

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 7, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, QC (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their second report: Mr. D. M. Stephens, Chairman of The Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, presented further details with respect to the tender submitted by the Joint Venture Group consisting of McNamara Construction Limited, Atlas Construction Co. Limited, Janin Construction Limited, C. A. Pitts General Contractor Limited and Atlas-Winston Limited, pertaining to the Kettle Rapids General Contract. Mr. Stephens made a statement to the committee regarding the corrected contract tendered by the above named Joint Venture Group and accepted by the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I noted this morning that in the comments made by Mr. Stephens that he was referring to some comments made at the last committee hearing and was quoting from them, and I presume this was from portions of his testimony at the time and were not directly from his notes. I wondered therefore if either Manitoba Hydro or the Provincial Government had in fact taken down the proceedings by some secretarial staff in shorthand, and if so, would it be possible to have those parts of the proceedings made part of the record of the House. It seems to me that the subject that we were discussing this morning is one that is of very major importance to the Province of Manitoba. The immediate contract of course is of major financial importance, being the biggest contract that we have ever let in this province, in fact one of the biggest ever let in Canada, and so the implications to the taxpayers of this province are of course major.

There is the further long term consideration of the whole of the tendering practices and procedures which are vital to the question of protection of the taxpayers of the province and the ensuring of the best deals for the government. It seemed to me that the question part of the period and the answers provided by Hydro really are an essential part of the report of the committee, so I would like to have the notes - which I presume were taken - assembled and made part of the report of the committee.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain of my procedural position at the moment, but if I may speak I would like to point out that when the first meeting of the committee was held, the Chairman of the Hydro Board gave a prepared statement, copies of which were supplied to all members, and similarly at the meeting of the committee this morning. No verbatim reports were taken of the discussion which followed in the committee at the previous sitting nor of this morning and hence none are available.

However, I think that one would have to point out that the substance of all of the matters under discussion and the pertinent information is all contained in the statements both of the previous meeting and this morning, and that between the two formal statements that they constitute a pretty complete record of the nature of the transactions in which the Board of the Manitoba Hydro has been engaged.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh yes, I beg your pardon.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

Before we proceed, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 100 students of Grade 11 standing from the St. James Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Kendrick. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James. On behalf of all the honourable members of the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).... Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.  
Orders of the Day.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that Wellington constituency -- that a certain achievement of recognition was made by one of the schools, a high school, on this program known as "Reach for the Top". The school happened to be the one that did reach the top and one of the members of the panel that appeared on television the other night on that program is one of the ushers that serves us here in the Chamber, Wayne Arnason.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Could he tell us when we might expect the report of the Gilson study on the use of purple gas for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: That report will be available to the members soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Have the government received the report as yet?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, the report has been received and, as members are aware, legislation partly based on it will be forthcoming and it's I think of interest to have the report at that time.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate when the report was received by the government?

MR. ROBLIN: Some time ago. I do not have the correct date.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Public Utilities, but before I do I would like to have permission from him to give some explanation of the background of my question. Sir, I will give you an example of what I'm getting at. I heard of an instance where a person had an Austin car in February, he had a licence plate on it, he renewed his application for a licence which he received and I understand it cost him approximately \$11.00. On March 2nd he bought a 1967 other type car, a new one, he transferred the licence plates and it cost him \$2.50 to make the transfer with no additional costs. Now a car of that particular type, the licence plate is \$24.75, I believe. In this particular instance the Bureau have informed me that there is no additional cost except the \$2.50 transfer. Now what I would like to ask the Minister of Public Utilities, if you think that this is fair to the rest of the citizens of Manitoba who must pay the \$24.75.

MR. McLEAN: I'm afraid I lost the question.

MR. DAWSON: I'll explain it to you once more. The question is ....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would use the last few sentences to ask the question. I think he had it right there.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I said in the last few sentences was that the difference was that by just transferring one licence plate to the other - the Austin's plate was \$11.00 - he paid \$2.50 to make the transfer, which cost \$13.50, opposed to \$24.75 for other people who have the same type of car. He put this licence plate on a 1967 type of car. Now my question was, do you think that this is fair to the rest of the citizens?

MR. McLEAN: I would express no opinion as to the fairness, Mr. Speaker, and I'll be glad to look into the particular matter about which the member has spoken.

MR. DAWSON: A subsequent question. I have already looked into it, Sir. I mentioned that, and ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the question was answered.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce made a speech which contained matters of policy of the present government. I can't recall where it was - I read about it in the paper - I know it wasn't here, and I just wondered whether he would be good enough if when he is giving us a copy of the speech that he made to the Realtors that he would also give us a copy of the speech that was reported in today's paper.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, QC (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I know the speech that the honourable gentleman is referring to.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of NDP) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce aware of the fact that he did make a speech?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware of the fact that I've made several speeches.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll be good enough to get today's newspaper and identify the speech more correctly to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Minister would appreciate that advice if you would show him the newspaper. May we proceed?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'll make a specific question. I'll ask for the one he made to the Farm Implement Schedule study, which I suspect may be the one that my honourable friend is checking.

MR. GREEN: If I get that one, Mr. Speaker, I'll...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the same Minister, the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On January 26th, I had an Order for Return passed asking for details of a possible feasibility study on the Pulp and Paper Industry by the firm of Parsons and Whitmore. When can I have the answer to this Order?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is "soon".

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a similar question and I direct it to the Honourable Minister of Tourism. My Order for Return was passed on January 27th with respect to 171,000-odd dollars paid to Dalton K. Camp and Associates. I wonder when I can expect the answer to this Order?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, QC (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I expect "soon": I believe it's being prepared by one of the other departments.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): I'd like to direct a question before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend the Minister of Health. When can we expect some legislation on the denturists? Soon, would you think? This is the fourth time I've asked this question, Mr. Speaker, and the time is getting on.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the time is getting on, and I appreciate the fact that the honourable member has asked me four times for an answer, and I appreciate the fact that he probably won't be satisfied by the answer I give him this time, which is "soon".

