

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Friday, February 26th, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL, (Lakeside): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I trust that the applause will be half as hearty and about a tenth as sincere when I finish.

The first thing I'd like to say, Madam Speaker, is to thank the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce who was leading the House at the time for his courtesy in not forcing me to continue at 16 minutes after five. I appreciate that courtesy and I'll repay it in the only way that I can and that is by sticking strictly to the sub-amendment and endeavouring to finish within my time.

The question before the House, Madam Speaker, is the amendment to the amendment. It adds some harsh words to the critical terms that were already employed by the leader of our group in moving the amendment. In my opinion the government deserves this criticism on many counts, including the two that are indicated in the sub-amendment which deal with land acquisition and financial policy. It's with regard to the former that I intend to take the most of my time.

A few days ago the Leader of our party spoke quite in detail about a land acquisition arrangement that had been made by the government which I shall refer to as "The Bain Deal". Today I asked the Premier and the Attorney-General in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources about another land acquisition program that's in progress, namely, the Pine Ridge, or as the government prefers to call it, The Bird's Hill Proposed Park Area. I received no answer to the question except that the First Minister said that an answer would be forthcoming and the Honourable the Attorney-General said in answer to my question as to whether he had been consulted with regard to the legality of the expropriation proceedings, said that he had not been consulted. It is my opinion, Madam Speaker, and I give it for what it's worth, but I have given the matter some consideration, that the expropriations that took place there are illegal; that the Act was not followed and consequently the proceedings that have been taken up to date are without the sanction of the law.

But before I discuss Pine Ridge in any detail I'd like to ask once again, why are these harsh words such as "gross mismanagement" and "discriminatory inconsistency" re land acquisition used in this connection? The answer I think, Madam Speaker, is that we have a constant and a continuing series of unconscionable performances by this government with regard to its land acquisition policy, and I am quite frankly amazed as well as shocked to see the continuance of the kind of arrangements that the government has been making. I will not go back any further than the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, but I think all the members of the House who were here at that time will recall that almost from the day that floodway proceedings began that we had simply a stream of questions in this House and statements by honourable members from different parties regarding the method of land acquisition that was followed with regard to the floodway. Expropriation proceedings were taken there almost from the beginning and there have been many complaints --I noted with interest a recent statement attributed to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation that the large majority of these cases had been settled. Well they may have been settled but I can assure my honourable friend that a great many of them were settled under protest and the recipients of the settlement were far from satisfied in addition to the dislocation to their businesses and private lives.

Then we had, of course, the Art Centre discussion that took place at the time of the summer session and there was quite a lot of attention paid to that matter and as far as I'm concerned it remains completely unresolved, and the questions remain unanswered. I'm sure that there is lots more to be heard with regard to that particular arrangement. Incidentally I can't help but remark in dealing with the Art Centre that I saw a newspaper article that indicated --I think it was the very day following the by-election in River Heights-- that the successful candidate in that constituency declared that he had a score to settle with me on this subject. Well if the Honourable Minister has any score to settle with me, I would suggest that this is the time to settle it because we're talking land acquisition. I must say that I have been very interested in the subject all through the term of the present government; I'm still interested in it; I have said some things regarding the Art Centre and the conduct of those negotiations. I have nothing to take back of what I said --in fact, I'm prepared to say quite a bit more. If my honourable friend has any score to settle with me, then I'm available to him at any time.

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . Then we had --not so much heard of it here as yet but I expect there will be-- the famous Duthoit case and the Grand Beach expropriations --and if my memory serves me correctly, both expropriations and purchases in that area. We had with regard to the-- might I ask someone on the front row if that case has been appealed? Is it before the courts because if it is actually before the courts, has it been appealed?

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN, (Premier) (Wolseley): I think it is under appeal Madam Speaker.

MR. CAMPBELL: I enquired to see if it was under appeal and if it is, I shall not discuss the case itself, but so far as the judgement that has already been given, I note the remarks that were made in connection with the Minister of Industry and Commerce who had been holding a different portfolio at that time, and what effect his pronouncements may have had with regard to land values in that area. But certainly that was a case and the arrangements that were made there have been far from satisfactory and with the exception of the Duthoit case itself which if under appeal will perhaps not be allowed for discussion in this House, certainly there will be more heard of that during this session I would expect. So far as I am aware there were both expropriations and purchases in that area. I mention these things simply to show the lack of a consistent policy.

Then, of course, we have the Portage la Prairie Diversion and so far as my information goes, no expropriation has taken place in that area. There have been a lot of negotiations with land owners who are concerned and some of the settlements have been made I believe but so far as I'm aware no expropriation proceedings have been taken up to date. I am told that the condition of the Portage Diversion land acquisition has been since last November in a state of suspended animation. Nothing has been done; no progress has been made so far as my informants are aware.

Then, of course, just recently we had the discussion of the Bain Estate, and I marvel at the fact, Madam Speaker, marvel at the fact that my honourable friends on the front row who are usually so eager and anxious to get to their feet and answer any criticism that is directed at them have let all this time go by and made no reply to the accusations that were levelled and the information that was placed before this House. Information that indicates that once again as in the Art Centre purchase that huge profits were made by a company that came into the picture after the Government of Manitoba had had --one might almost say, unlimited opportunities to acquire the property either by expropriation or by purchase. I don't know why there has been no answer. I expect that some attempt at one will soon be forthcoming. Not only the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is concerned in this one, but my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation as well, because from the information that I have from the local people up there, the program that was developed by my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation was even worse than the one by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Why has there been no answer to this question?

Madam Speaker, when my colleague the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie asked today if the misspelled name, which I take it to be, in the Public Accounts of Octave Enterprise was the same company that was mentioned in connection with the Bain property estate, and my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer said he would take the question as noted. I'm sure that he knows now that it is the same company. I'm sure that he knows now that it is, and I would hazard a guess, Madam Speaker --it is only a guess, I have no information on the subject-- but I would hazard a guess that the government has been in some way inveigled into the position that they perhaps put up the deposit for the company that made the profit out of the land. (Interjection) Well surely not, that's what I say too. Surely not, but I am making a guess. This story is one that we certainly will hear much more of. It happens to be most of: a large acreage in my constituency, a great deal of the Portage la Prairie Diversion is in my constituency, and I hear much of the talk of the people whose land has been taken, and I certainly hear a great deal of criticism from the people who have had their land forcibly taken from them for the Portage la Prairie Diversion and then learn of the arrangement or deal that was made in connection with the Bain Estate, and the two matters simply just do not agree Madam Speaker. Then, and I am sure of course that this by no means exhausts the list that could be mentioned here with regard to land acquisition. My honourable friends mention that, the story said that \$90 million worth of land has been acquired by this government. Well if the procedures that have been used in the Bain Estate and the Art Centre, if those discrepancies in the prices paid for, in comparison with the middle man, would hold true on the \$90 million then the waste and extravagance in those two deals alone must run into the --in that \$90 million. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Where did you get that figure of \$90 million?

MR. CAMPBELL: One of my colleagues got it, I believe it was the Financial Post that he quoted as saying that this government during its term in office had developed land acquisition totals to the extent of \$90 millions of dollars.

MR. ROBLIN: You don't credit that do you?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, when my honourable friends issue so many press releases telling of what they are buying all the time and the huge sums that they are spending I find it hard to credit, but I find these deals that we are talking about hard to credit too. Just as hard. So when we think of the others that are going on, the hydro, the telephone, the highways, and we are only mentioning a few of them in these that I am discussing, but I call them to the attention of the House so as to emphasize the harsh language that's used in both the amendment and the sub-amendment with regard to the land acquisition policy. And the last one that I wish to mention is the Pine Ridge or as the government calls it Birds Hill Park.

Let me just run over the methods employed to show the lack of consistency. Floodway, expropriation. Art Centre, two business men of the city financing the government, financing the government in connection with the arrangements. Grand Beach --if my information is correct-- both purchase and expropriation, resulting in an appeal to the court which drastically raised the amount of compensation that had been offered by the government. Portage Diversion, no expropriation. And I am told by members of one of the Pine Ridge delegations that waited upon certain members of the Cabinet and officials of the department, that during one of the interviews that took place there that the Honourable the First Minister said to them, well now that's it. From now on on land deals we are going to deal only by expropriation. He said after what we got into and the criticism that was directed toward us over the art centre, from now on it's expropriation only. But this hasn't been carried out either. I am not recommending that it's the only procedure but I say that this is the statement that my honourable friend is credited to have made to this delegation. And it has not been carried out, because in the Portage la Prairie area where negotiations have been going on since that time, so far as I know there has not yet been any expropriation proceedings taken. Bain Estate, no expropriation, no action by the ministers that had the matter in hand; and finally a huge profit made by a middle man company. Pine Ridge, expropriation, but illegal expropriation, in my submission. If I judge the matter correctly the government was relying upon the amendment that was passed in the 1964 spring session, which gave them a year in which to make their offer, but the difficulty was that that amendment did not come into effect until the 16th day of April, expropriation notices had been sent out on the 10th day of April and the Act as it was before the amendment was made applied to those expropriations.

Now Madam Speaker what a category of mismanagement and misjudgement. I am not going to attempt to take the time to give any further detail about any but the Pine Ridge area. This one was originally presented to the House as I recall it, I haven't checked Hansard, as a 9,300 acre proposition. I had the opportunity, along with my honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead, and the leader of our party, of attending a public meeting, by invitation, at Pine Ridge. It was a well attended meeting and I say here what I said to them is that the first big mistake, among many, in this proceeding was that the government took too much land. The government prides itself on the fact that it thinks big, and they were thinking big in this state, but I said to that group out there, and I say here, that neither Duff Roblin nor Sterling Lyon have any idea how big 9,300 acres is. It's a tremendous area. By the way the group agreed with me too. They knew they didn't know. It is a tremendous size. It's about 15 times as big as the Assiniboine Park was before the recent extension was made. And this was the first serious mistake in the Pine Ridge area, to be followed by many more, of taking too much land.

