not this particular Chamber. I would just hope that the honourable member would avoid any further dealing with this particular case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well, the grievances and the petition were based on information that was given by members of the Minister's own staff, members of the city lockup, that gave me the same information, so I will not relate to that particular case. But what it is, is basically that law-abiding people in my area, people are looking for leadership; three Ministers on that side are charged with the responsibilities of showing leadership; the Minister of Corrections, the Minister of Health and certainly the Attorney-General. And when I finish my grievance I would hope, that I'm sure the Honourable Attorney-General as the type of person I know, will listen to what I have to say and certainly correct me if I step out of bounds.

But I really think that the petition from a group of responsible teachers of all political faiths is just the cream on the sundae, this topping on the sundae, because I've

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)been getting these complaints from the ordinary working people, from the businessmen, from everybody in the area and they're accelerating to a rate and they're all here. They're recorded in the news media, they're all here, they all happened in Wolseley; in the last 30 days there's been an unbelievable increase in what I'm talking about. And I wish to relate to that my concerns and then offer hopefully some solutions.

But the grievance is that we're looking at the arrest, the bail and the court system, and we're looking at the parole system in which they've got such a thing called a mandatory parole, and I would suggest that obviously that mandatory parole which probably is a federal thing, but at the same time it appears to me that it's wrong, because it's false information that the public is getting in the news media. Because what happens when you say a person is sentenced to five years in jail, really he's forced to leave the jail after three years or so, whatever it is, because he's got this mandatory parole. There's no taking into account whether this persons is of a violent nature, or whether he's been cured, or whether there's any hope of rehabilitation; and I'm simply saying we've got to find a way. I would submit that young Mr. English and Mr. Stewart, and Mr. English certainly, who may or may not lose his eye; he's a fellow who had a career planned in the RCMP and if he was rejected there intended to go into the military. You know, what compensation is this fellow going to get? He's got a lifetime of wages of which he may very well have to change his career if things don't work out his way. I'm simply saying that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've tried to probably give too much latitude. Now we're dealing with names and particulars of what has happened to victims of a particular incident, a matter very much before the court, and it's subjudice and the honourable member should not proceed in this vein whatsoever.--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris. Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: I think that the Attorney-General is attempting to unduly circumscribe debate in this House. When a member in this Chamber cannot refrain during the period of grievance a matter before this House that is of immediate concern to his constituency and his constituents, then I think the Minister is overly sensitive. Whether or not those matters are before the courts they appear publicly in the newspapers and are being commented upon outside this House, and if these matters can be commented upon publicly outside the House, what really is stopping us from debating them inside the House? The Minister I think is . . .--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . .drawing conclusions from the rules that really are not contained within the rules.--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Minister take a moment till I express my sentiments to the House? Those people who have a desire to speak on this grievance will all get an opportunity. I am going to ask once and for all for the co-operation of all the honourable members not to fly by the seat of their pants. This is not an aviation area or anything else.--(Interjection)--If the Honourable Minister has something to say, will wait till I'm done and then get up. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we are trying to measure who is most concerned and who is concerned or not concerned with an act of violence. I tell the honourable member that my children attend the school where this incident took place and I might be just as vehement in my indignation and my vituperation as anybody else. Are we to extend the debate of the Assembly to a matter where two accused - and if they are convicted I hope that they are properly dealt with - are we to extend the debate of the House to two accused whose trial is now pending before a magistrate in the City of Winnipeg? Because I think that that is what we are dealing with.

Now, I or the Member for Wolseley would now be angry enough to want to engage in some type of extra legal activities because we are so annoyed. But because I might feel that way or the Member for Wolseley might feel that way, does that mean that we suddenly remove the provisions which society has established for civilized dealings with these matters? I think that that is the issue.

GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the House Leader raises a legitimate point if he was here at the outset of the debate. But I think that he has missed the point. The point that has been raised by the Member for Wolseley is not specifically the matter in question which is referred to by the House Leader. But he was speaking in generalities, primarily in generalities, and he cited --(Interjection)-- Well, Sir, here we have the backbench on the other side who seem to want to protect crime in this province, in this city.--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the honourable member address his remarks to the Chair and not to the back bench?

MR. JORGENSEN: I don't know why the honourable gentlemen opposite are so agitated if it isn't for the reason that I've just outlined. What the Honourable Member for Wolseley is attempting to do is to deal with crime in general, the increase in the incidents that have taken place in the last few days . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please. The honourable member is no longer debating the point of order but debating the issue. Let me only say this in respect to proceedings on grievances, every member is entitled to have one and can speak on whatever subjects he likes. But I say again, there are certain basic rules to the parliamentary process which must be adhered to and a matter that is before the courts is sub judice and is not to be debated. It may be referred to, but no more than that, no evidence or any other participatory remarks will be allowed. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The concern of the system, and I said it was crumbling, as I will attempt to point out to the three Ministers on the other side who I think are charged with the duties to improve the situation. I talked in general about an area of compensation; I talked about the leniencies of the court in which the leniency alone in arson is creating such huge increases in the insurance rates that nobody with a rooming house can get a three-year policy anymore. And it just seems to me that we all pay, we all pay because we take a lenient attitude towards an ever-increasing concern.

As I say, there's many many cases alluded to in the media. And I can't help but allude to the one where a man was arrested for indecent assault, and I'd like to refer to the article, for attacking a nine-year old boy, and he was released on his own volition, his own undertaking. Again, a man from my district, a man from a house that lives off per diem rates and government experiments and he was one of those government experiments, where is the supervision? What happened? Why again was he allowed to walk out on his own okay? And whoever was in charge of this particular man did not have the wherewithal to check him out to make sure that he got the proper psychiatric treatment, because lo and behold he committed a similar crime again.

These are the type of things that I'm talking about, the concerns that happen. These all happened in Wolseley, we've got a lot of sick crimes happening there, and I'm not kidding you. When you turn around in a hotel that caters in beer and caters to young people who holis-bolis without losing their licences sells to the people under 21 and there's no sign posted in the hotel. It's about time every hotel in this city, and especially in light of the Quinlan case, printed a thing--(Interjection)--I'm talking about the people between 18 and under and 18 to 21, and I'm talking about the fact that most of these kids are on some form of speed, MDA or something, and they shouldn't be drinking beer, and drugs or speed or whatever--(Interjection)--and drugs, one or the other. I'm not going to dictate to them the morals, but the point is that hotels - at the Westminster the other day a fellow, and it says in the paper I hope I can talk about him, Peter Grant of 80 Furby Street was murdered. It was related to a certain hotel in the district and the men arrested were reported, I won't read their names, but it was talking about drugs, MDA, beer, and they also lived in the downtown core. You know, the victim and the persons involved are all in this particular area, and this is the kind of thing that we're talking about. We're talking about people who, because of the concentration of government experiments in our area, have to be supervised. They have to be supervised. If

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)they're not supervised, we have some rights, the other people who pay taxes that lead in the normal community, they have some rights as well, and they've got to feel that government is supplying leadership in order to protect them.