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I directed a question to the Minister of Education and it was intercepted by the Premier, regarding the statement made by the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission who suggested that pressure would assist communities to get a school if it was made on the government. Now, he said he would let us know what the Chairman meant by that remark.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will be patient awhile I am sure he will get an answer to this question. It will not be possible to give it immediately. We have to enter into communication with the gentleman concerned and establish the facts.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, another question I'd like to direct to the Minister of - Public Utilities, I believe it is. The other day I directed a question about the policy of selling the driving records of certain individuals to certain firms who were making use of it to sell and re-sell it and he said he would look into it. Has he a report today?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the reports are made available for a fee under the provisions of an Order-in-Council that was passed in 1950 and amended in one small particular in 1956.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on this question, may I ask whether or not the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities would be prepared to either table or issue copies of the Order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for the benefit of members of the Assembly. I think this is a most important matter.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is not the custom to table Orders-in-Council but I will try and remember, and look forward to assistance if my memory fails me, to give the Order-in-Council numbers to the House tomorrow or when we next meet and the Orders will be available for examination of course by any member of the House.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question.

MR. SPEAKER: On the same subject?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yes. What individuals are granted the right to buy this information. I understand that not everyone can buy it. What is the reason for the difference between who can buy it and who can't buy this information?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there is, as far as I am aware, no distinction, and anyone who is prepared to pay the fee set out in the Orders-in-Council, with the amendment, is entitled to obtain the information.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Health. If I was to ask him when we could expect the report of the Hospital Commission, would the answer be "soon"?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer would not be "soon". The answer would be that it will be down by the end of the week.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I pointed out to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that there were very severe rumours in Birtle-Russell about a certain potash company moving from Manitoba to Saskatchewan. I was hoping he would have something to report on this before the Orders of the Day, but if he hasn't - he used the word "blunder" this morning quite often at a certain meeting and I would suggest that this would be a fantastic blunder for Manitoba and Manitoba's government if this is true, and if it isn't true let's find out about it. Is it or isn't it true? --(Interjection)-- He's the man to answer the question. No comments?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may have the opportunity to do so, I don't mind making a comment in reply to my honourable friend. The question as to location of potash mines is not one for the government. We do not decide where these are. It's decided by the people who are mining the potash and they decide it on the basis of various considerations, among which of course are the opportunities or regulations that are provided in the various provinces, and I'm quite certain that in Manitoba the pros and cons of establishing a potash mine with respect to government regulations are just as favourable as they are in other provinces. If a potash mine is established some place else, it is because of reasons which are quite out of our control and have to do with the right of the company concerned to establish its mine where it wishes to do so.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker....

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question?

MR. CLEMENT: Yes. The question was put quite bluntly to me that it was because they were not able to make an agreement with the Manitoba government. This is what I'm asking you. Apparently the mine has been moved, and on the Minister's own admission, it is because they have better circumstances in Saskatchewan. I must take it for granted this is true, then.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister - if my honourable friend is referring to me - is admitting nothing - admitting nothing. If my honourable friend will give us some facts we'll certainly be glad to look into them, but just because he has some rumour which apparently he hasn't any further information upon, I can't go into the matter on that basis. If my honourable friend will frame a question, put it in writing, frame a question which will ventilate his interest in this matter, we'll do our best to find the answer, but I'm not aware of any failure on the part of the government, or any private concern for that matter, to come to an agreement with respect to the location of a mine. As far as my information goes, it is based on what the mining company itself deems to be desirable in their interest and is mostly located as to where the potash can be most conveniently mined. If my honourable friend will give me a question in writing, I'll be glad to make any other further searches he wishes.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I want to enquire about whether this particular statute that I have a copy of governing the sale of tobacco is still in the statute books. I have access to Volume 1 of the Revised Statutes for 1954 in Child Welfare, Chapter 35, Page 359 and Item No. 130. Probably lacking knowledge and still in the process of learning the rituals and procedures of the House and other matters related, I ask the Attorney-General whether the information that I have is correct, that this Act is still in the same form, as it is in the reference that I made, on the statute books.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. The last couple of days I've had several enquiries from municipalities in regard to purchasing of municipal equipment and fire engines. Is there going to be any municipal exemption from sales tax in the provisions of this legislation?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I think I should stick to the same answer that I have given to all the other honourable members. If he'll be good enough to address his questions to me during the debate, I'll answer it in my reply and then we can have any further discussion at committee stage.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. About two weeks ago I asked a question, and in the absence of the Minister, it was undertaken by the House Leader that this would be passed on. I asked for a report on the Horse Racing Commission. When can we expect it?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation (Rockwood-Iberville): There has been no report brought down by this commission to this date and I'm not aware of the exact time that this is due, if in fact it is due.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the legislation specifically requires a report to be made.

MR. ENNS: I'll take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to address a question to my honourable friend the Attorney-General. In the ordinary course of events, how long does it take a person to recover money and/or property that has been awarded to him by the Crown? Now I don't know whether I'm specific -- well then, I'll tell you briefly the case. There's a chap in Neepawa desperately hard up who got into a scuffle with a fellow. He was knocked down and the police caught the guy that night. He went before the judge - the incident, November 19, 1966 - he went before Judge Newman in Brandon on January 5th; they recovered the money - some \$95.00 - and the clothing. He is yet waiting for the return of both and here it is March 7th, and he needs not only the money but he needs his clothing. It's winter time. When can he expect it or what is the hold up? Why can't he get his money back from the Court? They've recovered it.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm of course not familiar with the case about which my honourable friend speaks. I can only speculate that there may be some question involved as to retention of clothing or money as exhibits beyond an appeal period, which is usually up to about 30 days, but if my honourable friend will give me a note with the name of the case and so on, I'll be happy to give him particulars privately on it if I can find out anything for him.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Health. What is the policy of the Hospital Commission in regard to refund for premiums for people who have gone to hospital in the States. I know of a case that gave all the receipts, the information and the medical report, and they were told that they had to wait six weeks after this request before they would receive a payment. Now is that the policy of the -- I believe the Minister is aware of the case that I've mentioned. I think he received a letter on that.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the question as notice, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, relative to the question relating to the development of the potash industry, could the Honourable the First Minister advise the House whether one of the considerations - before selling our potash resources to the highest bidder - whether one of his considerations will be the development of this potash by the people of Manitoba through the agency of a Crown Corporation?