The park idea is all right but there was another mistake there. It shouldn't have been expropriated. Expropriation Madam Speaker should be used as an emergency measure, not for this kind of a development, but I may come to that a little later. I understand that the 9,300 hundred acres has now been somewhat reduced, that some acres have been taken out. I ask the government is it the big companies that have succeeded in getting their land withdrawn from that park and are the private individuals still left in and have not been allowed to withdraw? Was the first mistake in my opinion, the size of it. The honourable gentlemen didn't realize how big it was. But in addition to that, it didn't need to be that big and approximately half the amount of that acreage if I remember correctly --I haven't had time to check this-- about half of the amount of that acreage was already owned by the province itself and municipalities combined, and what the government should have done is start with the acreage that

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd). they had and then added to it all those people who wished to sell and that the province was willing to buy at the price that they wanted, because they had the kind of area, in that part that the municipalities already owned they had the kind of area that's representative of the whole, and Madam Speaker, there just was no sense, let alone justice, of going in and disturbing the local people who didn't want to sell. If you didn't have enough land you might make some kind of a case for it. But you had enough land to start with, lots of land for your lake and for your games and for all the rest of it, and you could have got more land from people who were willing to sell. But it was wrong, it was unjust, it was unfair, it was discriminatory to force the people who didn't want to sell to come into a park area by expropriation. Sure, if you've got a hydro line and it must go through, for the general good it must go through, you may sometimes need expropriation. Same with a highway. My honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works sometimes I am sure can justify the expropriation -- telephone lines and the other things. But a park - no. It's a fine thing, nice thing to have, but to put people out of their homes, to make them into displaced persons, to get land for a park that was already big enough is both nonsensical and unjust, in my opinion. But I would still have taken in people who wanted to come and I am sure that there were some of those.

Well that was the second, or are we up to the third mistake? There's still lots more. Another mistake was, I won't try to keep count of them, another one was that from the beginning the people who were sent out there to negotiate with the land holders continued to regard this as agricultural land. This is no more agricultural land --oh, there are a few places that are-- than this floor is. It's not, nature didn't intend it for agricultural land. It had a different purpose for it. It had the purpose of a park for it, for some of it. It's all right, it's good park land, some of it. I understand that in one press release my honourable friend the First Minister referred to it as waste land. It's not waste land. It's wonderful land for the purposes that nature intended it for. But it isn't agricultural land. There are some little spots that are, but not on the whole, and the people who have been out there negotiating have continued to argue with the people who are being dispossessed by this government, on the basis of agricultural price. And Madam Speaker, this simply must be reviewed by the government. After the government officials have dealt with it they go to the land owners and they make what my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Resources when he speaks will likely call "an offer".

I maintain that there have been no offers made to a lot of the people there in the business sense because they are not written offers. They don't even leave a statement with the land owner of what they are prepared to pay. These are not offers. And almost a year after these poor displaced people who want to arrange their own business affairs want to get another home someplace, in one or two cases want to get another farm some place, are left on tenderhooks as to what they're going to get, and when they're going to get it. And a year after have no firm offer. It's true that the Act provides for 75% of an amount that has been offered according to the government's definition to them, can be provided to them. But the most of people if they're still negotiating hate to take this 75% because they regard it as some kind of an implied commitment even though I grant you that the Act says that it is entirely without prejudice.

Well, that's another mistake. And then they shouldn't have taken, the government shouldn't have taken the costly homes in that area. There are some homes I will be interested to know later on what valuations the appraisers put on them. They shouldn't take those costly homes because they don't get enough land to make the investment worthwhile. There are two particularly expensive homes there. One of them sitting on a small piece of land, one of them on a good sized piece of land. In my opinion neither of them should have been taken. In the small piece of land it runs the price of the land up much too high because of the home. The rumour is out there by the local people that that's where the Park Director is going to live. I wouldn't be a bit surprised. I wouldn't be a bit surprised that that's what's going to happen. (Interjection) I don't even know. But I know the house that he figures he's going to live in, if this rumour is correct. The other excellent home sits on a, there are many excellent homes but I mean these are outstanding homes and very expensive. The other one sits on a sizeable piece of land. But it shouldn't have been taken either because of the fact that the man who is on it is doing a wonderful job of raising trees and he has a valuable asset there in the trees that are already on the place. And do you know what the government is prepared to offer him? A few cents a tree I am told. Incidentally, and I don't want to be

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd). . . . melodramatic about this, I don't think the occasion requires it, but this particular man has been so worried, so harrassed by the general situation that he's spent a good many days in the hospital in Greater Winnipeg and his health has deteriorated considerably. And there's a little elderly single lady to whom I have spoken out therewho has just a few acres, just a few acres that she has provided for herself after hunting around for years for a place on which to retire for the summertime, and this little lady tells me that she is being offered only the amount that she has herself already put into that land. Well these are some of the mistakes.

I still say they should have added to the land that was already easy to acquire, those people who wanted to sell, and they should have not taken the land from the ones who wanted to keep their land. They shouldn't expropriate for non-essentials when they have enough land available. They shouldn't refuse to pay a fair price for trees in cases like this, and they shouldn't turn down the argument of a man who says that he is producing sod and has been seeding down in preparation for selling sod at quite a few cents per square yard, and figure out how much that means on an acreage basis. They should have told the folks that they were dealing with whether they had mineral rights or not. My honourable friend the Attorney-General, my honourable colleague who sits to my right, will know that it's not an easy matter for distinguished legal lights like themselves to look quickly at a Certificate of Title and inform the owner whether he has the mineral rights or not. And do you expect people out there who haven't got that training to know right off the bat whether they've got mineral rights or not? If the government's going to take that land away from them it should tell them what advantages and benefits they've got on it and deal with them on a fair basis. It's unfair and it is discriminatory to not deal with them in full possession of the knowledge of what their assets are. These people don't know what to do. One farmer is in the process now of having to move away to Gladstone. I promised to be through in my time and I'm going to try to be.

I call upon the Honourable the Attorney-General to give us the opinion of his Department as to whether these expropriations are legal or not. My submission is that they are not. And I'm to blame partly, because I sat here and let that legislation go through and I apply the term that my honourable friend from St. George applied to the heat tax --it's vicious legislation. And I missed it here or I'd have said that before. And when my honourable friends say that they are going to deal with the Expropriation Act, for goodness sake let's deal with it on something like the basis that the United Kingdom found it necessary to do. Let's clean up this unfair and discriminatory act. It was bad enough when we were in office I grant you. It's been made much worse since and I take my fair share of responsibility for sitting here and remaining silent at that time and letting it go through. I don't even offer an excuse. The only explanation I can give is that in the crush of the events I didn't read it carefully enough and that is no excuse. But if you are going to bring in legislation, let's fix it this time. But thank God when we were in office we didn't use it this way. The power was there, it was bad enough, but we never used it this way. And I counsel my honourable friends to think about it before they proceed any further with this discriminatory action that they are taking in that area. Take advice from the United Kingdom which found out that it had to, with all of its experience and its fairness toward the average individual, it found out that it had to put in legislation, it had to set up a land court or a land tribunal and it decided that it should set up its tribunal in a way that the public authority at public meetings could decide whether the purpose was right that the land was being taken for or not. We haven't got that. We've got an appeal to the court, but the appeal to the court is on the amount of compensation only. We have no appeal to the court on the matter of the policy under which it is taken. The United Kingdom has and it should be in there. And it's coming to the time when we should have it too.

And in the meantime, I call upon this government to set up a committee of investigation of all these land acquisition arrangements that I have mentioned to-day and any others that any of the other members wish to raise in a similar category. A committee of investigation to give the government assistance in this legislation that it says its going to bring in. The Speech from the Throne says in general terms something about legislation to protect the individual against the power of the state. Well protect it now. The power of the state is being used against innocent parties out in the Pine Ridge area. Protect it now and then put in legislation that this kind of thing won't occur again. Quite a few of the honourable members will remember, I think it was called the Dugdale Case in the United Kingdom where the

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd). . . . Minister of Agriculture resigned his portfolio because of the fact that an official of his department arbitrarily used the power that had been given to them with regard to the purposes to which land might be put. Because this official arbitrarily used that power against the individual, a storm was raised in the House of Commons and it didn't abate until the Minister concerned, though he hadn't been even aware of what was going on, took full responsibility for it and resigned his portfolio.

Madam Speaker, before this matter is over, before this investigation finishes, before this storm abates, we'll probably have some resignations or some firings among cabinet ministers too. And in the meantime, let's pay close heed to the rights that are given to this official that's going to be set up to protect the public interest. But while that's being done, let the government act in that position themselves and let them protect the rights of these private citizens.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER, (Roblin): Madam Speaker, first of all let me congratulate you on the very capable manner in which you are performing your duties in what I am sure is a very, at times, trying and arduous job. I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne on the very worthwhile speeches that they made. They did a very good job and like the rest of the members I am also very pleased to be able to welcome the Provincial Secretary back to our midst again and very pleased to have you in our ranks again.

I also think Madam Speaker that maybe it's a little bit appropriate that I follow the last two members that have spoken because one of the topics I want to deal with first is the topic of debt and this has been known to interest these two gentlemen considerably. I am still unable to figure out how a man who has been so active in the Credit Union movement and has done so much in this regard still doesn't believe in the use of credit. I haven't figured this one out yet. I hope he tells me some day.

MR. FROESE: I sure will.