So I'm saying that when you go into the system and you talk about these two assaults on these young people, you talk about the murder that took place the other day related to a drinking establishment, you talk about a number of situations, but in particular you talk about the leniency of the courts pertaining to a case which I was familiar with.

Well, the case that I'm familiar with, where we pleaded with the law enforcement people to do something about this man who went around hammering cars with a hammer, tearing up all the neighbors' flowers. Every time that he got drunk he went on the rampage, and when I knocked on the door he missed me, yelling that I wasn't NDP, to get off his property and fell down the stairs, and now what do you do to this guy who is a schizophrenic according to this article, arrested three times, a violent person, all the neighbors have reported this continual pattern of violence. Mrs. Pascal talked to me about all her flowers and the threats that she's had and the assault charges that her husband laid because he had to throw him out of the house. This man finally, finally gets two months in jail by Judge Howard Collerman because he has a long record. The only reason they gave him two months, it says here, is because of his long record dating back to 1957. Well, isn't that something to the other taxpayers on Home Street?

We talked about a fellow on Sherbrook Street who tried to extort \$250,000, that's not a crime of violence, but it again indicates the pattern in Wolseley. We talked about another fellow on Alloway.--(Interjection)--Well, because they were prompted by spite and liquor, because they broke into all these apartments in the area and stole \$1,110 worth of goods.--(Interjection)--This is what I'm talking about.

We talked about a Tribune article on April 16th. Three incidents reported in the paper. Are these equally shared by the rest of the city? No. They're all in Wolseley. The first one--(Interjection)--

A MEMBER: What do you do to attract them?

A MEMBER: He got elected to clean it up, that's why.

MR. WILSON: Maybe because the by-election took too long, the criminals felt they could move into the unrepresented area. I'm simply saying that the 1,000 block on Wolseley Avenue--(Interjection)--the people were made to lie down on the floor and held up at gun-point, and when the guy comes in he's also made to lie down.--(Interjection)--Yes, he got \$40 and he took the woman's purse and got \$100. And then there's another, the assailants fled. But then there's another one on Arlington Street. They knocked on the door, when the people answered the door a man with a hand gun wearing a mask demanded to be let in and the other two men standing by charged in as well. The woman had time to phone the police and the fellows ran off. Again 40 minutes later--(Interjection)--Palmerston, Palmerston, again they dumped fluid on the woman's house and set fire to it. No arrests have been made, that's what the article says.

All right. We go on, and you go on all the time. I'm very very concerned when a fellow only gets two months, the leniency of these sentences, and I'm worried about this Jerry character when he gets out. I'm not worried for myself because I remember the house and I won't bother knocking on the door. I'm worried about the neighbors that still say what happens when he gets out? Why isn't that fellow given psychiatric care? He cannot handle liquor.

I'd like to talk about, if I could, the shooting spree. Again Sherbrook Street. A man held in beating. Again we're talking about a fellow released on \$1,000 bond, Young Street. We're talking, again, a man who is out on parole robbed a massage parlour, and this is one time somebody got his just dues.

We talked about indecent assault. Again--(Interjection)--Well, what I am trying to say is, being a relatively new member to the House I would have liked to have read the incidents involved, but I want to proceed with caution. I do point out that they are available in the newspapers of this city and they're all there for anyone to check out and they're there pointing to the alarming increase - and those were all read from within the last 30 days.

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)

It all started last New Year's Eve when we had a shooting on Westminster and since that time all hell has broke loose. This is what's causing it, there just doesn't seem to be--(Interjection)--well, it's fine for you, but I happen to live in that area, and the Honourable Minister of Mines expressed his concern. But when you have people unsupervised, from people that get money from the government who are not properly supervised and are allowed after committing an offence to get let out on their own reconnaissance and then come back and commit another offence. And we're talking about the mental state of those young children due to those attacks. I happen to have a daughter and I'm going to see to it that I spend the time to see she gets properly back and forth. But I don't see why. Why should Rossmere and East Kildonan - East Kildonan, they tried to put one of those government experiments in there and the people were up in arms - why should other districts of the city not accept some of these responsibilities? And I say it's time government offered proper responsibility and looked at...

Let me tell you what I think a good district is. It's a house with limited experiments, residential homes, schools, churches, community clubs, and open space. And that's what we have in Wolseley. But added to that, we've got a questionable beer parlour that is managed in a very questionable way. We have rock and roll discotheques, we have rub joints, and we have a lot of unwashed bikers attending that hotel. --(Interjections)--Yes, well that's fine. I'm not too concerned about it, I'd just as soon that that hotel was out of there.

I'm talking about the things that we have that are good and the things that we have that are bad. And the solution is simple. You create a strip - I'm talking about the sin part of it or the moral thing - I know this is a liberal society, you just have to move them into one section at a time, and then Hudson Bay rules, because they're going on now and it's a shame that people in the downtown core have to put up with it.

We're talking about people that are looked up to. The concept is everybody's on a high. And guess who gets looked up to, the tough guy, the guy that can go around assaulting people. Part of this attitude is because of the revolving door. We have the Attorney-General putting him in one door, and we have the do-gooders and the lack system and the Minister of Corrections letting them out the other door. And then we have the Minister of Health with his \$395 million budget supplying all sorts of money unsupervised in obviously a very lucrative situation. I'm telling you there's got to be a way, and especially with sex offenders. I think the government has to approach a serious concern because of the increase of sex offences against young children and there should be some thought given to something like voluntary castration.--(Interjection)--All right, you laugh. These people are animals, it's a proven fact. Whatever happened to the old work gangs? Whatever happened to the northern isolation for some of these people that--(Interjection)--yes, that's right. You three wise Ministers over there, and there's only one of them there. But all right. All right. We have some of our rights, and I'm just simply saying when I talk about the soft touch toward - look at the cases of arson, especially in the commercial area. Where are the big sentences for arson and then maybe we'd have a little less property damage and all of us citizens paying those huge increases in insurance rates because of the laxity in dealing with people that are involved with arson.

You talk about the court problems and this is a sensitive area. There's an article here: "Ontario recommends the courts start staying open 16 hours a day." Why should somebody be exempt from working overtime? Let's clean up the backlog rather than get into a huge system of plea bargaining and people getting off. If they're guilty of a crime let him be dealt with for that crime. It says here: "In plea bargaining, lawyers for the defence and the Crown agree that the accused will plead guilty to a lesser charge, something in exchange. In exchange for the dropping of other charges, negotiations are conducted in private." Well, I just simply say that I as a layman feel that system is wrong and I think that the mandatory parole system is wrong and I just wanted to read it into the record.