MR. ROBLIN: I think my honourable friend is asking me questions of policy where it is not really customary on the Orders of the Day.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Highways in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see that the government apparently is prepared to accept the resolution proposed by my colleague the Honourable the Member for St. George constituency and is prepared to proceed with the construction of the road from Grand Rapids to connect with the present road to Thompson.

The government has gone further and suggested they are now prepared to move on a road to Lynn Lake as well, and I certainly commend the Minister on having accepted this point of view which I have been advocating in this House now for some three or four years, because I do believe that the only method that we can really get northern development is by providing road access. The days when we could depend on strictly air connections or even rail connections

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... to develop northern Manitoba have gone by. I'm convinced that the difficulties we had at Thompson with regard to labour problems there and the attitude of the people in Thompson was in large part connected with the fact that they were cut off from the balance of the province. In fact, many of the northerners when they referred to going elsewhere in the province didn't refer to going south or going out of town for a few days, they referred to going "out", and this was a reflection of their feeling of complete remoteness from the rest of Manitoba in complete cut-off, and this is the situation today in Lynn Lake. There is a rail connection but there is no road connection.

So in the past two or three years when I've spoken on this item, mainly on the Highways estimates, I've been urging the Minister to move on a road to Lynn Lake, at least make a start. I recognize that there are costs involved here. I recognize that the northern construction is in most cases more costly than the one in southern Manitoba, that the total population figures at this time are not such that in itself a road is maybe warranted by traffic figures. On the other hand, I think we have to look upon this as a development program. I recall that the Attorney-General - I regret he's out of his seat now - when speaking some two or three years ago in the north, said: "You get the development and we'll build the roads." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a method that we no longer can follow insofar as northern Manitoba. We have developments in pockets, and in order to get further development I think we have to connect these pockets together. So we simply can't say let's wait for someone else to do something. Unless we proceed and link the key points in northern Manitoba by a road system, the whole of northern development will in fact be very much delayed.

I readily agree that I would like to see the federal Roads to Resources program continue. I think this is one that is of particular importance to provinces like Manitoba who still have large undeveloped areas and I would hope that they would be prepared to go along with us, but I think it's essential for the province itself to be prepared to come out with a comprehensive road program, one that will admittedly extend over a period of years but one which leads to a complete development of a road network in northern Manitoba.

The government frequently speaks, and I agree in good part with what they say, that the future of Manitoba is hooked to the development of our Pre-Cambrian shield. It's true that we don't at the moment appear to have the same mineral resources in the field of oil and natural gas as do Saskatchewan and Alberta - and I emphasize "at the moment" - because I think that we shouldn't close our eyes, that this can change, with new developments and new exploration techniques we could still very well become a major producer. But we do have an asset that the other two provinces don't have, and that is a larger chunk of the Laurentian Shield than they do, that area of rock which in Ontario and Quebec has been the largest producer of hard rock minerals. We have that, but again accessibility is the major factor.

There is of course, in addition to this, the whole of the tourist industry. We see throughout the north now lodges being developed on inaccessible lakes available only to those who can fly in, and these, while I'm not being critical of them, I don't think provide that general type of tourist industry which is of major benefit to the Province of Manitoba, because those who simply come here and land temporarily at Winnipeg simply to transfer to another aircraft to take them to a northern fishing lodge and then leave again, don't in the long run provide any great tourist dollars to the Province of Manitoba. Those, on the other hand, who come by road and spend some time in the province, travel through it and move through the whole of the province, I think by and large provide a better tourist from the standpoint of revenue insofar as Manitoba is concerned. So I would hope that the Minister can proceed with a comprehensive program for the north.

As I pointed out in past years when speaking on the road to Lynn Lake, Mr. Speaker, we have I think a particular problem here in that the Province of Saskatchewan today is moving on its northern roads, and if the Minister would refer to the Saskatchewan road map he will see that on their northern road development they are, at the moment, further north than we are. They have reached just - oh, a matter of a very few miles south of the 56th parallel on the eastern side of the province, whereas over on the western side they are well above the 56th, in fact about 56 1/2 at Lac La L.... On the eastern development they have reached the point where they are barely 40 miles from Reindeer Lake. Reindeer Lake is the one that connects very closely to Lynn Lake at the moment, in fact there is a winter road presently linking Lynn with Reindeer Lake, and there is a possibility therefore that the extension of the Saskatchewan road system would in fact pass the Lynn Lake area. It would then mean that the general traffic through there would move through Saskatchewan rather than through Manitoba. I think we have

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . had part of that experience with two roads that Saskatchewan has already built, and I'm referring to the one from Prince Albert to Flin Flon known as the Hansen Lake road, and the other one then through the Hudson Bay valley and the Pasquia into The Pas itself. These today are carrying a very substantial amount of traffic, traffic which previously was funnelled down our No. 10 highway and which today is moving out into Saskatchewan.

When I was in The Pas with the balance of the members recently, I was enquiring in fact with people there who told me that it was fairly common now for people in the north to travel to Prince Albert or to Saskatoon rather than come to Winnipeg, because with the connections that they had through Saskatchewan it was easier for them, less distance, and therefore was a better communication system for them. So I think we have to look upon this in this light as well, that if we don't proceed to move we may well find ourselves too late, that the traffic patterns will be established into Saskatchewan rather than into the Province of Manitoba.

I am pleased to see that the Minister is now prepared to consider a road to Lynn Lake. I would like to suggest to the Minister that we have a look at some further developments at the same time, and that what we really need is an overall program for road construction throughout northern Manitoba. It seems to me that if we do that, then we have to look inevitably at a connection with Gillam and Kettle Rapids. We had a discussion this morning in Committee about the amount of money that Manitoba is going to spend at Kettle Rapids. It is obviously going to be a very major development. The anticipated date for the contract that we were discussing this morning for completion is 1971. This means that throughout that period of time there will be tremendous traffic into Gillam and into Kettle Rapids, and presumably once that is completed there will be some further work. In any case, there will have to be a transmission line put in; there will have to be some transport over the ground in any case. It appears to me that the time is now ripe to consider that connection as well, make a road connection from Thompson to Kettle Rapids.