MR. ALEXANDER: I think, Madam Speaker, that when considering debt, in talking about debt, it's of interest and really a necessity to discuss the purpose of it, and for a few minutes I'd like to be a little personal in this because I can remember in 1938, the year I left school, my dad went into debt considerably to be able to change over from horses to power machinery, and it was no small venture in those days to go into debt for that purpose. I'm glad to say that it paid off. I know myself, I got out of the Air Force in 1954 and started farming and I had to buy my farm on credit. I had to buy my machinery on credit. I managed to get started farming and a few years later found I had to buy a little bigger machinery on credit, had to buy another quarter section on credit, and the debt was piling up. But I found that this wasn't a millstone around my neck because through the use of this debt and the use of this credit I was able to increase the productivity of my farm, I was able to develop my farm, I was able to make a good economic unit of it, and now I find myself in the fortunate position of not only being able to pay off my debt and debt charges but also to make myself a living as well. And I think my situation, Madam Speaker, is common in the Province of Manitoba because I'd like to know how many businesses in this province is started without using credit. How many businesses have enlarged and developed without going into debt? I think, Madam Speaker, that the proper use of debt, the proper use of credit, is good sound business and in this regard I would like to take a few minutes to analyze the debt picture in Manitoba. And from a report just handed us on the Agricultural Credit Corporation they state that their total debt outstanding now is 19.9 million roughly. About 11 million of this is a direct charge on the public and another eight million is taken out of the Post War Emergency Fund. And I wonder what businessman in Manitoba or in this Legislature will say that this isn't a good sound investment, that this isn't good business, and that it's benefits will be returned not only to the people taking out the debt but to the Province of Manitoba many times over.

I would like to refer now to the public utility situation as of December 31st, 1963. Direct debt of 172.6 million, and I'm sure again we'll agree that this is no millstone around the taxpayer's neck in Manitoba. This is no burden on the future. This is a good sound investment in Manitoba. The same period in roads and bridges, 132.58 million and I've read in the paper lately, in one, I think it was the Carillon paper, that the member from Carillon was complaining about the debt situation in Manitoba, and I was wondering if the people in his area, and in the Steinbach area particularly, don't feel that this investment in roads, and this investment in communications in Manitoba, haven't created a good economic climate for them

(MR. ALEXANDER, cont'd).....to operate in. I suggest it has. And I think they will agree with us that this is good business practice.

Similarly with the member from Neepawa. I think he would have to agree that the money invested in roads has been to the benefit of his constituency and to the benefit of business in his town and to the benefit of Manitoba. The same with roads to the Flin Flon area, the Thompson area, the Grand Rapids area. These roads, this money, this use of credit has really developed and is continuing to develop the Province of Manitoba for the future as well as the present. Then as well as the direct debt, Madam Speaker, I would like to mention the debt which is guaranteed as to principal and interest by the provincial government, and if we include this the figures as of December 31st, 1963: Manitoba Hydro 232 million, 150 thousand, Manitoba Telephone System 47 million, 500 thousand. This gives us a total commitment by the province to the utilities of 452.3 million. As of the same period 10.9 million was outstanding by the Agriculture and Industrial Development Fund. As mentioned before, roads and bridges, 132.6 million. This gives a figure, Madam Speaker, of 594.8 million, and my figures are, like the Honourable Member from Neepawa may be a little subject to correction, my arithmetic might be, but my figures say this is 594.8 million dollars out of a total debt, or a total guaranteed debt, of 685 million dollars in the whole province. And this, Madam Speaker, I say is money which is invested in the development of Manitoba and is good business.

As well the provincial government has used its credit facilities for human development institutions as well, and in this regard guaranteed debt to the University of Manitoba, 16.1 million, guaranteed by the Province of Manitoba for the use of hospitals 8.7 million, and then guaranteed for the interest only to school districts of 4.8 million and 2.8 million gives us a figure of 32.4 million dollars invested for the development of our human resources as well. And I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that nobody on the opposite side of the House will deny that this is a good investment for the people of Manitoba. They've done it in the past but surely they can't continue to do it. This gives us a grant total, Madam Speaker, of money invested in the future development of resources of Manitoba, both material and human, of 637.2 million out of a total debt charge of 685 million. And to listen to the opposition members you'd think this government was going out borrowing the grocery money to operate day by day. We've heard that this is a millstone, this is a charge on the future taxpayer, this is mortgaging the future, they say. The member from St. Boniface says this is right. I say no it's not because this, Madam Speaker, unlike the past government is money being used to provide a future for Manitoba, to provide a future for the taxpayers of Manitoba, to provide an economic climate in the future where Manitoba can develop and there'll be a standard of living for our future residents of this fine province. (Interjection) Times have changed, Madam Speaker, I'd like at this time to charge the Liberal Party, while we are doing a little charging, of complete misrepresentation, being completely misleading, and at times I think fringing on being dishonest in their presentation of the debt picture to the people of Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on the point of order I wonder if the member would give instances of being completely misleading, and giving completely erroneous pictures, did he say? If he would, I would be very happy to hear from him.

MR. ALEXANDER: I think the attitude of the Liberal Party, Madam Speaker, in presenting debt has been presenting a whole picture as a direct charge on the taxpayer of Manitoba instead of being invested in public utilities. They also have taken the stand of saying, and leaving the impression rather, that this government is using debt for its daily operations rather than putting the picture that it is an investment, a necessary investment in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker I think the member said... (Interjection)

MADAM SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, I think I can have my impression of what the Liberal Party in Manitoba say. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition doesn't like it and doesn't agree with it he can use his own time to say so.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ALEXANDER: If we had to prove things in this House some of you people wouldn't be saying very much.

A MEMBER: Oh, I don't know. You tried to get me out, you couldn't do that either.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the honourable member permit a question Madam Speaker?

MR. ALEXANDER: I think I'd prefer to keep on speaking. I'm finished with him now, I want to do with the NDP for a minute. (Interjection) Could you tell me when you left here?

A MEMBER: Oh, a long time ago.

MR. ALEXANDER: It doesn't show. Well, Madam Speaker, I would like at this time now to comment --Madam Speaker, I would like at this time to comment on the statement made by the Leader of the NDP in this debate and he was talking about developing Manitoba, too, only he had a little different slant. He, if I understand him correctly, he was going to do it by having Crown corporations do the developing of Manitoba. (Interjection) -- I'm glad to hear somebody in the NDP said "some". I didn't hear the word "some" being mentioned, and I hope that you'll be a little specific in your definition of "some" before the House is over, because I'd like to know.....

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of privilege, I would ask the honourable member, and he is a gentleman after all, whether he would do us the courtesy of referring to us by our proper name, namely the New Democratic Party.

MR. ALEXANDER: Did I slip into an old habit? I meant the NDP. Did I say anything else?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes you did. And I am only asking.

MR. ALEXANDER: I hate to apologize. I'll bring you up to date, NDP, I'm sorry, habits die hard. I would say, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead said "some" and I would be interested in knowing what "some" they're going to use because I think the residents of Manitoba would be interested, too, on whether they're going to say that some industries presently functioning in business are not developing the province properly and they'll decide to nationalize them so that they can be used more efficiently, so they say, quotation marks "more efficiently". I don't agree with that assumption. Are they going to set up new Crown corporations in competition to businesses that are already in business in Manitoba? So, in other words Manitoba we're back to the old C. C. F. manifest of 1930 of nationalization, nationalize the economy of Manitoba and we'll develop it.

Madam Speaker, I just hope, I just challenge the Leader of the NDP to use that as a major plank in a platform in the next election of Manitoba, the nationalization of industry in Manitoba for development. This should be very interesting. (Interjections) Huh, whatever it will it won't be too hard to bury you. --(Interjection)-- We're not going to steal that one, I'll guarantee you that.

Well, Madam Speaker, I would like now to touch on a favourite subject of mine, namely Agriculture and pay service to one part of Agriculture which I think hasn't had enough credit paid to it in the past, and that is the Agriculture Extension Service. I feel that this service is quite often the heart of a provincial agricultural program, and in 1956-57 I can remember the morale of the Extension Service in Manitoba was at a low ebb. We were losing some of our best men to industry, turnover was rapid, and I know at Roblin our Ag Reps were turning over fairly rapidly. I am happy to report today that the morale in the Extension Service is very high. I can only use a local example to illustrate this again. Our present Ag Rep has been in that area since 1956 and this continuity in the job has enabled him to provide a very worthwhile service to the people of Manitoba, to the people of Roblin, and I am sure this situation is duplicated throughout Manitoba. The figures alone show that in 1957-58 we had 35 Ag Reps in Manitoba; we now have 43. We had 10 Home Economists; we now have 14, an increase of four. We had 12 specialists; we now have 27, an increase of 15, giving us a total in 1957-58 of 57, a total in 1963-64 of 84 in the Extension Service, an increase of 27 over 50 percent and these people are enabling Manitoba farmers to have more efficient production which is of benefit not only to the farmers but to the consumers and the economy in the province of Manitoba.

I would also like to take a minute to touch on crop insurance in Manitoba. Through the leadership and drive of the present Minister of Agriculture, we are now in a situation where the Federal Government have passed legislation for re-insurance of risk. This will enable the Manitoba Government at the present time to expand crop insurance to cover over 70 percent of the farmers in Manitoba. This is providing that the Federal Government sign an agreement with the Province of Manitoba which they have not yet done, and I sincerely hope, Madam Speaker, that the Federal Government will see fit to sign this agreement in the next few days because time is essential if we are going to be able to provide this extra crop insurance facility to these people and these farmers in Manitoba. If this agreement is not

February 26th, 1965

87

(MR. ALEXANDER, cont'd).....signed within the next few days, Manitoba farmers -- a lot of them-- will be denied crop insurance for at least another year. Time is of the essence here and I sincerely hope that the Federal Government will see fit to have this agreement signed so that Manitoba farmers will be able to get crop insurance for the coming year.

Madam Speaker, I always like to be brief, and I think if we sum up the situation in general when one looks at the --I can't call it anything else but shoddy performance of the Liberal party in opposition, when one looks at the stateism, state control and proliferation of Crown corporations as proposed by the NDP Party and then look at the record and also look at the future proposals of this government, there can be no doubt that this government deserves the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

.....Continued on next page

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I, as other members who have taken part in the debate so far, extend to you kindest regards to yourself and to your tenure in the office of Speaker of this Chamber. I suppose that today hasn't been a very auspicious occasion for you since after all you were challenged on two rulings today, but I hope that this will not be the pattern for the session and that your rulings in this Chamber will meet with the general and unanimous approval of members here.