I think if the hotel owners were more responsible we wouldn't have some of these problems that emanate from there. There's one article here, some guy climbed

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)150 feet upon a pole, he was high on beer and drugs and wanted to commit suicide. These are the things that take place because--(Interjection)--well, the hotels have a duty. Most of the beer waitresses and waiters I know are pretty hep and they know the smell of grass and they know when a person is out of his tree, and there should be some more responsibility placed on the hotel owner.--(Interjections)--Well I simply say, I'm very concerned because I thinkAgain, I'd like to record, and I've told the Police Chief this, that I think it's a tragedy that our Police Chiefs for some reason or other best known to themselves, do not attend upon the hotel drinking places or watering troughs of these young people during closing time, because it's when the hotels close down that the fights take place, that it's really wide open, Hudson Bay, Flin Flon rules, they just seem to go right at it. I think that the police have a duty to send some of their heavies down during the closing time to make sure these people go on to their parties, because that's when all the problems take place is during the closing hour. You know, it's a funny thing in the country you don't have that problem because the owner of the hotel threatens to cut him off. And people were cut off from being served and barred from a hotel, they'd soon behave themselves. It's when they know they can get back in. There's not the same problems that exist in any of the rural areas that there are right here in this downtown area.

Well, I'm going to offer some solutions. I couldn't help but refer to an article by Vic Grant when he said: "Den of Iniquity is finally closed, but only the basement portion of it is because the upstairs is still going wide open," I would like some day that the Honourable Attorney-General would assure this House that there must be a study done some time that there is no eastern or organized crime operating within the City of Winnipeg." I really think this article hits it right on the head when he says "drug trade was lucrative, hookers were in abundance and underage drinkers were prevalent." This was in an article referred to called: "Den of Iniquity has finally been closed."

Our policemen cost about \$16 an hour, we had three of them there and goodness knows how many other times they were there. But the girl was let off by the judge on an absolute discharge because he was baffled by the prostitution laws. Well maybe if we got after the hotel owner there wouldn't be the problem there. And I found in my district when I was on City Council that you can clean up the slums and that takes care of a lot of the problems. At one time we were the drug capital, Winnipeg, and the clinic was operating there and they're still there. But I remember going to 59 Balmoral to see if it was one of the more active houses, and you couldn't get up to the third floor because the only way you could get there was by a ladder. And the young high children up in that area wouldn't come down and wouldn't let me up, and we exchanged insults, and so I ran a check and found out that the house was owned by a very respectable firm. I called up the property management person and asked him if he was breaking a by-law. In most of these dumps you can find by-law infractions. So guess what he did? He tore the house down. That's what I call a responsible property management person.

And just to the case that I referred to in the beginning. I'm talking about a particular slum called 877 Preston. My honourable Liberal friend should check out and see who the owner of that one is. But that's an example of a terrace that should be ripped down and the government should put up a senior citizen housing there. Because over ten of the suites are occupied by people on provincial welfare. If the provincial welfare removed the people from that house, that person would sell that property to the government and build a senior citizen high rise there. It's perfect. You've got open space across the street, you've got some other MHRC houses on Evanson, Arlington, and you've got the Madison Apartments. It would give the old people in the area something they've been asking for for years.

Certainly increased sentences, Mr. Speaker, would be the answer. And that's the whole point of my privilege today, is because we've got to get some more emphasis and more respect for increased sentences. I couldn't help but think of that when I referred to a couple of things, and especially an article where it talked about the law of the poor is the law of the jungle. It referred to one law equally for everyone. Well,

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd) I would say that if we had less of a range of emphasis on sentencing and more in cases certainly of molesting of children, that we give some thought to increase sentences with psychiatric care. Now I refer to this article because I don't agree. He talks about an equal law, I don't agree there's an equal law, I don't believe there's an equal law for people of different family backgrounds, because the whole thing involves money. I'm simply saying, how can the judges simply say that everybody is equal under the law when everybody talks the same words in a defence and yet the sentences vary so differently from judge to judge.

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes.

MR. WILSON: Well I'll be brief, Mr. Speaker. I think what we have to have, too, is also some co-operation between the politicians and the police because I'd like to see the police make the politicians aware of the trouble spots in their riding, and likewise we who are at the grass roots level and live in our ridings can get out there and co-operate with the police. And I'd like to see an autonomous information centre, because one of the greatest drawbacks to information to the police is because you have to give your name and address if you complain against somebody. In the city you have to give your name and address if you complain about a by-law infraction. And even though the administrators of the city deny it, when you phone somebody about a by-law infraction, it's very strange how either the person seems to all of a sudden know who phoned the complaint in. I know that in dealing with a lot of dogs in my area.--(Interjection)-- I think that the report could be made and the matter of confidentiality should be there.

I really feel and I'll close, but I really feel that the situation you have in Tyndall Park, the situation that I referred to in Wolseley, if the teachers are this mad, and I can assure you the people are mad - the street problems we can handle ourselves - is the exact quotation from this article. You know, it's a funny way, if government won't offer leadership, if law enforcement and the courts won't deal harshly with these people, I think responsible people at some time or other are going to act and act accordingly how they think. And I would hope that members opposite would take my experiences in the Wolseley area and give some hark to them because we're in real trouble, we're in real trouble. I pointed out some of the spots, in every one of them, your government is involved in. You're not involved in the behaviour of the people but you're involved in some of the things. Your thirst for the almighty dollar out of liquor taxes, or thirst by the owner to jam them in like sardines - and no one listens to our complaints, nobody revokes the licenses or has discussion with the owners. You know, they promised us several times that bikers would be barred from that place. That only lasted, that was only a drifting comment.--(Interjection)--Well I don't want to get into that. But I'm just simply saying that every article you can refer to has to do with two brothers breaking into the clothing store; a guy broke in two times into McKnight's Drug Store to get - what did he want? Drugs, pills. Two times he broke in.--(Interjection)--Yes, and then he went back again for a second time and stole another \$125 worth of drugs. It's very funny. All these places are right next door to the very business that I was talking about that causes all the problems, the business you people opposite make so much money on in tax.