Well, once you have reached that point, Mr. Speaker, in a program, then I think it is inevitable that a logical connection further is to Churchill. If you have reached Kettle Rapids, which appears to be a sensible development program from northern Manitoba, then shouldn't there be a connection as well with the Port of Churchill? After all, the government has indicated its interests in the Port of Churchill. I can't say that I have been impressed by their action insofar as the Port of Churchill. I have been much impressed by their statements about it, and I'm pleased to see that the member for the constituency has some resolutions before us indicating his interest in the area. I think the time has come for the government to show that it also means action on the area and that a connection with Churchill should be added to an overall development program of roads for northern Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, that the resolution be further amended by adding after the fourth "Whereas" of the amendment the following: and Whereas further development of all parts of northern Manitoba is largely dependent on road access; and Whereas a road connection from Provincial Road No. 391 through Gillam, Kettle Rapids, to Churchill would render accessible large areas of Northern Manitoba; and Whereas such a road would provide access to Manitoba's only seaport; " and by inserting between the two first paragraphs of the operative part of the amendment the following: "Be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of constructing a road to connect Churchill, Kettle Rapids and Gillam with Thompson on Provincial Road 391. "

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Campbell, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 26.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for St. John's, and had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and had I voted, I would have voted for the sub-amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub amendment lost. We are now dealing with the amendment?

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: We are now dealing with the main motion, the main motion as amended.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate, I was grateful that the Minister didn't bring in an amendment like he did last year which destroyed my resolution completely, because he did bring in a resolution which did promise the construction of this road at some date but it was rather indefinite, because it could be next year, it could be five years from now or maybe longer. However, I do have some hope that maybe this road will be built some day because there is no question that the value of this road would be substantial to the people of northern Manitoba.

But what does disturb me is that there are some members of the opposite side who oppose this because they don't want the road to go up there at all. They feel that there is access to northern Manitoba via No. 10 and they feel that this road going north from Grand Rapids to Ponton would take away traffic from their areas. I think this is a very parochial outlook; I think it would enhance the traffic and encourage more tourist traffic to northern Manitoba if we had a road going to Ponton direct from Grand Rapids which would enable people to make a complete circle going around through The Pas and back to Dauphin or whatever way they choose to travel. So I think that the attitude that some members have such as the Minister of Welfare is completely parochial and I wish his attitude on this would change.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't recall having voiced any opposition to this particular road. If I have made any comment at all, it was the question of priority.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Welfare is quoted at a meeting that took place up at Thompson in the public press as opposing this road, feeling that the north was well enough served by No. 10.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, again I say I did not oppose the road, I spoke in terms of priorities of constructing roads in northern Manitoba.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't at the meeting, but the people that were certainly took that impression. If he didn't mean it, then I won't pursue it any further, but that was certainly the impression he left with those who attended the meeting.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that this road would have fit the north in every which way and I still am convinced that the giant Hydro Electric project at Kettle Rapids, the cost of this project could have been saved by transporting a lot of the goods on this road. As I have said before and pointed out in my resolution, the distance to Ponton and back is a saving of 500 miles via Grand Rapids. It opens up vast areas to fishing, pulp stands, and I think it is unfortunate that we aren't building this road now to take advantage of the savings that I am sure would result by building it now before this project gets underway.

However, as the government hasn't seen fit to go along with my thinking on this at this time, I can assure them though that next year I will re-introduce the resolution as I did this year in the hopes that they will agree with it next year and support it so that it will be built next year rather than perhaps five or ten years hence.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): On behalf of the member, I would like to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): I would ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member of LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. DAWSON: In the absence of this Member, Mr. Speaker, I would ask to have this motion stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I would like to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: I would beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to have this matter stand.

MR. GREEN: With your indulgence, I think the Member from Wellington meant to say that he was holding this debate for me, and if I could take it at the present time.

MR. PETURSSON: It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to defer to the Honourable Member for Inkster and have him speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood you otherwise. However, the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington -- is it my understanding that the Honourable Member for Wellington, after the Honourable Member for Inkster has spoken, it is your wish that it remain standing in your name?

MR. PAULLEY: No, he adjourned it for the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: That's fine then. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I enter the debate at this time specifically to speak to the amendment of the resolution that was originally put, the amendment having been made by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. Mr. Speaker, it's just this type of amendment which I think creates the difficulties which we experience in industrial relations, and more specifically, I believe that we experience these difficulties because some people think that by employing the wisdom of Solomon they are able to legislate a solution to the difficulties that are sometimes experienced as between management and labour instead of, Mr. Speaker, regarding the various problems that management and labour experience as something which is inherent in our society, as something which we should regard with respect, Mr. Speaker, as being desirable rather than something which we legislate against. There is a great temptation upon many people to attempt to solve these problems by creating rules, and when they make these rules, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they wind up in a hopeless cobweb of difficulties, each rule creating additional difficulties, each rule accelerating the difficulties that may be experienced.

My first objection to this particular amendment is that it purports to legislate with regard to labour, and I note that my honourable friend the Member from Assiniboia found that it was difficult to discuss the area of free speech without relating it to labour, that he found that in order to deal with this problem he had to make a specific relationship to labour. I think that in quoting from his speech, "well let's relate it to labour. I think this is who it does affect and where we should deal with it, or it's easier to deal with it in that particular phase." I agree that it's easier for my honourable friend to legislate and restrict the free speech of labour people than it would be to restrict the free speech of society in general, but because it is easier for him to restrict the freedom of speech of people engaged in industrial relations doesn't mean that it should be easier for this House to take away those freedoms, which I submit, Mr. Speaker, are important for everybody, and I suggest to you that it is important for everybody that people in labour unions and people amongst management groups and people who wish to make public demonstrations and people who belong to political parties not have restrictions against their rights to employ free speech.