May I also congratulate the member for Lac du Bonnet who moved the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I feel that I have some association with the member from Lac du Bonnet in that he represents a sister constituency. I like to think of Brokenhead and Lac du Bonnet as sister constituencies, both having once formed the constituency of St. Clements which was as I understand it one of the largest rural constituencies in the province for many many years. They are both sisters. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately for the honourable member, his is the more exciting of the two sisters, containing all of the summer resort area, the playground you might say, of eastern Manitoba and Brokenhead rather more mundane, hard-working and industrious an area, maybe not too exciting in terms of scenery and so on but I believe that the farming area of Brokenhead is good farming area, at least almost all of it. And then up near the City of Winnipeg it is really a residential area for people who commute to work in Winnipeg.

May I also extend congratulations to the member from Fisher for his speech which he gave in seconding the motion in reply. I have had association of considerable kind with the member for Fisher, inasmuch as we both served for several months, in fact over a year intermittently, together on the Manitoba Livestock Investigation Commission.

I had hoped, Madam Speaker, that tonight I would be able to make some remarks relative to the land acquisition practices of this government but I find it difficult to do so because the Minister of Agriculture, who is a fine character or perhaps I should say a prime suspect in this drama, is missing. So is the Minister of Mines, and I see that the Premier has taken flight as well. I don't know whether it would be considered in bad taste by honourable members opposite if I were to make extensive remarks about land acquisition practices but at this stage I don't particularly care what they think and I shall proceed, and they can inform their absentee friends, members of the front bench, as to just what I say. -- (Interjection) -- Apparently not very much.

I was amused by the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Roblin who spoke last. He tried very desperately to set up a straw man, namely that the opposition was irresponsible with regard to its analysis of the province's debt picture. I haven't heard, at least from our side here and from the group to the right I don't think, I haven't heard any sort of protracted criticism of the debt picture. That may come but it hasn't been made so far.

Members on that side have had ample opportunity now to defend themselves regarding the charges that have been made about the land acquisition practices of this government and so far they have failed to do so. -- (Interjection) -- This silence is disturbing, Madam Speaker, and what makes it even more disturbing to me was the particular suggestion made by the member for Lakeside this evening when he suggested that a certain item of \$20,000 appearing in the Public Accounts that it might have been money paid by the government, paid as deposit money for this firm Octave Enterprises. If this is in fact the case, Madam Speaker, I feel that the situation is not only one which demands censure but it invites anger. I think sometimes there is justification for that feeling being shown in this Chamber where there is just cause.

When this government first began to expropriate land for the floodway three years ago I became very directly involved personally, since it was after all the constituency of Brokenhead that suffered the brunt of this -- I would call it an attack by the government. The way they have gone about buying land in this province has been almost tantamount to an attack on people who were unfortunate enough to own land in the path that the government wanted to build things -- invasion, yes, that would be appropriate too, and I became caught in a strange crossfire between people greatly dissatisfied on the one hand, and with just cause, and on the other hand the Minister of Agriculture, appearing at numerous meetings, slowly, deliberately, almost oozyly, telling the people they had nothing to worry about, that the government was not really intent on doing them any sort of injustice, that he would see to it that everything would be handled judiciously -- (Interjection) -- All the while in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, and outside this Chamber at numerous meetings that were held in the district, I objected to this government's practices and to its methods and techniques of expropriation and to the strange way in which they arrived at a value base to pay to the dispossessed, the expropriated. I pleaded with

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . the government, I cajoled, I begged the Cabinet, the Minister of Agriculture, to change their expropriation practices so that it would be used by them, not at the outset but only, as the Member for Lakeside has suggested, only as a last resort, but this is precisely what this government did not do. They did the opposite. I have here Hansard of last year, page 1945 of last session, and I quote, "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words about this proposed park that is going to be built in the area of Pine Ridge. As the Minister of Natural Resources indicated last Friday, it will be a very large park area intended to serve the Metropolitan area primarily. I have a great interest in this in more ways than one. I do believe that when the 100 or so property owners receive indication of what is going to happen there will again be difficulty ironing out all of the claims and all of the offers and so on." And then on the next page I went on, Madam Speaker, to say, "It will be very interesting to see how this method of land purchase will work out in reality because we have already had some experience with the way in which the floodway property was acquired, was purchased, and while it surely would seem that there is no one way that is going to be free of any sort of complaint, I feel that in many ways the method used in the purchase of floodway property left a great deal to be desired."

Madam Speaker, I last year was asking the Minister of Mines and Resources to please learn something from the experience gained in floodway property acquisition but he and his colleagues in Cabinet learned nothing. They repeated the same mistakes, put the people through the same turmoil as they did in the case of the floodway.

Now we see in the Throne Speech that they are going to, and I quote, "there will be legislation providing for the reorganization of the procedure for the acquisition of property required for public purposes." After some several hundred people have been dealt with so shabbily, after \$90 million apparently has been spent in acquisition of land, then they're going to reform. After the damage has been done, after the horses are gone, then they're going to reform their practice. Did you ever see anything so nonsensical, and to put it in more colloquial terms, did you see anything so stupid, which is the term that I deliberately wish to use. All the while that I was asking the government and the Cabinet Ministers to exercise care and caution, I was doing so, Madam Speaker, with restraint. Read my speeches in Hansard; read my statements to the Press. They were almost the ultimate in restraint. Perhaps I overdid it, but I feel I made the point. It's not my fault if they do not respond to decent language. Why did I use such restraint? Because I believed the Cabinet Ministers last year and the year before when they said that they were profoundly sorry for the inconvenience they were causing and for the displacement they were causing.

The Minister of Agriculture seemed to sum it up for us when he said last year and the year before, and I paraphrase pretty accurately now -- and I paraphrase, "No one could be more sorry than I to have to expropriate property from folk who have lived on and come to love their land, their plot of property. You can never repay them adequately for this." Check Hansard and you will find a statement from the Minister of Agriculture very very close to those precise words. At the time I believed him and his colleagues and that is why, when I did make protestations, I did so with restraint. That's why even when I did go out to these meetings in the area and explain to the people the errors of the government's approach, I did so without political design.

Members don't have to take my word for it. I have here two bulletins published by the Pine Ridge Land Owners Association, and I quote: "A meeting of the association was held on December 6, 1964, at 2:00 p.m. in the Pine Ridge Community Centre to discuss replies received from the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Resources. There were 26 members in attendance including the MLA for our area. By a show of hands the following information was confirmed", then there is a list of data. "Mr. Schreyer told us he was ready to assist us if he could and he fully intended to bring this matter up in the Legislature at the February Session. Mr. Schreyer was asked if he thought it advisable to use the medium of the Press, to which he replied there was nothing wrong with us giving factual reports to the press, radio and so on, but that we should not in any way antagonize the government with regard to settlements."

Take note -- I advised the people there not to take a belligerent stance but to try and be just a little more patient, to try to understand the government's position and so on. I think that the member for St. George would consider me as being a sucker for acting in that way, and I don't mean that in any offensive way, but if he were to say that now I might be inclined to agree with him.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)

And then I quote from a bulletin that was issued by the same group of people on January 7th — January 17th last -- and I quote: "A meeting was held by the membership to discuss what action to take after they had been interviewed by the Rattray Review Committee. There were more than 70 members present together with Mr. Ed Schreyer, the New Democrat, and Mr. Doug Campbell, former Leader of the Liberal Party. Certain information was exchanged", and so on. The point is that these people had to organize themselves and they had to try and organize themselves rather tightly because of the run-around that they were given by this government. The Member for Lakeside has already given you much of the detail of the way in which these people there were affected.

The point is, Madam Speaker, that from April until about August, I deliberately refrained from interceding in any way into this whole question of land acquisition in the Pine Ridge area because I felt that I would in some way bring political overtones into the negotiations that were going on, so I refrained from doing so. But after six, seven months had passed and still no inkling of an offer from this government to the hapless individuals out there, I began to receive phone calls from the people there actually demanding that I intercede. And so I did issue statements to the Press and so on and so forth, but I certainly did not take any advantage of the mood of the dispossessed people, I did not engage in any hectoring of the government until now, and now I say without reservation that I have nothing but criticism for this administration with regard to its land acquisition practices.

I already told members here once why I refrained from making any sort of criticism of the government back in the summer and spring of last year. It's because I believed them and all of their talk about fair play under the law that they were going to see was meted out. I believed them when they talked about love of the soil and how it broke their hearts to have to expropriate farm folks and so on.

Last summer some people came to me with information relative to the Bain Estate acquisition and regarding prices that were allegedly paid for it by the government. The price aspect was of course astounding, as has been revealed by the Leader of the Opposition, but to me even more important than the price aspect, but even more important was the method of acquisition used by the government. I made further enquiries, and as I said the Leader of the Opposition has already documented the pertinent facts, but lest members here and on the Cabinet benches opposite would like to forget, I want to repeat three salient features of that incident or transaction so as to serve as a basis for fresh comment on my part.

First of all, who would deny -- do Ministers opposite deny that a windfall profit in excess of 125 to 130 thousand dollars was picked up by a company on land held by it for less than a month, in fact technically not held by it at all, land picked up by that company without one cent of risk, in fact -- well perhaps a hundred dollars was put up by that company by way of option. And second, the second point, the government wasted in this regard at least \$130,000 and it might be argued they even wasted really closer to \$200,000.

And the third point, Madam Speaker, that the government's policy and power of expropriation that was used so rapaciously -- and I think that's the word -- used so rapaciously against the farm folk living in the path of the floodway and the small landholders in Pine Ridge, used so rapaciously against them was, in the case of the Bain Estate and the case of Octave Enterprises, used not at all. Why wasn't expropriation used? Was it because Octave Enterprises had developed such a love for the soil around Delta? I recall the Minister of Agriculture talking about love of the soil, and that it was really too bad to have to use expropriation against people who had lived so long on the land that they could just pick up the rich dark earth and inhale the musky odour of the soil. Apparently Octave Enterprises and the people that own it had come in three weeks to learn to love their soil so much that this government could simply not suffer to expropriate.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Who were they? Did you find out?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, when we were going through The Companies Act trying to revise it, members will recall that there doesn't seem much that one can do about dummy directors and so on. But in any case, Madam Speaker, as for the farmers and market gardeners between Dugald and Lockport, in that salient, around Pine Ridge and elsewhere, the government did expropriate them. That's common knowledge. They expropriated them because these people had no love for the soil. How could they? They had only owned this land for five, ten, fifteen, twenty-five, thirty, fifty and sixty years, that's all. Not long enough. Does this government, and particularly does the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Mines and

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . Resources, really think that Manitobans are that gullible or stupid? I can recall the Premier of this province using the term "mugwumpery" once when referring to the member for St. George and to the former member for Carillon. But I say that if the term "mugwumpery" was ever to be used appropriately in this Chamber, it applies to this Cabinet and particularly to the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Mines and Resources. After that kind of exhibition on the part of this government, nothing could surprise us any more. Nothing would be a surprise.