And then a fellow who's out on a one-day pass, he really goes to town. And all the crimes you read in the paper that are in my area, it's just terrible. When you talk about one guy assaults a nine and a ten year old boy, that's another case. Here's a case: "Four charges bring 15 months in jail." Here's a man wearing a stocking mask who held up somebody with a knife and he was 18 years old. So what does the Minister of Corrections' Department do? They take him to the Manitoba Youth Centre and he escapes from there. So after his third arrest they finally decided to shift him to adult court. And this is April 15th, in the Winnipeg Tribune. So some of those people - there's a lot of social workers looking for work. If the people in the department can't do the job, let's get a little tougher with them. Because if they're going to turn around on a do-gooder situation and let this guy out who robbed people with a knife, don't give him any psychiatric treatment, and after a third

GRIEVANCE

(MR. WILSON cont'd)offence they finally shift him to adult court, then I got to suggest to you that somebody needs a university or like degree, because some of the biggest con artists in the world are cons that are trying to have their sentence reduced or act like they're half looney in order to get a lighter sentence or get transferred.

So I'll close by simply saying that Wolseley wants to be residential, it wants to enjoy its schools and churches and community clubs and open space but it doesn't necessarily have to put up with the things that have been going on in there. I would like the members opposite and especially those three Ministers to look, look in the mirror and see if they would like that going on in their riding.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Minister of Education isn't in his seat, I can't recognize him at all anyway. The Honourable Member for Logan. The motion has been agreed to. --(Interjection)-- Does the Honourable Minister wish to speak on the grievance?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to put to the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up, it has to be by unanimous consent over the hour. (Agreed)

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is: the honourable member made reference to Hudson's Bay and Flin Flon rules. This is strange to me. Would the honourable member be good enough to explain what the Hudson's Bay and Flin Flon rules are?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well to the Minister of Education and certainly being a Minister of Education he should know, Hudson Bay rules are a street term for what happens behind the Westminster Hotel every Friday and Saturday night. If you've heard of the term "boots and saddles" they have knives, they kick, they use chains and they're always forever brawling. The people that live in that area are fed up. They're fed up with seeing a 26-year-old boy get murdered; they're fed up with people zonked out on drugs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan for two minutes. Call it 4:30? Very well. (Agreed)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We'll go into Private Members' Hour. Bills.

The first one is No. 21, proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for St. Johns. (Stand)

Bill 41, proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. The Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

Bill 48, proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could we have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 55. Does the Honourable Member for Roblin wish to introduce it? (Stand)

RESOLUTION 17

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 17. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin:

WHEREAS any increase in the toll charges currently under consideration by the Federal Government on the St. Lawrence Seaway would weigh most heavily on the movement of grain which presently provides some 87 percent of the total revenue of the Seaway; and

WHEREAS the prairie region generally has long suffered discriminatory freight and transportation policies that have generally favored central Canada; and

WHEREAS any decrease in the current level of support by the Federal Government for the operation of the Seaway would tend to add significantly to the costs of goods and services coming into Manitoba using this transportation system and would add significantly to goods, primarily grain, leaving our province; and

WHEREAS the restructuring of toll rates on the St. Lawrence Seaway should not be done in isolation from the urgent necessity of a general overview and shaping of new and equitable national transportation policies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this government consider the advisability of expressing in the strongest possible terms its objections to any increase in the toll structures of the St. Lawrence Seaway at this time.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking briefly to this resolution and in indicating to you and to the members of the House the reason for its introduction at this time, permit me to say that while it probably resulted from a meeting that I had and others had, and I would hope to think that perhaps members of the government as well, with members of the Canadian Lake Shipping Associations who were in this province some time ago soliciting our support for the position put forward in this resolution, namely the voicing of protest of any changes that apparently the Federal Government is contemplating with respect to toll charges on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the representation made to myself and to other members of our group at that time. It was very evident in a very short time that quite aside from whatever interests they were speaking of and representing, namely the shipping industry of the Great Lakes system in Eastern Canada, the concern that became immediately evident to me was that we as Manitobans should be concerned for our own very specific reasons, some of them which are mentioned in the resolution, others which I would hope perhaps would be brought out in any discussion and debate on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it came as a surprise to me in doing a little bit of research with respect to the operation of the Seaway, I refer to a specific study done by the University of Toronto and the York University in a joint program in transportation having to do with the operation of the Seaway, the extent to which the movement of grain monopolizes I must say the total freight hauled on the Seaway. The report indicates that upwards to 87 percent of the revenues generated on the Canadian side by the Seaway emanate from

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. ENNS cont'd) the movement of grain. Mr. Speaker, I think that Western Canadians and in particular Manitobans and that portion of Saskatchewan, the eastern portion of Saskatchewan, from whence most of the grain moving into the Thunder Bay region and consequently through the Seaway are particularly concerned about any increase in toll charges on this great Canadian waterway. The argument could be put forward that Alberta and the western regions of Saskatchewan, more of their grain moves out of the Vancouver ports and subsequently don't have the same direct interest in this matter but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the House that really one shouldn't regionalize in any way when we discuss the operations of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I can just barely recall, not having been that involved in public life at the time of its construction, some of the high hopes that were held out for what it would mean in terms of the economic life of this country and particularly the prairie region, Mr. Speaker. What the St. Lawrence Seaway does of course, it reaches out into the heartland of the North American Continent both on the American side and the Canadian side and makes available to us, through the tremendous savings of water hauling, so much of the goods and services that we require here in the prairie regions. Mr. Speaker, the fact that grain constitutes such a major portion of Canada's trade surplus dollars earned really makes it a matter that concerns all Canadians. If our position vis-a-vis import and export trade is in jeopardy, if we are unable to earn through export the kind of dollars that keep our trade pattern in reasonable condition, that is reasonably balanced, then, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't really matter where the Canadian lives, whether he is in Toronto or Montreal or Vancouver or in Edmonton, he will be adversely affected by it. Mr. Speaker, I simply believe that the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway is far too vital a link in our whole economic structure to be allowed to be tinkered with or to be treated in isolation.

I know that the subject of transportation and freight rates isn't a particularly glamorous and doesn't particularly attract a great deal of attention, but, Mr. Speaker, it's not saying too much that the whole question of trying to achieve some equitability in our transportation system is one that probably is as important as any other one that the nation faces. If you recall some of the discussions, some of the papers that were presented at such important meetings such as the Prairie Economic Conference held in Calgary several years ago attended by members of the Federal Cabinet including the First Minister, attended by all the prairie provinces as well as the Province of British Columbia, transportation, freight rates, discriminatory freight rates was the principle theme that was being expressed time and time again. I say in the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we have over the years built a bias into our transportation system that basically mitigates against certain kinds of development here in the prairie regions. We have example after example to demonstrate that - where to bring in certain goods, particularly manufactured and steel goods, into the prairie regions it is more expensive than to bring them to Vancouver. In Vancouver the railways have to compete with the water carriers where that competition doesn't exist in the prairie region. Mr. Speaker, for us the St. Lawrence Seaway at least brings us within reach of water and that of course was the whole purpose of building this structure.