So my first objection, Mr. Speaker, is that what my honourable friend is doing is creating labour as a separate category of our population whose right to the exercise of free speech must be limited or must be restricted in some way. If the honourable members would look at the original resolution, it doesn't mention labour; it doesn't mention picketing. All that it says, and I repeat, is that we in this House recognize that a person, any person whether from management or labour, has the right to walk down a public street carrying a sign asking support for his position, and we have sufficient confidence, Mr. Speaker, in our democratic society and in the inherent good of the right of free speech to know that such speech cannot damage our society but must indeed strengthen it, and that it will only strengthen it relative to this right being accorded to everybody and not taken away from a specific group. I suggest, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... that if it is taken away from a specific group, it's not the specific group that loses the right that is being damaged, but all of society is being damaged. Perhaps the particular group can get along without this particular right, and I don't suggest that that is the case but perhaps they would find ways to get along, but we can't permit our society to try to get along without this right of free speech being accorded to everyone.

Well, my honourable friend makes another observation which I think is again a traditional weakness of groups in our society - it's most easily identified with people in the Progressive Conservative Party and in the Liberal Party - makes an observation that it's possible for them to adjudicate proper laws as between management and labour, and my honourable friend makes it clear that it's an adjudication of these rights that he's seeking, because he says in his speech - and I think this is the most important part of it - "We must remember that in the last analysis what we are doing is making a social decision, that is the easier we make picketing, we give more strength to labour; the harder we make picketing, the more strength we give to management."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we in this party take the position that we are not adjudicating here as between management and labour and we are not going to pass laws which have the effect or are directed at making management stronger or making labour stronger. We say that the right of free speech afforded to everybody cannot help but make all society stronger, and if given that right certain groups are able to elevate themselves - these are the other groups - then we say that that shouldn't deter us from giving this right, because, Mr. Speaker, we can't accept the proposition which appears to be suggested by my honourable friends to the right that free speech is all right provided it doesn't upset the economic status quo. If free speech upsets the economic status quo, if it will result in one group being able to achieve more out of society than another group, then we reject it, and this is the position that is being taken by the Liberal Party vis-a-vis this resolution. So we now have this Party saying that it's all right for people to walk down the street with signs seeking support of their position provided it doesn't upset any of the economic status quo. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Party is making a qualitative judgment as to the rightness of the existing economic status quo. We make no such qualitative judgment. We don't accept the fact that because the economic status quo can be altered as a result of people exercising their normal rights, that we should thereby not permit the rights to which everybody is stated to be entitled, and I think this is what this amendment seeks to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, other Legislatures have tried to legislate with regard to what my honourable friend calls "picketing". I think that the term "picketing" is used because my honourable friend thinks that if the term "picketing" is used that it's easier to get legislation against it. On the other hand, I avoid using the term "picketing" because, Mr. Speaker, I frankly admit that it doesn't properly describe the type of conduct which we seek to guarantee within the meaning of this resolution.

But other Legislatures have sought to enter this field of restricting free speech. The Legislature of British Columbia passed a whole bunch of laws which said where and when people could walk down the streets carrying signs. I believe there is similar legislation in Alberta. In the Province of Newfoundland, I think they've gone to the extent of saying when people can advertise over the radio and television during the course of a lawful strike, and, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has proven to be, first of all, restrictive as against trade unions, that is that these are the only people who are forbidden this type of advertising; and secondly, it's proven to be ridiculously ineffective and impossible to effectively do what it was supposed to do.

For instance in British Columbia, they have legislation that during a lawful strike the only place that a person can picket - and I'll use my honourable friend's words - is in front of the premises which are on strike. In British Columbia there was one case where a trucking company was on strike and they had no real effective premises, just a depot, and therefore the union, in order to -- or the people who were on strike, in order to lawfully seek support had to run around following trucks, standing at the location where the trucks were unloading. They went from location to location, standing with a sign in the presence of the truck unloading. In another case, the firm for which these people were employed hired a management firm which occupied certain offices and the management firm apparently was entrusted with the management of all of this company's operations, but the people seeking public support couldn't walk with signs in the vicinity of the management firm because it wasn't the firm who employed them, it was a separate corporation.

Now, we don't see, Mr. Speaker, why my honourable friends should seek to have

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . legislation which would effectively restrict or delineate a right which they agree belongs to everybody. It's all very well to say, as the resolution does indeed say, "(1) Picketing is a legitimate bargaining weapon." That sounds very good although I don't like the word "picketing" and I don't like the word "weapon". "(2) Legislation on picketing should clearly set out the manner in which picketing may be legally done." Picketing is a legitimate bargaining weapon but we're going to say when, where, how and under what circumstances it shall be done.

Well, let's turn this resolution around, Mr. Speaker. Let's assume that it says the following: "(1) The right to hire non-union people is a legitimate prerogative of management." Very good. "(2) Legislation on when management may hire non-union people, how they may hire non-union people, the circumstances under which they may hire non-union people should be clearly set out." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the numbers (1) and (2) contradict each other. If there is a right of free speech then we don't have to reiterate it. We don't have to say as is said in The Labour Relations Act - and I suggest that it's a very dangerous statement - "Every employee has the right to belong to a trade union." Well, whoever disagreed with that? When was that not a right since 1824? In 1799 a Legislature consisting - not elected by the people - consisting entirely of the management class did in fact enact legislation in 1799, which lasted until 1824, which said that it was criminal to get together to try to figure out a way of increasing your wages; but since 1824 nobody has ever questioned the right of a person to belong to a trade union, but our Labour Relations Act says, "Every man has the right to belong to a trade union", and the government likes to tell people that they have given these people the right to belong to trade unions.

We don't have to be told that picketing - and I hope I'm using the term in which my honourable friend made it - is a legitimate bargaining weapon. Every person has the right to use lawful means to seek public support. We don't need legislation for that. What we need legislation for is to assert that position in the face of certain court judgments which appear to be taking that right away. Mr. Speaker, the second statement that legislation on picketing should clearly set out the manner in which picketing may be legally done merely wishes to incorporate restrictions on free speech into the legislation. Our group strongly opposes such restrictions, Mr. Speaker, because there is no reason for any restrictions ever to have crept into either our common law or our legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what we are in effect asking for in this Legislature is a legislative injunction. My honourable friends may wish to bring in legislation restricting the right of free speech. We don't agree that such legislation should be brought in, but if they want to bring in such legislation they have every right as elected representatives of the people to do so. What we are saying is that until the Legislature says anything to the contrary, nobody should have this right taken away from them, and the honourable members over on my right and the honourable members of the government side can bring in as much legislation on picketing as they desire and we will oppose it. What we are saying is that no legislation has been enacted to date and the Legislature should grant a legislative injunction preventing people from losing their right of free speech without legislative sanction.