May I say, Madam Speaker, that last year -- last year I asked this government to act judiciously in obtaining the land for the Pine Ridge Park. I have already quoted you the excerpts, page 1945, 1943 and so on, but it was of no avail. The government wouldn't, didn't, wouldn't, couldn't, I don't know. They just did not -- they did not avail themselves of any advice. So now I am going to put it to them in terms that I hope they will be able to understand. This whole land acquisition episode in Manitoba as carried out by this government is a dirty, stinking mess.

One reason why I say so is because of unco-ordinate land values arbitrarily arrived at. The second reason is however in my opinion more important, and that is method. If their method was judicious in the first place they would have extended equal treatment under the law. The basic concept, Madam Speaker, is equal treatment under the law to citizens of one sovereignty. This government violated that basic principle. Let them show otherwise. I don't like to use cliches either, Madam Speaker, but with some justification I think I can say that this government has in its land acquisition practices, whether by deliberate intent or not, but to look from perspective one can see that they have treated the poor with expropriation and to the large landholder they have indulged in secret and surreptitious free bargaining, and let them show otherwise.

But it is not only a case of unequal treatment before the laws, it is also a matter of capricious and arbitrary use of power. This is after all a democracy and it seems sometimes silly, naive and childish to have to talk about fundamentals of democracy, but once in a while it is necessary when a slight step off the path is taken, and here I am not sure that the step off the path was a slight one. No other government, to my knowledge, in this country has ever expropriated such large numbers of small landowners without even attempting to make -- without even attempting to make offers on the basis of free negotiation.

Let me tell to this government once again -- they've been told this before -- that the example of what ought to be done in the case of acquisition of large tracts of land can be seen, the example is there in the case of the Satellite Airport at St. Andrews, of which I have personal knowledge, in which my family was personally involved. There the federal government bought 1,600 acres of land for Satellite Airport, a substantial tract of land, Madam Speaker, and about 30 to 40 property owners involved, again a fairly substantial number.

This government would obviously have expropriated them on the pretext that without expropriation they could not avoid speculation. But the federal Department of Transport went there, freely negotiated from the start, acquired the land without one expropriation from any of the 30 property owners. They acquired the land of the 1,600 acres within three months. They paid a price that was not unreasonable. In fact, they paid a price that was later matched by the provincial government in the case of the floodway at Gonor and Narol, but the difference was that the provincial government started out with an offer of \$75.00 and after two and a half years of wheeling and dealing and horse trading and arbitrarily mixing and admixing property values, ended up paying \$250.00 an acre. But think, think of the waste of time; think of the effect it had on the people out there; think of the low, dishonest kind of enterprise indulged in by this government in that episode. They ended up paying the same amount as was paid by the federal Department of Transport for land of similar kind just five, six miles across the way.

Not having learned anything from the floodway expropriation the government proceeded to do the same thing in the case of the Pine Ridge District. Without notice, without notice it expropriated them in one fell swoop, and then to add insult to injury it waited eight, nine and ten months before making an initial offer. Seven months at the minimum, and if that isn't adding insult to injury I don't know what is. To me, this is the ultimate.

Now when my Leader back on April 8th -- March 8th, pardon me, 1961, suggested to this government that The Expropriation Act and the way they were attempting to change it then was going against centuries of commonly conceived landholder rights, do you know what the present Minister of Mines said to my Leader? He said, and I quote, "Nonsense, and if you had any brains you would know better."

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . .

I'm sorry that my honourable friend the Minister of Mines isn't here because I would like to say to him that this is precisely what has happened. This government has in fact gone against centuries of commonly conceived -- commonly conceived under common law, commonly conceived landholders' rights, and if they haven't changed the law to do so they have done so by practice under the law and outside the law.

I gather from the member for Lakeside that the filing of the Expropriation Notice may be illegal. This would not surprise me at this stage, Madam Speaker. It would not surprise me. And in any case -- I don't know whether the member from Lakeside would agree or not -- I would say does it really matter so much at this stage since this government has done by practice as much evil, as much injury to people as it could have done by evil law. Law or practice, what's the difference?

The Premier of this province said last year -- I forget the exact context, I don't remember what the issue was -- but he said something to the effect that "We must not bring the juggernaut of the state down on hapless people". I don't know what he was referring to. It seems to me at the back of my mind it had to do with the St. Vital, the bus issue, school issue, and so on. Well apparently this government, this Cabinet decides whether it is going to enforce the laws of this province and when they're going to ignore them. They decide whether they're going to use the law against some property owners and when they're going to ignore it and not use it against other property owners.

This then, Madam Speaker, is not a government of laws any more; it becomes a government of men. I suggest to you that the difference between a government of laws and a government of men is the difference between freedom and tyranny. Give them time, give them time without an effective opposition, give them time for them to fight elections with large funds for fighting elections with, they'll make a mess of things and they'll make a mess of individual rights too. Let me say to them, those that talk about nationalization and so on across the way, that this Conservative government has acted more arbitrarily and capriciously against individuals than any other single government in this province's history, and even in this country.

MR. JOHNSON: You're getting carried away.

MR. SCHREYER: Certainly more so than the government of the Province of Saskatchewan. It may have had -- it may have had the socialist label but it was a social democratic government and social democracy does not have to take a back seat to any kind of ideology when it comes to concern for individual rights. The Opposition -- the member for Roblin has gone back to school, and judging by his reaction I can see why he should have done so. We on this side have now given the government warning. We have given them warning; we have made our charges; I am making them now. I say to this government defend yourself if indeed you have any defence. I accuse this government in its land acquisition practices of blatant hypocrisy. I accuse this government of blatant and capricious inconsistency. I accuse this government of arbitrary use of power on the side of wealth. I accuse this government of turpitude. I accuse this government of failing to act prudently in the public interests. This is something we expect our public utilities to do. This government is charged even more so with that obligation.

And finally I accuse the specific departments involved in the Bain acquisition -- the Bain property acquisition of swearing false declarations of value, and let them show otherwise. It is not our fault if we must continue to make these charges since they have had now seventy-two hours with no response. I submit, Madam Speaker, that this government's land acquisition practices make up a low dishonest chapter in this story of the Conservative government of Manitoba. If their educational program was their crowning glory, this is their lowest ebb.

And as a sequel to this, and if I have time, I would like to make reference to two other cases of land acquisition apart from the Bain acquisition, apart from the Pine Ridge acquisition, apart from the floodway. I want to let members be aware of the way in which the Department of Public Works has been going around getting some of its property. Yes, the McKenzie property. It's now been settled, but I wonder if the honourable members realize that the McKenzie property, this new house, the basement for it was being dug at a time when the Department of Public Works knew that the road would be going right by. No warning given to the proprietor. The house was constructed. Then when he was half way through his interior finishing they came by with the notice that they would require this property. They suggested to him that perhaps he should stop going any further right there. They made an offer. It was unsatisfactory. They left him, left him for several months. He started to complete

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . the finishing of the inside of his house. They came back and told him that if he persisted in finishing the inside of his house they would not necessarily take responsibility for that and might not pay him for it, so he stopped. Months passed again; no final payment; no settlement. Finally settlement was arrived at, at a cost I would suggest far in excess of what that house may have been worth, and the property there, all for the simple reason that they failed to advise the individual that he would be making a mistake in starting the construction of this house.

Now that's one case. Another case -- I cannot use the individual's name because I have not checked it fully with him, that is to say I have not received his permission for any sort of public disclosure -- but here was a gentleman living in a ribbon development and the Department of Public Works saw that they needed a cloverleaf or semi-cloverleaf interchange, so they sent big equipment through throwing up the grade for this interchange, big equipment moving within five feet of the corner picket of his fence. They didn't have the courtesy to at least consult, or discuss the matter with the property owner. The result is that with all of the shaking of the heavy earth moving equipment the picket fence was put on a cant, part of the basement and the plaster was cracked and so on, and today there is a sort of a modern high speed interchange type roadway going within five miles and much elevated past somebody's (Interjection -- five feet) five feet from this person's corner picket. This kind of nonsense -- well, Madam Speaker, to have a sense of proportion of all this you must realize these two cases do not compare in magnitude with the cases of Pine Ridge and the floodway and so on; but they are indicative of a pattern and that is that there is simply a lack of co-ordination in land acquisition practices. The member for Lakeside mentioned something about the Dunsdale affair in Britain. I presume he is referring to the Churchill Downs scandal involving property which necessitated the resignation of a Cabinet Minister, as a result. But the British at least learned something. They learned as a result of that scandal that if they wanted to right the wrong they would have to set up a land acquisition tribunal with . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the Honourable Member he has four minutes left.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you. A land acquisition tribunal of a politically removed nature, sort of quasi judicial tribunal, that was to co-ordinate land acquisition. Madam Speaker, I hope for the sake of this government that its reference in the Speech from the Throne to reforming its land acquisition practices has something of substance in there. I hope it is not just a case of window dressing. Thank you.

. . . . Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS, (Minister of Industry & Commerce), (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I had the honour this last year of attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association where a number of those present were speakers in their various legislatures in parliaments throughout the world and I learned afresh at that time the great value of the high office of Speaker, the great regard in which the Speakers who occupy those chairs are held and was deeply impressed indeed in the regard in which they are held by the other members of parliament. On another occasion I shall report at greater length to the House on the proceedings of that Parliament but I did want to use this occasion to say how much my own respect for the high office was refreshed and to extend my compliments to you on this occasion. I would like to say also that the mover and seconder of the speech acquitted themselves extremely well. I found their addresses not only interesting but very forcefully given and I think a valuable contribution to the deliberations of the House. I welcome back my lifelong friend and companion at arms in the political field and my valued colleague in the Cabinet and feel that we are fortunate indeed to have him back with us. I am going to enter into this debate in—I am not going to touch on the subject of land acquisition, I can assure the members of the opposition—(Interjections)—because the case for the government is being prepared in detail and with the kind of care that has obviously been lavished upon it in a number of quarters on the opposite side. It will be presented factually, it will be presented without innuendo, it will be presented in moderate and temperate language which befits the House— which is more than I can say for my honourable friend for whom I had a good deal of respect up till now as a parliamentarian and I think as a young man he should learn to temper his language. He will find it will gain greater acceptance both in this House and among the public. But the government's case is..

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker on a point of privilege involving a member of my party I wonder whether the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce might expand on that because at no time did you Madam Speaker or any other member of this House challenge the language that was used by my colleague.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I will deal with the references to economic matters that have been made very largely by my honourable and good and jovial friend, the leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I think I will rise on a point of privilege. I would like the honourable minister to tell me what terms I used, specifically what terms did I use that were unparliamentary?

MR. EVANS: I just offered a word of advice to my honourable friend in his debating and I suggest that if he has some advice to offer me on other occasions he'll take some proper occasion to do it. There has been some reference in two quarters of the House to a phrase that my leader used in connection with the state of the economy in Manitoba in which the word deplorable was used and I think too that it's very deplorable that in this province that we are not up as the leading province in Canada. I think it's deplorable that we have not all of the economic resources that we would like to have and I join with him in this sentiment that all is not as good as it should be. I might add that I was the first to say so in the House. I think some five or six years ago honourable members may remember that I made a speech introducing the idea that theirs should be a study which eventually came to be known as the COMEF Report and I indicated that preliminary studies showed that there would be a shortage of some 40,000 jobs in this province by 1970, which is the year I used, if nothing was done about it. Subsequently this was confirmed by the COMEF Report and so if my honourable friends had only been listening at that time I tell them that I made a far better speech than they did. I made it with more facts behind it, I made a stronger case for the kind of action that we have taken and if they had only studied that more carefully and repeated it back to me they might have made a slightly more damaging case than they have.

But I don't want to quarrel with my honourable friend because I agree with the main statement that he made. I think his principle was perfectly right when he said that I submit that taxes are not the solution to the problem of discovering increased sources of revenue to support better educational health and welfare services required by this province. I submit that increased productivity is the area in which the government should explore in its search for funds, and that of course is the principle upon which we are acting. Well I said so first, I said so four or five years ago, and I said so forcefully, and we devised the COMEF plan as a solution. Now my honourable friends over here claim to have some sort of monopoly on the

(MR. EVANS, cont'd). . . . process of planning. Well that is utter nonsense because there was a plan put forward under the title of the Committee for Manitoba's Economic Future which was the best plan of any state or provincial government in North America in the year 1963, '62 or '63. In that year we were awarded the prize of the Society of Industrial Realtors, a runner-up on that occasion was the great state of New York. The state which succeeded us in that championship was the great state of Texas. I suggest to you we are in quite fast company and we have been able to stand up to it.

We united labour and management and agriculture and government in a well co-ordinated plan to attack the problem with which we were confronted, which was a shortage of productivity or of economic production in the province to accomplish all the purposes that we wanted. It outlined the plan for us which can be described as having the dimensions of 75 x 75, that is to say 75,000 new jobs by 1975. Well, things are encouraging as a result of the work of that COMEF Report and I have to report to you that progress in the economy at this moment is encouraging. I won't say it's satisfactory, I will probably never say that it is completely satisfactory because there are always new horizons that we can approach if we keep our eyes on the stars. But we are now estimating that the value of manufactured products for Manitoba plants in 1964 will reach about \$995 million, slightly under the billion dollar mark that we had hoped for. This is an increase of \$63 million or 6.8 percent over the \$932 million which was produced in 1963. For the period for January to July 1964 the value of shipments in Manitoba were running at a rate of 10.2 percent over the comparable period of '63. The rate for all Canada at that time was 9.1. For the first six months we were 10.2, the average for all of Canada was 9.1. However, the growth rate of 6.8 percent in manufacture shipments in Manitoba during 1964 will be slightly less than the total for Canada. The major reason was the strike at the International Nickle Company at Thompson during the months of August and September. There is no doubt that had the Thompson strike not taken place manufacturers' shipments would have exceeded the billion dollar mark that was the growth rate in the province would have equalled or surpassed that of all Canada. Between 1958 and 1963 factory shipments in Manitoba have increased by 38.1 percent as compared with 34.9 percent for all of Canada, and so our percentage increase has been fully equal to or better than the average for all of Canada in that period. The figures are as follows and I think they are worth recording: 1958 was \$675 million; 1959 - \$730, 1960 - \$720, 1961 - \$779, 1962 - \$885, 1963 - \$932, and for 1964 we estimate \$995 million. I record those figures in detail so that honourable members will have a chance to look at them and consider them as we proceed on with debate or with the debates on my estimates.

I turn now to the matter of employment in manufacturing and we have had the opportunity of studying some material which has not yet been fully released by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics but it is estimated that the total employment in manufacturing industries will reach 46,700 for the year. This is an increase of some 2,000 or 4.5 percent over 1963. And it's I think most encouraging, most encouraging to me, that this exceeds the target set in front of us by COMEF. COMEF said that we could reach the employment that we are seeking by 1975 if certain targets were reached and they set an employment target in manufacturing of 1,760 jobs for the current year and we have exceeded it by reaching the total of 2,000. Another measure of the success that has been achieved so far can be found in new capital investment in manufacturing. Estimates for the Department of Trade and Commerce forecast total capital expenditures in manufacturing in Manitoba in 1964 at \$36.3 million which is an increase of \$7.8 million or 27 percent over the \$28.5 million invested in 1963.

The tourist industry I am glad to say will also reach new high points. So I record that in substantiation of my statement that things are encouraging in the economic sphere in Manitoba.

And I would like to deal with one or two remarks of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in his speech the other day. He said, he made the extraordinary statement that there were fewer jobs in 1963 than in 1959 in manufacturing and I can only assume that my honourable friend, who is now returning to the Chamber, I'm glad to say, (Interjection) because --you must have some radar wave that brought you back (Interjection) or mental telepathy, as I was about to challenge some of your figures. Well I'm so glad you're back. You made a remark to the effect, and I don't think I misquote you, when I say that you claimed there were fewer jobs in 1963 than in 1959 in manufacturing in Manitoba. Well I'm not at all sure-- I don't believe that I have the same sources of information that you have, I suggest that your figure is well worth checking again because the figures are as follows: That in

February 26th, 1965

(MR. EVANS, cont'd).....1958 --and here I point out that the basis of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics has changed slightly, I don't think it makes any difference-- but on the new basis there were 41, 508 jobs in 1958 and by 1964 that had risen to 46, 700. So I think my honourable friend is completely mistaken in whatever figures he was using. I quote these as the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and I point out that I think his figures are wrong.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm quoting, Madam Speaker if my memory serves me right and if I may figures that were dealing with intermediary years between '58 and '64 I haven't my script before me either, but I'll be glad to check this with my honourable friend.

MR. EVANS: Well I record then the figures as I have them and I'm sure we can come to an understanding. With respect to personal income, my honourable friend made some remark to the effect that personal incomes showed the smallest increase of any province, and here we run across a difficult set of statistics to understand or to follow. I'm not quite aware of what figures he was using in showing some particular percentage increase between two years. I do point out however, that the personal incomes --I haven't had access to those particular figures, I wasn't able to confirm the announcement, the figures that were recorded at that time.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll let you have them.

MR. EVANS: I do point out that with respect to taking the Canadian average as 100 Manitoba isn't too badly off in personal income. Manitoba has about 96% of the Canadian average and we are higher than Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and somewhat below Saskatchewan which was a very high year in the year in question because of the very large wheat sales, but somewhat lower, and then lower than British Columbia and Ontario. Not by too much. Ontario was 116, we were 96. Substantially below, I must admit. Nevertheless personal income is not in a very sad state in Manitoba.

Now we have the extraordinary statement that we are not attracting new industry but are losing it. Well there have been individual industries that have been lost, I think the one that was cited was the Sovereign Life and we regret that very much. Others have been lost. I have quoted in this chamber on other occasions some very substantial losses that occurred. We know what's happened to the Overhaul Base shrinking from 1300 down to 800. We know what's happened to the fur trade which has shrunk down from 900 to 100. We know what's happened to well there's the Railway Overhaul Shop when the conversion came from diesel to steam, from steam to diesel rather, the other way round, and I think some 2300 jobs were lost throughout the province. And these things have happened. But those difficulties have been overcome and we are in fact making very substantial new gains.

I would like to tell my honourable friend that in 1964, 41 new manufacturing establishments were announced or went into production with an investment of three million, three hundred and sixty-seven thousand dollars and direct employment of 524 people in those factories. In assessing industrial development one must look at the expansion of industry already in the province. The figures I have just quoted are those of new industries. They were never here before. But our great advance has been in the expansion of production and expansion of productive facilities of factories already existing in the province and in 1964, 295 Manitoba establishments invested thirty million dollars in additions to their plants and for equipment. The direct increase in employment was 1, 499 and the total direct employment including additional employees outside --no, let me correct that. That the direct employment in new industries and the direct employment in the expansion of existing industries comes to 2, 023 jobs. So I think this refutes the suggestion that we are not attracting new industry or getting expansion in the province. We are. We have overcome the deficits that we have incurred by some of these industries fading out and we have been able to make the advances that I have recorded.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . those figures, I wonder if the Honourable Minister, Madam Speaker, could give us the number of additional people who came on the labour market in the same time.

MR. EVANS: I'm not quite able to do it in the way my honourable friend asked, but I did record the, in detail, the increase in manufacturing employment, year by year, and I think my honourable friend will see that it has been a net gain. I'm not able to tell you at the moment those who have.