Mr. Speaker, I don't present myself as an expert in this matter but I am aware that, for instance, when consideration is given to such other major transportation networks such as the Canadian National Railways, that we don't treat that in limbo or isolation. We treat that very much as part of the whole Canadian scene. The Canadian public at large subsidizes and supports the continuance of the operation of the Canadian National Railways as well as the other railway for reasons of national concern. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the St. Lawrence Seaway should be regarded in the same manner, should have the same priority of attention paid to it as do such institutions as mentioned, namely the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. Speaker, we have been led to understand by several recent Ministers of Transportation in the Federal Government that a major overhaul, a major restructuring of the transportation system generally speaking in the country is overdue and is being looked at and will soon be laid out for Canadians to have a look at and to hopefully adopt.

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. ENNS cont'd) Hopefully it will be a more equitable one for the prairie region. One of the strongest recommendations that this report comes up with is that no unilateral action should be taken with respect to changes of the toll structures on the Seaway without it being part and parcel of that greater consideration that is now taking place within the transportation systems in Canada. Mr. Speaker, it was therefore with no difficulty that I found it possible to indicate to members of the Shipping Association on the Great Lakes that we had a very direct interest in the manner and the way in which the St. Lawrence Seaway is operated.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we are negligent if we as Manitoba legislators don't concern ourselves with the operations of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Mr. Speaker, again I say that the St. Lawrence Seaway is a long way from any of our constituents and it's a long way away from the Province of Manitoba in that sense. But, Sir, most of our grain moves through that Seaway with the exception of the twenty or thirty odd million bushels that moves out through the Port of Churchill. A great deal of our incoming goods, particularly heavy goods, utilize the seaway and any appreciable difference or changes in the costs charged to the users on the St. Lawrence Seaway will be felt by Manitobans of every description immediately. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we should be giving up any points at this stage of the game in terms of trying to hammer out a more equitable transportation policy, particularly for the prairie region and I consider the St. Lawrence Seaway as being part of it. Mr. Speaker, if the argument can be sustained and is made that the users should be paying a greater portion of the costs accrued to the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway, that may be an argument that can be put forward but I would say that it should not be put forward in isolation of the other aspects of transportation that we have to look at. I wouldn't like to at this stage give away any bargaining points particularly with my eastern confederates in this instance, by treating this question in isolation.

The representations that we heard, Mr. Speaker, indicated that proposed increases are sizable, ones that would have pretty significant effects in terms of the costs of goods that we ship through that seaway for foreign export and vice versa, costs of goods that we import into the prairie region for our own use.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to believe that this resolution would win the support of the government and all members of the House. I would like to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government would find it possible to, at its earliest convenience, do their own study and research into the matter. I would urge them to act with some urgency on the matter because the proposed increases in the toll structures are imminent. I would have liked to have had, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to have presented this resolution just prior to the meeting that is currently going on among the First Ministers of the western provinces. It's the kind of situation I think, Mr. Speaker, that the former Prairie Economic Council of First Ministers could and should be dealing with. Now it's to my regret that that council has fallen into disuse, if I can use that phrase. Certainly it's a position, Mr. Speaker, that I, through the moving of this resolution, request the First Minister and this government to take up with the First Minister of Saskatchewan particularly, Mr. Blakney, and with some dispatch indicate this expression of concern on the part of the Manitoba Legislature to the authorities in Eastern Canada, to the Federal Government, that we are concerned about any unilateral changes on the toll structure of this great waterway and that we don't believe that this should be taken in isolation from the considerations that we know - at least we're being told - are currently on their way in terms of redoing and perhaps restructuring the entire transportation system in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I should just add in closing that nothing should be read into this resolution that would in any way detract from the ongoing concern and belief that the Port of Churchill should be encouraged to be utilized to its fullest and maximum intent. I don't believe that any members here would want to read into this resolution that we are pitting the facilities or the services available to us from the Port of Churchill as against the St. Lawrence Seaway. That's not that case at all. We require and we need, particularly emanating from the prairie region, every possible aspect of transportation that's to our advantage. It's encouraging, Mr. Speaker, to note that this year the potential

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. ENNS cont'd) freight utilization again particularly the movement of grain would appear to be very encouraging for the Port of Churchill. A significant increase of grain is being forecast for movement out of the Port of Churchill as compared to other years. That, Mr. Speaker, is a situation that we would only want to see encouraged and indeed, Mr. Speaker, should be part and parcel of this overall transportation program that we're trying to devise for this country. But that doesn't take away from the fact that the present plans that are under foot with respect to raising the toll rates on the St. Lawrence Seaway have a major economic effect on us here in Manitoba, particularly on the grain farmers in Manitoba, but I say not to their exclusion.

We use that transportation corridor for the movement of all kinds of goods and services that we require in this area and we shouldn't be sitting idly by while somebody else in Eastern Canada is deciding that that toll structure will be seriously changed or tampered with. After all, Mr. Speaker, as Canadians we all contributed to the building of that St. Lawrence Seaway. The fact that it's located in Ontario or Quebec is there only by geographic accident. We as Canadian taxpayers built the Seaway, we have a right to at least be consulted about its operation before any significant changes take place. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The resolution is what is known as a "motherhood" resolution and I want to thank the Member for Lakeside for having made these comments. The members on this side of the House are prepared to support the resolution and the resolve portion of the resolution is really academic as I'm sure that everyone is aware that the Minister of Transport, the Honourable Len Evans who is not here at the moment, has on every occasion when it was necessary, forcefully protested for the benefit of the western provinces. I'm sure that if he hasn't already done so he will do so on this occasion. With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, if there's anyone else on that side of the House who wishes to speak, or on this side, that is all we have to say. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, while the Member for Ste. Rose commented and thought this was a "motherhood" resolution I want to, for the record, say to my colleague from Lakeside that I want to endorse him wholeheartedly on this particular resolution. I would like to say that while it's one type of problem that is facing not only the farmers of Manitoba, but when the Member from Lakeside talks about the amount of grain or the total business that is done on the Seaway it involves about 87 percent and it's all grain, I think it becomes a very very important item for discussion.

I know, Mr. Speaker, this has been a matter that has been battled out over the years and I want to add too for the record, and I'm finding it rather difficult - I thought to myself what more can I say after listening to the comments from my colleague the Member for Lakeside - but there is one comment that I would like to add. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that a gentleman by the name of George Franklin who has, over the years, represented us in Manitoba and that portion of Saskatchewan insofar as the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway is concerned, he has fought the battle very admirably in defence of this particular problem. I would like to bring it to the attention of members on the other side of the House something that probably they're not aware of because they are all city members.

A MEMBER: They're not grain shippers Henry.