In other words, unless a Legislature comes in and passes laws to the contrary - which we will resist - we want this Legislature to say that in the meantime and before such legislation is passed, and while we're waiting for it and while we're waiting for the Woods Committee and while we're waiting for people to make up their minds as to when they say people should be permitted to walk in front of places with signs and when and how and under what circumstances and as to what they say on these signs, until they can get a Legislature to agree as to these regulations - and I suggest to you that this Legislature, and I include members on all sides, will not agree to such legislation - that until then, we make it plain that this Legislature does not agree with the infringement on that right of free speech which has in fact been enacted by semi-legislation when the Legislature hasn't made itself clear on the subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it plain that members of all parties talk differently on this issue when it comes to other questions. They're quite clear and we hear it from all sides of the House - there is controversy - that a person like George Lincoln Rockwell, whatever he has to say, despite its effect, should have the right to free speech, and they'll argue passionately to give this man the right to free speech although some of the doctrines which he propounds have had far more serious effect than people walking down the street with signs. They're quite clear that a person like Von Thadden should be permitted to espouse his views on television despite how those views may affect the Canadian public. But they bang their hands down and

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... say "No, get an injunction," when a person walks down a street with a sign that says, "Support my position as against my employer. Support me and don't support my employer."

I just can't reconcile how people can take that position with regard to protection of the right of free speech for people like George Lincoln Rockwell and Von Thadden and say -- (Interjection)-- and McCarthy, and various other people, and members of this Party and of the Social Credit Party and the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party, that all of these people are entitled to espouse their views no matter how or whether or not they affect the economic status quo, but the trade unionist can't do it because he might get support and if he gets support that might improve his position, and if it improves his position, it'll improve it vis-a-vis management and it's the management people we want to protect and therefore don't give them this right to free speech.

We can't reconcile this position, Mr. Speaker. We take the position - and this is what this amendment seeks to do - we want the Legislature to guarantee that until legislation is enacted, everybody has the right to peacefully communicate information provided they are not breaking any laws, for which they can be arrested by a policeman, and it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we are opposing this amendment.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to take part in the debate on this amendment. I think that I have attempted to make our position quite clear. I believe the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, while his amendments are well intentioned I know, they are in four distinct parts. They have been covered rather thoroughly by the Honourable Member for Inkster in a rather dubious way and a philosophical way, suggesting that picketing was limited. Picketing - legal legitimate picketing he knows is not limited. He is well aware that picketing is accepted as a proper tool of bargaining, but there isn't any need to re-state that particular premise as part of the amendment.

The other part dealing with picketing, to try and spell out what you think pickets should do, there's no need to do that with legal picketing and it's used as a proper tool. My honourable friend from Inkster is well aware of that. He would in fact, while condemning the community for preferred treatment to the likes of Rockwell, suggest to this House that government objected to labour per se having the same rights which is ridiculous. He knows it and I'm sure the community know it, that the action and use of legal picketing is not a question at all.

Now, the third recommendation of the amendment referring this particular matter to the Woods Committee is really not necessary at this time because we have tabled the report from the Woods Committee. They have indicated that they are studying this problem and I am sure that honourable members know that this Committee will report on this very complex subject just as soon as they've been able to arrive at a consensus.

The other point I wish to make is that it is being considered in other jurisdictions as well, and I might say in other jurisdictions the use of injunctions have been a hundredfold compared to the use of injunctions in this jurisdiction, and they seem quite prepared to wait until there is some reasonable consensus on this particular problem, as important as it is to the trade union movement. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, to change what I had said earlier. While I am prepared and realize we have the responsibility to make the determination as to the legislation that we will bring forward on this matter, that we will do it when we are satisfied that it has been well studied, that there is some consensus and we feel that the time is appropriate.

So I can see no point in launching a committee in this House. I think it would be premature, Mr. Speaker, to have a committee of this House at this particular time to consider this question when there is so little consensus across this great country of ours. It's all very well for my honourable friend from Inkster to talk philosophically and suggest to you that pickets are hampered. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that legal picketing is not hampered. It is when picketing becomes bothersome; it is when picketing becomes a hindrance to trade and commerce; it becomes a bother when it is indicated that picketing may be injurious to the individual. --(Interjection)-- Well, if intimidation and violence is not an indication of what happens in some areas and on some picket lines, then I guess there's nothing to worry about illegal picketing.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have made our position quite clear. We have the task force in Ottawa which is concerned and which is studying this; you have jurisdiction of Ontario which has a royal commission; we have a labour-management committee in Manitoba which is studying this problem, and I trust that we will make the necessary determinations and will bring

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd) . . . forth whatever legislation we feel is necessary to deal with this problem at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? We're dealing with the amendment.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, can I have the yeas and nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the information of the House, we are dealing with the amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster on Page 6.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Green, Hamilton, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 12; Nays, 35.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for St. Vital. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for St. John's. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment. -- (Interjection)-- I usually know how he's going to vote.

MR. SPEAKER: We're now dealing with the main motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, is the member . . .

MR. GREEN: If I spoke, I would close the debate, and I'm prepared to let anybody . . .

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. --(Interjection)-- Oh - Kildonan, I'm sorry.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member, can we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): In the absence of the honourable member, can we have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution on the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House. I must ask that this motion stand, or ask leave for it to stand, but if there's any other member who desires to speak, I would be more than pleased to hear them.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, QC (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would object if I said a word or two.