MR. PAULLEY: I would appreciate it if you could get me that figure sometime later. I think it would be very revealing.

(MR. EVANS, cont'd). We could have some further opportunity to discuss that perhaps on the estimates. I do have some figures on it somewhere but I'm not able to lay my hand on it at the moment. Now my honourable friend said that private industry is unwilling or unable to provide the kind of vital force behind the industrial drive that is necessary. He and I have a complete disagreement on this point. I indicate to him that for the 1961/63 period we've stood up rather better than the neighbouring province which seemed to have the other philosophy that there should be a greater degree of state participation in the industrial process than we believe in. Manitoba showed in salaries and wages paid in manufacturing an increase of ten percent. In Saskatchewan, it was 3.9. That's a pretty fair comparison. In the same period factory shipments increased. After taking account of inventory shipments and orders, Manitoba 19.6 percent, Saskatchewan 10.7. I don't think that lends any support to my honourable friend's contention that a public ownership policy is a more vital or driving one than a private enterprise one. He invited me to keep my mind open through the narrow slit that still existed and I'll do that, I'll endeavour to widen the slit..

MR. PAULLEY: But you're aware at the same time, the net per capita income in Manitoba went down by .5 percent whereas in Saskatchewan it went up by 8 percent.

MR. EVANS: I'm not -- I would have to take a more careful look at..

MR. PAULLEY: I'd think we'd better get our figures together..

MR. EVANS:before commenting on them at this time. What I was commenting on is the fact that I'm quite prepared to keep an open mind. That being a Conservative I don't believe in extremes on either side. That's my definition of being a Conservative. I think that you find the sensible middle road and you pursue it and you get better results that way than you do pressing almost anything to an extreme. And so I continue to follow that policy in economic policy as well.

Now with respect to the remarks concerning reliance on the COMEF Report and not showing a defeatist attitude, I think we can point to our action that has followed on the COMEF Report, on the participation of the government in certain institutions at least and to say that far from having a defeatist attitude we have accepted the challenge of acquiring 75,000 new jobs which would not come by themselves by the year 1975. Far from being defeatist, we believe we can do it. Our first year so far has shown that we can at least keep up with the target and perhaps exceed it. I don't believe we're going to be defeated; we're going to win. In fact I know we are.

But the remarks that were attributed to the Premier dealt with the matter of a regional development policy for Canada, and it was in this sense that he was calling upon Ottawa to devise a national policy which would call for the development of Canada by regions so that each would reach its maximum potential, each would make its maximum contribution. This same principle was recognized by the Economic Council of Canada in its Annual Report. You'll remember Dr. Deutsch used these words "We emphasize however that a broad basis of regional participation in economic growth is essential if we are to attain consistent high standards of economic performance especially as regards high employment and sustained productivity advances". Well it's long been recognized by the Premier and by this government and by the province, we want close co-operation with Ottawa, but we recognize our own responsibility as far as we can within our own powers and within our own limitations in the province to stimulate our own economy and to do the best we can for ourselves, and it was in that sense that he was referring to assistance from Ottawa in the outlining of a broad economic policy for Canada.

Well I have admitted to my honourable friend that I still have an open and I hope relatively unprejudiced mind toward any form of development that's going to help this province and we hold ourselves out as a willing partner to industry. We think a junior partner. We think the initiative and the drive must come from business men who risk their own money, who spend their own time, who develop their own businesses. And we believe that it can be done. I would think if anything is typical of the attitude that has been taken by this government in the economic sphere both in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, the Department of Agriculture and certainly in my department toward the thing is that it can be done and I believe the spirit of confidence is growing to the point where it of its own momentum will achieve the objectives that we're after. We do want industry which will come here and succeed. If they can find a place of if there is a place for the Manitoba Government to supply some of the technical assistance that they require we are ready and willing and anxious indeed to provide it.

(MR. EVANS, cont'd).

The term planning is used in a great many cases rather loosely. There's the kind of planning which involves the authoritarian dictation of exactly what everybody's to do and how they're to do it and what reward they're to have; and there is the other concept of allowing the free agents of the economy to find their own futures and their own destinies and to seek help from their government for the kind of services that they're not able to provide for themselves.

Well my honourable friend then turned to another rather general statement when he said that --by quoting somewhat correctly-- that "laissez faire is dead, and that we require more manpower training and so far this has not been done." I think I took down my honourable friend's words correctly. I hope I don't misquote him, I try not to. But I think if my honourable friend will only think back fairly over the measures that have been taken he is bound to recognize that some very extensive efforts have been made by this province to increase the manpower training and the manpower training facilities of this Province in the technical schools, in expanded educational programs, the Manitoba Institute of Technology, in upgrading courses, and I might say in the in-plant training program that is being conducted in the garment industry by my own department.

In this last one I would like to acquaint him with some of the facts of the situation so he will have the measure of this program, its extent and the progress that it's made to date. There have been so far 51 plants take part in the training program itself. So far, 504 graduates have gone through these training courses. They have received basic training and qualified in the four basic operations on sewing machines. There are in training at the moment 160 students and there are nine courses applied for which have not yet been started. Some 83 percent of the students who have graduated as trained machine operators are still at work in their plants. This is quite a high percent. This does not apply --the 83 percent does not apply to all the students who entered the course because there was a substantial failure rate. It is a hard course and only skilled and properly qualified people graduate, but of those who graduated some 83 percent are now employed. There were between four and five hundred idle sewing machines in these factories for want of trained employees at the time the course started. It is my understanding that they are now nearly all busy and further equipment orders are being placed, and for the first time there is a sufficient supply of trained employees to run the factories and production is increasing accordingly.

And so I give my honourable friend the measure of one program that was started by this department which I think would justify some modification in his statement to the effect that no training has been done. I would invite him to read some of the press releases that have been put out by this government for his edification, and if he doesn't care to edify himself that's his own lookout, but I would say to him that there is very interesting factual information contained in the press release dated February 19, 1965, under the title of "Training Programs Get Good Response. . The Honourable George Johnson, the Minister of Education, reports an excellent response to an extended incentive program designed to assist present unemployed workers to prepare for future work in skilled jobs. Launched in November, the new program is providing living allowances to 1, 138 students in upgrading or basic training for skill development courses in trade training courses at Winnipeg and Brandon, and in apprenticeship training programs. Dr. Johnson said that students qualifying for assistance are registered with the National Employment Service; are categorized as unemployed; and are referred or directed into training programs by the National Employment Service.

"The Minister reported that 663 of these students are enrolled in upgrading courses; 300 are taking trade training courses at Winnipeg and Brandon; and 175 students are enrolled in apprenticeship training programs. The upgrading or basic training for skill development courses are designed to provide students with a standing required to admit them to trade training courses requiring less than high school graduation. Instruction is given in Industrial Mathematics, Trade Science, and Practical English. Dr. Johnson said that 285 such trainees are enrolled in 14 classes in Winnipeg while 378 students are taking the same program in 17 classes in nine centres throughout the province. Further classes are planned for the near future in the isolated communities of Pelican Rapids and Berens River. Many of these students will be of Indian ancestry the Minister says. Dr. Johnson reported that five basic training classes have graduated in Manitoba in recent months and that some 250 graduates of the upgrading program are currently enrolled in vocational or trade training

(MR. EVANS, cont'd).....courses at the Manitoba Institute of Technology. Upgrading courses are also underway at Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Dauphin, Flin Flon, Plum Coulee, Swan River, St. Pierre, and Ebb and Flow.

"Trainees receive living allowances ranging from \$12.00 to \$50.00 per week, depending upon residence" -- and as it says in this press release, "they get their training allowance according to their residence and according to their marital status-- their marital status and their number of dependents. The province recovers 50 percent of the apprentice allowance payments and 90 percent of the other allowance payments from the federal government. I ask my friend to consider if that isn't a substantial program and substantial progress, and justifies some modification of his stricture here about the manpower training program.

MR. PAULLEY: I am afraid I might dim the rosy view when we come to that particular part of the discussions of estimates.

MR. EVANS: Very good. I'll look forward to some further exchanges on this. Next my honourable friend called on us to establish some research institutes that might provide technologists to industry, and I have in previous years outlined the services that have been performed through my own department. We regard this as one of the main responsibilities of my department, not only not so much to send out people within the civil service to help industry but we have retained a great many in the consulting field to come here and work with the industry, and there are four main programs that have been undertaken in that regard in different industries. I speak of the garment industry, the fur working industry, the sheet metal, and I have to confess at the moment the fourth slips my mind. But they have been substantial. They have gone into plant after plant, given expert technical advice which has been accepted and has been of benefit to the plants that have undertaken these courses.

I was not able to quite understand my honourable friend's reference to a royalty system which might be set up in some kind of a way. I took it that he might be referring to royalties on natural resources that are chargeable by the province, and I assure him that the narrow slit in my mind is still open enough to receive that suggestion and if we have some opportunity to act on it, I am sure I'll get support from the other departments concerned.

I repeat again in connection with his last remark that crown corporations in certain particular industries --and I think he referred to a steel plant and he did say something to the effect that I had dragged the pulp and paper mill at The Pas out of the mothballs again. Well I can assure my honourable friend that it has never been in the mothballs, that that matter is under constant and steady review, and with that rather obscure statement I am not going to say anything more because until I have something to announce, I won't announce it. There are other provinces not too far from here who have announced the pulp mill eight times, and I see just this last day or so the last of the eight has been cancelled out. So I just tell you that Saskatchewan is now without a pulp mill having announced it eight times. I have never announced it --I won't announce it until I have a pulp mill to announce.

MR. PAULLEY: We are even without a government now.

MR. EVANS: But I did want, Madam Speaker, to take some part in this debate when I found that some statements were made that were at variance with the facts as I knew them. I wanted to present our side of the case to claim that we are in great heart about achieving our objectives under COMEF, to increase productivity here with the object of providing not so much money returns but the better life for Manitoba. My honourable friend spoke of it in terms of providing the social capital in education and other things, and that's one way of stating it. Another is to give an opportunity to those who grow up in this province to remain here, to earn their living here, to settle down and not only enjoy their own province and their friends and relations and the surroundings that are familiar to them, but also to contribute and build their own province. And with that object in mind we are proceeding in good heart; we are encouraged; we are going to reach our objectives; and that I am sure will be a matter of satisfaction in all quarters of the House.

..... Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition,

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am absolutely amazed at the performance that we have seen in this House in the past week. On Tuesday of this week I made certain statements in this House and certain charges against the government. Those charges, Madam Speaker, were documented. They were accurate, they were precise, they were clear. Since that time we have not had a single reply from this government, not a single reply, Madam Speaker.

The first speech we have had from a Cabinet Minister of this government has been the one that was just completed a few moments ago. So far not a single reply and might I add not an answer from the government to any questions that we have asked -- and the First Minister can sit there and smirk if he wishes because, Madam Speaker, that is the attitude of this government. They couldn't care less about the public. When I spoke the other day the present Minister of Mines and Natural Resources sat there with a great big grin on his face. Now the First Minister sits there with a big grin on his face because these people, Madam Speaker, couldn't care less obviously about \$100,000 or \$142,000. Their attitude is what's a \$100,000 (interjection) or is it what's a million dollars? They are not the least bit concerned, Madam Speaker, and if there was ever an admission of defeat, an admission of guilt from a government, it's been the attitude of this government in the past week. Because what have we heard from them? Not a word.

MR. ROBLIN: You will.

MR. MOLGAT: Not a reply.

MR. ROBLIN: You will, in due course.

MR. MOLGAT: What speeches have we had, Madam Speaker, from the government? Well the Member for Swan River, the Member for St. Matthews, the Member for Roblin and one Cabinet Minister. Madam Speaker, who was that? Was that the minister? Oh, I was afraid it was the Minister of Welfare -- pardon me -- of Health. What answer, Madam Speaker, do we get from these people? None whatever. And tonight we get a recital from the Minister of Industry and Commerce from the innumerable reports that he's produced for this government, a recital of statistics, but not an answer of any kind. Madam Speaker, that isn't good enough.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right.

MR. MOLGAT: On what grounds can this government say "in due course." After I spoke here the other day what did we hear from the government? This was their statement in the papers. The First Minister said in due course they were going to have a reply. In the course of -- how? The same way as Mr. Molgat spoke, he said, point by point. Asked how he would answer, Mr. Lyon said, "That will be easy." Well, Madam Speaker, where are the answers from the government? The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources hasn't been in the House all day. Busy up in his office writing his speech? The Minister of Agriculture is obviously out with him. I don't know why they don't invite the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that is the previous minister, who started this whole affair (interjections). That's for sure. When I asked questions from him today, he was told by the First Minister, "No. No answers." The only answers we get in this House are from the First Minister. Well, Madam Speaker, it's about time that we got an answer from this government. It's about time the people of Manitoba knew what's going on in this province because they're not satisfied with what's going on. And my honourable friend can sit there and smirk all he wants. But let me tell him, the people of this province are fed up with this government, fed right up to the ears, and all he needs to do is to go out and find out. And if he'd like to find out let him call an election. Let him call an election right now. I dare him to. Because, Madam Speaker, the results would amaze my honourable friend. And if he doesn't know it, then I suggest to him he go out and find out what's going on in Manitoba. Because these people of this province are no longer prepared you know to listen to statistics like the Minister of Industry and Commerce just recited. They're no longer prepared to accept platitudes of that sort because they've come to find out what's gone on in the Province of Manitoba. And, Madam Speaker, it's a pretty sorry mess. And I can't say that I get any satisfaction or that I rejoice in any way at this situation, because it's a sad situation for this province. It's one that every one of us will have to pay for. The ineptitude of this government is going to weigh heavy on the people of this province for many years to come. Not only have they wasted years but they have put the situation of this province such that for many years to come the rest of us will have to pay heavily for the way in which they have administered our affairs. They have put us in the position where the tax load is ever heavy on our people. They've put on taxes the likes of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) which my colleague, the Member for St. George, spoke this afternoon, are cruel taxes. In addition to that they have raised the debt load in this province regardless of what the Member for Roblin might be saying. If he will go and check the figures he will find that they have raised the debt load in this province to the point that it's the highest per capita of any province in Canada.

MR. ROBLIN: That is quite wrong.

MR. MOLGAT: Bar none, bar none. The First Minister can say that's quite wrong. He knows that those are not my figures. He knows that those come from our impartial group of observers who take the province's. -- oh and they don't take his statements (interjection) because they know better. They know that they have to go and get accurate statements and they therefore go and search through the reports of this province and of every other province. If they weren't fair in their estimates, if they took this province separately, if they gave a different accounting for Manitoba than they gave for Ontario my honourable friend could complain. But they don't. They don't.

MR. ROBLIN: I know they do.

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend knows very well they don't. He knows perfectly well that they take every province and they analyze it in exactly the same way.

MR. ROBLIN: No they don't.

MR. MOLGAT: Is he suggesting for one moment that the Tax Foundation is a body that set out purposely to make my friend the goat? He is, he is. But they haven't set out to point that out. They are taking right across the board, they are taking every province in the same way and they show conclusively what this government has done to the Province of Manitoba. And, Madam Speaker, let us make no mistake about this. The next government that takes over in this province is going to have a tough row to hoe (interjections) because of the way this government has operated (interjections). Madam Speaker, I know that our group are not going to find it easy to accept this legacy from my honourable friends. It's going to be a tough one, but we are prepared to accept the challenge because we know that Manitoba needs a change in government and the sooner the better.

MR. PAULLEY: After both of you, (interjections)

MR. MOLGAT: And I say to my honourable friend give the people of Manitoba a chance. They'd love to have it right now. There's nothing they'd rather have right now than the opportunity to have a change of government. But I don't suppose my honourable friend will do anything about it. We'll have to carry on for the next two years and suffer under this administration. But the least that one could expect, Madam Speaker, is that this administration would at least make some attempt to improve its operation, some attempt to give better service to the people of Manitoba. Well what do we find, Madam Speaker? When the members on this side of the House come up and present to the government some very specific cases such as the ones that I brought up earlier this week we have silence from the government. We have arrogance from this government. They're obviously trying to pretend that these charges mean nothing at all.

A MEMBER: What would you call it?

MR. MOLGAT: Well the First Minister shakes his head. The Minister of Mines and Resources said that the replies would be easy. Where's he been all day? If they're easy replies, if it's a simple case, if there's nothing to it, why isn't the Minister of Agriculture here? Why don't they answer some questions? Why don't they come forward and give their replies, if it's an easy case? Yes, I suppose possibly he's out expropriating from some of the poor people, the ones who can't afford

A MEMBER: Maybe he's expropriating the answers.

MR. MOLGAT: Possibly, possibly, Madam Speaker, if I have the time it might be a wise thing for me to read a small poem to the members of this House, because I think (interjections). Well, now, that's a good one. I'm glad you brought that up because let me tell you there are a lot of people in Canada right now talking about furniture deals. Well if they think that the furniture deals have got anything on the Art Centre deals of this government or the Bain Estate deals of this government, then let them bring them out. Because if there was ever anything that needed investigation more it's the way this government proceeded with its art centre purchases or with the Bain Estate purchases, and I dare them to have an investigation. So don't come along and talk to me about furniture deals because you've got plenty to look into in your own cupboard, my friend, and just open the doors and have your investigation. I dare you. (interjections) Madam Speaker, my friends across the way in the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) case of the Bain Estate were very happy to go about apparently proceeding to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars unnecessarily. The case of the Bird's Hill expropriation reversed with the case. There immediate expropriation without warning was the order of the day. I think it would be fitting for me to read into the record a little poem entitled "The Bird's Hill Expropriation" (interjection) well, the Pine Ridge if you prefer. And it reads as follows: "On April the 10th in the year just past, with provincial government a shadow cast; without a warning or any sign, they said this land was no longer mine. I sat and waited day by day, for a government appraiser to come my way. My heart was heavy and full of woe, and I knew in the end I'd have to go. My nerves were bad and I couldn't sleep, so off to the doctor an appointment to keep. He sent me home with pills of gold, and a lecture to rest as I was told. Along about August the eventful day came. Up strode a man, Bang by name. He said he was there as a servant of Duff's, and he wanted the facts or I'd be wearing the cuffs. Inside and outside he looked and he measured, but failed to be impressed by the things that I treasured. I told him how hard we had worked on the place, but never a trace of a smile crossed his face. I brought up the case of inadequate pension to live elsewhere, but he paid no attention. His mind was made up with the price he would quote, and into his records the figures he'd note. He opened his brief case and took out a book, But what he wrote there I had not a look. With assurance galore he'd go straight to the coffer, And in no time at all he'd be back with an offer. More weeks passed by and finally one day, Mr. Bang crossed the threshold and said he would pay. He set out the figures all neatly compiled, But no interest I showed as I inwardly smiled. One look at the offer was all that I needed, To know that my pleadings hadn't been heeded. On Henry or Jarvis I could see myself settled, And the more I perused it the more I got nettled. Back to the committee once more to review, the figures of mine which I thought were true. They added a hundred to the total named first, And hoped that with this my hurt feelings they'd nurse. Instead of being pacified and willing to sign, I decided to wait and bide my time. Our Member of Parliament sees it our way, And maybe he'll get them to up with the pay. And now on this rather sad Christmas Day, I review the past year with a look of dismay. The time has slipped by with no money in sight, And all I foresee is a long dragged out fight." That, Madam Speaker, was written by one of the expropriated people in the Bird's Hill area. It's obvious that these people, Madam Speaker, didn't have the same in with my honourable friends across the way. They weren't able to get a negotiated settlement. They were unable to get some extra values for their land. They were expropriated without notice nor bonus.

Madam Speaker, I submit that this government, in the past week, has shown by its total lack of reply to the charges made in this House, by its complete ignorance of the statements, that they are neither concerned nor interested in the welfare of this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 10:30. I must call the sub-amendment. The sub-amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR; CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn until 2:30 Monday afternoon.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.