MR. EINARSON: They're not grain shippers, that's quite right. Maybe with the exception of one or two. But you know, Mr. Speaker, I have often related this argument with my friends in eastern Canada because that's where the production of machinery is made, the biggest percentage of it. When a farmer buys a piece of equipment for operating his farm business - and so much of it is produced down in eastern Canada - when he buys that piece of equipment from a dealer in Manitoba he pays the price of that piece of equipment plus the freight charges from the factory in eastern Canada to the destination in Manitoba. That's one point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, which is relative to this resolution.

RESOLUTION 17

(MR. EINARSON cont'd)

The other point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this: that the farmer in Manitoba who produces grain pays the freight charges from the elevator which he delivers it to the Lakehead. Mr. Speaker, we're now talking and debating a problem and I would hope that the government would share this with us because I think we can put our politics aside. It's a problem that all of us in Manitoba must be concerned about because of the two things I just mentioned. To be fair with the farm people and all of us in Manitoba, as opposed to those who are in eastern Canada producing commodities that we need in western Canada - and I say the comparison is not quite fair to us. This is one of the reasons why Mr. Franklin, as a member of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, has fought the battle to try to talk reason with those in eastern Canada who have been wanting so much to increase the toll rates on the St. Lawrence Seaway. I think that those of us in Manitoba and that portion of Saskatchewan who are concerned about the increase in tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway have a very valid argument when we say, if we have to pay the freight charges on everything we buy in eastern Canada and also pay on our grains going from our elevators in Manitoba to the Lakehead, I think that the Federal Government should be giving some consideration to making sure that those rates on the St. Lawrence Seaway are fair and equitable insofar as we are concerned in Manitoba.

Those are just a few comments, Mr. Speaker, that I want to add to the comments that my colleague from Lakeside has made because I feel very strongly about them and I think they're very important and I think they must be mentioned in order that we can sort of have some measure of success. I hope they will be of some assistance in the way of providing information to the Ministry of Industry and Commerce of this government that will help him to fight that battle.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the other point that my colleague raised in regards to the Port of Churchill, I think the total number of bushels of grain that have been exported from that port were about 23 million bushels last year. It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, I'm given to understand that because Russia is prepared to take on extra insurance to protect herself and her boats coming into the Port of Churchill they're able to increase that number of bushels for export to the tune of approximately 35 million bushels.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add one other little comment. I think it's always good to have a little humour in times like this. I think back and if I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, you might rule me just slightly out of order but when we're talking about the Port of Churchill, I listened to comments from the Member for Churchill about the kind of life and environment that goes on up in that fair part of the Province of Manitoba compared with Winnipeg. He said he wouldn't have any other part as far as living was concerned. But I was given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that if we're going to improve and increase the number of sailors who are coming from other parts of the world to the Port of Churchill they were hoping there would be some greater kind of activity in the way of night life and what-have-you in the Town of Churchill. I'm wondering if the Member for Churchill wouldn't have some comments to make insofar as that facility is concerned. While it may not seem totally relevant or significant to the matter we're discussing, I feel that the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Port of Churchill are two important matters here. I would hope that the Minister of Industry and Commerce will not allow the eastern interests to change his attitude insofar as not being able to convince those in eastern Canada that the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway should not be increased to the extent that will be really detrimental to the farmers and the people of Manitoba and that part of Saskatchewan. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think that anything that this government can do that can keep as many dollars in the hands of the farmers in Manitoba as possible will be to the interests of the total population in this province.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I feel that the government here have a subject matter that is of real concern and of very great importance to the total economic structure of this province. Hopefully the comments that I've made I hope are in a constructive way and we are prepared on this side to do everything we can to assist the government in making sure that the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway will not be raised to the point where it's going to be a real detriment to the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

RESOLUTION 17

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LES OSLAND (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add my voice to the fact that the resolution that's before us is a good one. I believe that in the past every time that there has been any raising of costs to us either through the Rocky Mountain Rail Freight embargoes, etc., we seem to have been caught in the bind very badly here on the prairies. On the St. Lawrence Seaway the intention is once more another plank of raising another cost to us in the long run which everyone on the prairie here is going to have to pay for.

I'd like to also at this point in time just mention that members of the Hudson Bay Route Association and the Port Development Board who have fought, particularly the Hudson Bay Route Association, who have fought the long hard battle for the Port of Churchill development have really and truly been fighting a losing battle in a lot of respects. I don't know why they didn't give up years ago. I guess it's just the stubborn prairie-farmer-type that just won't give in. But we're all, I would say, prairie people and the fight has gone on. We know that the route through the Port of Churchill is 2,000 miles less, it costs the prairie farmer less to ship through that method and yet somehow or another back east we can't get our point through. I think we get our point through, it just will not be accepted.

One of the points that was raised during the debate was with regard to the redevelopment of Churchill with the fact that we've got a lot of foreign sailors coming into that town during the shipping season from all over the world. I believe in the past it has been one of the real crosses that Churchill has had to bear and the people of Canada because there is no doubt about it that what existed there when the boys got in off the ships was certainly no compliment to this country. That is not being derogatory towards the people, the people themselves invited the sailors into their homes, tried to make them as welcome as possible, but the physical surroundings and the recreation that was available was just really not there.

Since the redevelopment, of course, we've got a whole new ball of wax now. I believe the Member from Minnedosa can back us up - including yourself, Mr. Speaker. You attended the opening on Saturday the 24th. We've now got open area recreation. It is being run in such a manner that it welcomes everyone from all walks of life and I'm sure that the redevelopment of the Port is going to be an asset not only just to Churchill and Manitoba but to the whole of Canada and it will be something that when Russian sailors and English sailors or from all around the world come in, they're going to see something of Canada that will make us proud of having it there.

I think as far as the resolution is concerned the prairie people are going to have to fight and we've got a long hard fight ahead of us. It's now beginning to look as if the concentration of the power in the east is now really starting to take a real crack at us who do not belong to that golden triangle in the middle of Canada. I'm sure that on this side we back this resolution and I'm sure in the long run if all prairie people will get on the bandwagon and kind of co-operate that we can present a united front. I think we will get further than by going there in divided forces. Thank you.

MOTION presented and carried.