MR. COWAN: No, not at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before the House is rather an interesting one. --(Interjection)-- I'm closing the debate? Mr. Speaker, a point has come up as to whether I was closing the debate. I've got no authority to close the debate on this subject matter; I'm just speaking to it. --(Interjection)-- Having settled that, I will continue with my contribution. Even my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party can make mistakes, he says, so confession is good for the soul.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before us simply points out that there is in fact a shortage of nurses. To this everyone agrees, I'm certain - I'm certain that everyone agrees on that. The former Minister of Health about eight or nine years ago pointed up that there was a drastic shortage of nurses in 1959 and proposed certain programs to alleviate the shortage in those days. I refer to Hansard of July 13th, a special fall session we had following an election I believe, and on Page 866, Mr. Schreyer, the member for Brokenhead, was discussing the shortage of nurses in those days and the impact that it was having on society in general. My honourable friend the member for Gimli was answering him in those days, and they both agreed - they both agreed that there was a drastic shortage of nurses.

Now what have we done - what have we done in the eight or nine-year interval to correct this shortage of nurses? Is the situation as bad today as it was in 1959? My guess is that it is, that the shortage of nurses is just as drastic today as it was in 1959 when my honourable friend the Minister of Health admitted it was bad. He did admit it was bad in those days - the then Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker - the then Minister of Health.

Now, to bring this up-to-day, that is from 1959 up to January of 1967 - incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to see my honourable friend the Minister of Health coming in - a bulletin that I'm certain everyone in this House received, a Manitoba Hospital Commission bulletin for January headed: "Nursing Study Completed. Mr. Witney, when laying down the terms of reference for the committee last year, stressed it was to be an action committee and suggested that answers be found to the following questions" -- my honourable friend the Minister of Health is not paying much attention to me, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Is he? Good! But he said that this was a committee of action, this study committee.

The first term of reference, Number 1, was: How many more nurses the province needs. Not "Do they need nurses?" That wasn't the question at all. But how many? He doesn't quarrel at all with the fact that there is a shortage; he admits here there is a shortage. It's not a question of whether or not there is a shortage but he is asking the question: "How many more do we need?" That's what he says.

Number 2: How the schools of nursing and their educational programs can be expanded or changed to produce the increase. Once again not questioning the fact that there is a shortage. He admits there is. It's just a matter of determining the number we need and how are we going to get them. This is what he's saying here.

Number 3 in the terms of reference: How to obtain the additional academically qualified nurses for the staff of nursing schools. Once again frank admission that there is a shortage of nurses. It's just a question once more of what do we do to correct the situation.

Well, it shouldn't be necessary for me to further convince the House or the public since my honourable friend has admitted that there is a shortage. It shouldn't be necessary for me to read any further material to point up the fact that there is a shortage, but it is one of the easiest things for me to do, as the House well knows that I have a pretty efficient clipping service and one of the items that is easy to find is articles from the press supporting the fact that there is a shortage of nurses. Here's one that's only two weeks old - February 16th, 1967: "More nurses needed. Twelve RN's recruited in hospital drive." A recent drive has gained an additional 12 registered nurses for the Winnipeg General Hospital; administrator E. L. Casey said on Wednesday. "But, despite the fact that the hospital now employs more general duty RN's and licensed practical nurses than ever before, the need for more staff has never been more urgent." Well "never" is quite a long time. Here's the administrators saying that never has it been more urgent.

A letter here, (I certainly don't intend to read it) dated the 30th of February from a registered nurse; from a registered nurse, Mr. Speaker, pointing up the serious shortage of registered nurses.

Another article here from the Portage Graphic - apparently they've got a shortage of nurses out there - wondering what in the world that they should do about it. It goes on to say

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . . the Portage brief also noted that obtaining and retaining sufficient nursing personnel appears to be a problem that is common to all hospitals with but few exceptions all over the province.

Another one November 15, 1966, "Nurse lack reduces the use of wards. The report says the General Hospital employs only 235 out of 1,005 beds," and I think this was discussed at the time of the Health estimates. All these things certainly point up the need and so, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to dwell on this subject matter very long but the summary of activities for the calendar year 1966 that was tabled in the House earlier this year, on Page 147 and the pages following that, points up the need even for registered nurses in the fields in the public health fields. Page 152 of the Annual Report says: "During 1966 to the present, 286 home visits were made to patients discharged from psychiatric hospitals and rehab hospitals and sanatoria. Monthly visits have been made to Grahamdale as it has been impossible to recruit a nurse for this area." Or there may be a particular reason in that case; there may be a particular reason, I'm not denying that, but it says that it was impossible to recruit a nurse for the Grahamdale area. Well surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, I don't need to dwell at any length on this whole subject of the shortage of nurses going back as I did to 1959 and bringing you right up to the present day, and surely it does make a fellow wonder how long that the government does have to deliberate, because I would think that eight years would nearly be sufficient time in which to correct a serious situation of this nature. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge every member of this House to vote in the affirmative on this particular resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre have leave to have this matter stand? (Agreed):

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. PATRICK: May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. HARRIS: May we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, may we have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, may we allow this matter to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. COWAN: In the absence of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, may we have the indulgence of this House to let this matter stand?

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): In the absence of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, may we have leave to allow this matter to stand?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I propose this would not be in order ... the fact that the honourable member hasn't moved the resolution yet. Would that be correct? Because I have an amendment that I wanted to propose to this particular ....

MR. SPEAKER: Probably the Honourable Leader of the Opposition could wait a little while.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker -- I can't find the motion. Just a minute. Mr. Speaker ....

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Honourable Member for Gladstone wishes to proceed?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Certainly. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that

WHEREAS the first responsibility of any Government is the welfare of its people; and

WHEREAS this end cannot be achieved without adequate medical, dental and other professional personnel and services; and

WHEREAS surveys initiated by the Department of Industry and Commerce reveal a drastic shortage of such personnel and services in many parts of Manitoba; and

WHEREAS as a result of this situation both the health and financial position of a large percentage of Manitoba's rural people are prejudiced; and

WHEREAS statistics reveal that 75 percent or more of the medical and dental profession is located in the metropolitan area and the remainder in the rural areas, as against a population ratio of 50/50,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of immediately establishing a policy that will guarantee adequate medical and dental services and accommodation to these rural areas.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I found one of the original resolutions, and on this subject matter; Mr. Speaker, I was simply amazed and alarmed at the number of people who are absent from this House today, absent, I gather, because they don't want to speak on the resolutions and I can't understand anyone putting a resolution on the order paper and then just letting it sit there for a month and not talking about it. What's the point? What in the world is the point of putting a resolution on the Order Paper and then leaving it sit there and looking at it? And so, Mr. Speaker, I touched on this resolution of mine the other day when we were speaking on the Health estimates. As a matter of fact, just 10 minutes ago I spoke on the shortage of nurses in the province and surely I don't need to speak about that.