RESOLUTION 18

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 18. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside:

WHEREAS during the year 1976 the United States of America is celebrating its Bicentennial Anniversary as a nation and

WHEREAS July 1st, 1976, the citizens of Canada will celebrate their 109th Anniversary of Confederation of Canada, and

WHEREAS Canadians and Americans have traditionally lived together in peace and harmony on this North American Continent in a spirit of mutual affection, trust and respect, and

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

WHEREAS the citizens of Manitoba share a part of the world's longest undefended border with the citizens of the States of North Dakota and Minnesota, and

WHEREAS it is the desire of Manitobans to acknowledge the citizens of North Dakota and Minnesota and of the U.S. generally, their felicitations and goodwill in this historic year,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, extend to our good friends the citizens of North Dakota and Minnesota, our warm wishes for their future progress and peace and prosperity in their Bicentennial year, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be printed engrossed by the Clerk of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly and forwarded to the Governors of the State of North Dakota and Minnesota and to the President of the United States as a testimony of our goodwill unto our American neighbors.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I present this resolution for the consideration of the Assembly on non-political grounds in the interests of, I would say, international unity and goodwill between Canada and our American friends and especially our friends in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota.

I think, Mr. Speaker, at this time in the history of this great continent of North America as they celebrate their Bicentennial Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Constitution that I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution maybe will stimulate and renew especially the genuine goodwill and international pride that's prevailed and existed amongst Americans and Canadians, and especially those of us who share portions of the boundary in this great province with our neighbors in Minnesota and North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would hope this resolution will encourage better dialogue, maybe better understanding amongst those of us that share this border. I also hope it will remind us of some of the enormous benefits that we've enjoyed living in a sort of, as I say, a free democratic prosperous continent which has always been a most desirable place to live and raise one's family.

I also hope, Mr. Speaker, the resolution will remind us of some of the problems that we have shared with our American friends over the years, plus the reminders of the solutions that we have worked jointly together supporting and resolving those differences which have come up from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, it's a very interesting bicentennial that is taking place in the United States and I've been following a couple of articles. I sit this year as the Vice-President of the USA and Canada Highway 83 Association. A little document came across my desk the other day and told me of the procession, the regal processions of kings and queens that are going to be visiting during the Bicentennial this year, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting to note that the list includes the Queen of England, the Queen of Denmark, the King of Sweden, the King of Spain, the President of France and other aristocracies that will be parading around the parade routes during the Bicentennial. Behind all that pomp and ceremony and gold braid and protocol, red carpet, there's a sort of a hint of historical irony of those days, Mr. Speaker, that bring us back to the events that took place in the States 200 years ago. Historical irony especially on these kings and queens that are coming back on this Bicentennial celebration to remember an historic event of revolt against kings and queens at that particular time.

MR. GREEN: They overthrew the government by force.

MR. McKENZIE: Right. Another rather interesting and heart warming aspect will show our American friends bowing to Her Majesty or His Majesty in their greetings. I'm sure that there's some words such as Your Royal Highness which would really please the Honourable Member for Swan River and that. Those acts certainly would have appalled those defiant colonels of those days who our American friends are commemorating on this 200th Anniversary of their birth.

Mr. Speaker, I just bring the resolution as - it was done once before since I've

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) been in the Legislature, I can't recall, I think it was the Member for Crescentwood's brother brought one in on one occasion a number of years ago, I believe it was Minnesota's, but I bring it in in good faith and I'm sure we all wish our American friends well as they celebrate their Bicentennial.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I was a bit amused listening to the history lesson from the Honourable Member for Roblin and it reminded me of a quote by Sir John Harrington. "Treason doth never prosper. What's the reason? For if it prospered none dare call it treason." Really what the honourable member is asking us to do is asking us to celebrate the 200th anniversary of probably the most gigantic and most successful act of treason - and there's nothing else you can call it - treason that has occurred in the history of this world. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to support him in his celebration, but we are prepared to support him in his celebration of treason but let us be under no illusion about what we are celebrating. The Tory Party used to have a historian as a Research Director, I believe last year, a man of very good abilities. Perhaps, judging by the resolution, he has departed from the ranks of Tory advisors along with the previous leader because the resolution contains some statements that are just historical claptrap, historical nonsense. It is amusing, Mr. Speaker, that the Tory Party, which is the party that has traditionally had a great respect for history, that has traditionally anchored itself on the bedrock of history, displays to us today a total ignorance of history, an abysmal ignorance of history. Let me read the third "whereas" of this remarkable resolution.

"Whereas Canadians and Americans have traditionally lived together in peace and harmony on the North American Continent, in a spirit of mutual affection, trust and respect." --(Interjection)-- What is wrong with it? Mr. Speaker, all one has to do is read a little history. What is the history of the relationship between the peoples who lived in what is now Canada and what is now the United States? Let's look back.

If you go back to the French period, there was a tradition of war between the Iroquois in what are now the United States and the Hurons in Canada. The French in Canada aligned themselves with the Hurons, the English and the Dutch in the United States aligned themselves with the Iroquois and this war carried on for a century and more than a century. You had a whole series of wars involving the fur trade primarily in North America which lasted all the way to the fall of the French Empire in 1759-1760. A whole history which is almost, Mr. Speaker, unbroken. There were very short intervals of peace.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentlemen opposite are asking us to celebrate the Bicentenary of the Declaration of American Independence, not the Constitution because the Constitution wasn't proclaimed until some years later. The Declaration of Independence. What preceded immediately the Declaration of Independence? In 1775 the Americans invaded Canada. The Honourable gentlemen may either not know that or may have forgotten it. Mr. Speaker, myself and several gentlemen of the Tory caucus last year were in Quebec and I can recall standing on the place where Montgomery was shot down by the French-Canadians and the British troops who stopped the American invasion in the Lower Town in Quebec City. I stood at the spot where Benedict Arnold who was the other leader of the American Expeditionary Force was also stopped in the Lower Town. --(Interjection)-- Half shot? No, no, I'm afraid Montgomery was fully shot, he was dead. Benedict Arnold was perhaps half shot. He was later hung by the Americans as a traitor because he remained loyal to the British Crown. Sometimes the definition of "traitor" depends on who wins and who loses. It always depends on who wins and who loses. Arnold made a mistake. He was loyal to the side of tradition, to the side of history, but he was on the losing side unfortunately on this particular historical occasion.

Mr. Speaker, following that event relations were not peaceful and amicable as the honourable member would have us believe. In 1812 the Americans again invaded Canada and in fact again I've walked the battlefields where the Canadians defended Canadian soil against American invasions. I've been on Queenston Heights where Brock died and where the Canadians and the British turned back an American invasion across

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) the Niagara. I've been on the field at Chrysler's farm, I've been at Fort Henry. Mr. Speaker, the one thing I like about those places is that they still have cannons. Those cannons are pointed south. They have no ammunition, and they only shoot blanks but the cannons are still there. It gives me a feeling of security. They may be pop guns but at least they're pointed in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, the War of 1812 to 1814 was not the end of hostilities. We had hostilities during the Rebellions of 1837 and 1838. There were U.S. raids on Canada. There was a raid and threatened invasion during the American Civil War; there were border incidents throughout the period up to 1898 when the Alaska boundary quarrel developed. Mr. Speaker, it has recently emerged from historical research that the Americans had a contingency plan up to the Second World War for the invasion of Canada. One of their contingency plans took this contingency into account. So much for the peaceful history of co-existence, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable member also states in his fourth "whereas" that the citizens of Manitoba share a part of the world's longest undefended boundary. That is largely correct now. All we now have along the boundary are a few old cannons that are still pointed south. But when one goes back into Canadian history one finds that this was not so throughout most of Canadian history. The Honourable Member for Swan River belongs to a very proud organization in Canadian history, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Its origins are in the Northwest Mounted Police which were dispatched to the Canadian prairies primarily to guard against American annexation of the Canadian prairies. The Honourable Member for Swan River would be aware of that. --(Interjection)-- Barely? Oh I think the honourable member would be aware of that fact.

If one travels across the country one finds the Citadel at Halifax, the Citadel at Quebec, Fort Henry at Kingston, all of which were built in the late 1820s and 1830s, Fort York in Toronto. To guard against what? Against American invasion of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that you would find, Mr. Speaker, an Ontario Tory making a statement like the honourable member made because Ontario Tories I think in most cases have some concept about the traditions of our country, about the traditions of their party and they have some sense of history. They live in an area, for example in Kingston, where the cannon still points south which has a history based primarily upon the influx of the Loyalists into Canada from the United States.

What were the Loyalists? The Loyalists were Tories who were driven out, driven out of the United States into Canada. They were driven out of the United States by the victorious Americans whose revolution you are now celebrating, the Bicentenary of whose revolution you are now celebrating. Much of the history of Canadian political development originates in those influxes of Loyalists, those Tory Loyalists who settled in southern Ontario and the Maritimes.

The honourable member did mention that there was an irony in his resolution and that he was celebrating a revolution and he certainly is celebrating the Bicentenary of one of the most successful revolutions in history. There is another irony of course and that is that the Tory Party in Canada, the Tory Party in Canada has, ever since the Loyalist influx, had as its central tenet, its central belief, the celebration or the belief in the connection to the British Crown and in loyalty to the British Crown. The Honourable Member for Swan River still has that sense of Tory tradition, that sense of connection to the British Crown. The rest of the members of the Tory caucus seem to have lost that connection and their connection, Mr. Speaker, now seems to be to the American Mid West. We have the Member for River Heights continually berating us for our failure to establish more trade with the American Mid West. He doesn't do this anymore because he's no longer leader of his party. But that's significant because it really represents a total change in the nature of this particular Tory Party. The members opposite are not really traditional Tories. They are basically a carbon copy of Mid West Republicans. They're carbon copies --(Interjection)-- Yes, and the honourable members pound their desks and they should. They're carbon copies of Mid West Republicans really. --(Interjection)-- They love the Queen. Well they are now celebrating an act of treason against the British Crown; they are celebrating the revolt of the largest colony, the jewel of the

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) British Crown, that occurred in 1775-1776. Mr. Speaker, seeing that the Tory Party has now begun the habit of celebrating revolutions, I think that we can expect a resolution next year celebrating the 60th Anniversary of the October revolution in Russia. --(Interjection)-- No? Or in 1979 we can expect one celebrating the 30th Anniversary of the Chinese revolution. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, also in 1979 we can look forward to a resolution from the Honourable Member from Swan River, if he's still with us, celebrating the 330th Anniversary of the beheading of King Charles I in the British Revolution of 1640 to 1660.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps before this debate goes any further the House Leader should send out for the Minister of Education who would probably be interested in hearing the comments and hearing a review of some of the remarks made by the Member for St. Matthews because indeed, Sir, it was really ironic that we would have the history lesson that we had from the Member from St. Matthews having to do with the resolution before us and all the time he should be dwelling on events and years and incidents that occurred before the nation of Canada, before Canada as we know it existed. Before Canada had been formed as a country; before it had been confederated; before the railroad linked the various regions; before there was such a thing as a Canada in terms of soul and spirit. If one is going to take a look at this from the point of view of history, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps that we should go back to the three "Rs" with the Member for St. Matthews and have him look at the beginnings and the origins of this country and the extent to which his remarks were totally irrelevant.

MR. JOHANNSON: Would you permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't mind permitting a question except that we're running pretty close to the end of the hour and the Member for St. Matthews has had a fair turn at the resolution and I really feel, Sir, that I would prefer not to take a question at this time and get one or two things on the record.

We were pained on this side, Sir, to hear the member find it necessary to try to debunk and deflate the spirit and the sentiment of this resolution put forward by my colleague from Roblin.

The Member for St. Matthews tweaked us and twitted us as Tories because he said that he had always felt we had a great respect for history. Well we do. But I'll tell you one thing else that we stand for and I think that our record will show it, Mr. Speaker, on this continent. Our respect and our love for history in the Tory Party in Canada is probably matched by our respect and our love for our American neighbours and cousins. We're not afraid to say that and to stand for that. We've stood for it before and we stand for it now and I suggest we'll stand for it in the future.

I ask my honourable friend the Member for St. Matthews, the next time he needs help, call a hippy instead of a cop. The next time he needs help perhaps there are other areas of the world to which he'd like to go for that help rather than to the people who are related to us by blood, by history, by tradition, by culture, by spirit and who have stood with us and behind us in many tribulations and in many hours of need. I will take my alliance and my friendship with the citizens of the United States of America - not just North Dakota and Minnesota but the citizens of the United States generally - long before I want help from the Cubans or the Chinese or the Russians. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the basic differences between the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party. So, Sir, let us say that the Member for St. Matthews has got his history and his sentiment and his philosophy and his understanding of politics in this country somewhat mixed up.

The Member for Roblin has put forward a resolution that is directed at the friendship that exists between our two great peoples. There was no need for the Member for St. Matthews in his clever erudite way to tweak and twit the resolution put forward by my colleague in that spirit because it achieves nothing, Sir. It achieves nothing, Sir, except something in the nature of a putdown and it detracts from the sentiment that is genuinely being expressed by this party through this resolution. We'll be interested to see how the Member for St. Matthews votes should the resolution come to a vote and I hope it can do so. I hope it can do so, Sir.

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

I want to say that we've had an indication now from the Member for St. Matthews of what the First Minister was talking about the other day when he suggested that we should no longer travel to the south, go to the south and have the kind of communion and communication with our friends and neighbours to the south that we've had in the past. We've had it spelled out now at least by implication in the remarks by the Member for St. Matthews. We would like to commend and recommend this resolution to all Manitobans, Sir, and I hope we can pass it quickly through the House at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair. This resolution will be debated another day. At 8:00 the House will reconvene with the Honourable Deputy Speaker in the Chair in Committee of Supply.