Now this whole subject matter of this resolution touches on the welfare of at least 50 percent of the people of this province, or nearly 50 percent of the people of this province, because I'm talking about the 50 percent of the people in rural Manitoba that are short of doctors and dentists, and I would like any member from the rural area in this House to get up and say that they have an adequate supply of doctors and dentists and nurses in their area and have some to spare so that they could send them over to our part of the country.

It is a fact that there is a shortage. This has long since been established. I said, on speaking on the Health estimates, that not only was I saying this but the Department of Industry and Commerce had established this fact a year ago, and I like to refer to what my honourable friends say because it's pretty difficult for them to deny a lot of the facts that they establish in this House, so at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to what my honourable friends said.

Back just about two years ago - to be exact, on February 26, 1965 - the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this House said that "the business makeup of 12 Manitoba communities will be subjected to a searching analysis during the next year to determine if they have achieved their full potential in respect to drawing people within their orbit, and if they are providing adequate services." They went on to say that these 12 communities and towns that were under microscope (because that's the word that my honourable friend used, to define this searching analysis) were Roblin, Steinbach, Souris, Gimli, Beausejour, Neepawa, Morden, Carberry, Lac Du Bonnet. We waited then for approximately 18 months while these towns were under this

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . . searching microscope, and eventually the province tabled their findings. And my guess is that there are not many members of this House who were interested enough, interested to the point that they even asked the department for the reports. I'll bet you - I will bet a dollar if I'm permitted to do so - that there isn't another member in this House that's got the twelve reports in front of them that were tabled by the government, and I'll bet there are no takers. But I have. I've got them here. And what do they say? What do they say in support of my resolution? What do they say? Now in each one of the twelve areas, in each one of the twelve areas . . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell the Member for Gladstone that he owes me a dollar because I have the reports.

MR. SHOEMAKER: He's got to produce them. I won't pay my dollar out until he produces them.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . the Member for Gladstone is anxious to proceed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's right, yes. Now this is the way that the government proceeded to obtain the information that is given in the report. It says "Questionnaire" -- this is from the propaganda sheet, the orange one, of February 26, 1965. "The communities selected, said Mr. Evans, were those where there exists some potential developments. The answers to the surveys will largely determine what gaps exist in local regional development, and what can be done to fill these gaps so that each community may realize its full development potential. The answers to the questionnaires" -- that is, there were questionnaires sent out, approximately 1,000 to 1,500 in the 12 different areas -- the answers to the questionnaires will enable departmental planners and others to study the communities and to point out to the local people lost or wasted opportunities that may exist. The remedy, if there is one, will be brought to the attention to those most vitally concerned, the local Chambers or other booster groups, to take action. The questionnaires will not solve community problems, Mr. Evans emphasized, but will be used for the basis of studies to determine where opportunities for development do exist. The remedial action will be up to local initiative."

That's what they say. That is, first you find out what are the problems and then you proceed to do something to correct them. This is the whole purpose of having the 12 towns under the microscope. Now what do they say? What do they say?

Each one of the reports, Mr. Speaker, starts out with the same first two or three pages. There's the table of contents, figures and tables and then a preface, and it says: "This report is not a study in debt" -- that's a favorite word that this government likes to use and they say that this one is not in debt, as usually they go into great debt. "It is a fact-finding study and does not attempt to propose solutions but is intended primarily to answer three basic questions: 1. What is Neepawa's present trade pattern? --" and what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, the same applies to each one of these. At the moment I am referring to Neepawa. "What is Neepawa's present trade pattern? 2. What is Neepawa's potential trade pattern? 3. What are Neepawa's trade improvement possibilities? Of approximately 1,350 questionnaires that were mailed out to Neepawa trading area, 228 were returned, which is a sufficient number to give a reasonable indication as to the size of the present and potential trade."

They were quite happy with the number that were returned, and the summary and conclusions on the bottom of Page 6, it says, "However, there was criticism of two services offered by Neepawa; the professional group, especially dentists and doctors, and the clothing outlets. And as you go through the report the question asked is this: "An important factor in considering trade areas is the presence of other competing towns. For persons in Neepawa and area who does less than 100% of their shopping in Neepawa, the following centres were mentioned as communities where they did the remainder of their shopping." That is, the question on the questionnaire was this: If you do not presently do 100% of your shopping in Neepawa (or Swan River or wherever it is) where do you go and why do you go? Why do you get out of your own area to shop? And as respects the questionnaire for Neepawa as to why Neepawa area residents do not spend all of their shopping dollar in Neepawa, the following comments were reported: Reasons for shopping outside of Neepawa, Number two on the list - insufficient professional services. The number of times mentioned, 27; the percent mentioned, 16. They said, "We cannot obtain the professional services required in Neepawa so what do we do? We go to Brandon, we go to Winnipeg to obtain them, and having gone there the wife goes along and does all of her shopping." So we suffer financially as well, and this is indeed bad.

On Page 9 of the report, Trade Improvement Possibilities, "Additional spending in Neepawa would have to be preceded by improvements in or the addition of certain business

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . . enterprises in Neepawa. The following summarizes the suggestions of the survey respondents as recorded in Appendix C. Those replying to the questionnaires appear to be relatively satisfied with the business services of Neepawa except professional services and, to a lesser degree, clothing outlets. The respondents had no criticism of the quality of professional services, but many bluntly stated that they would not or could not wait around to be looked after. They said there are not enough doctors and dentists in Neepawa, they therefore went to other centers for their services, particularly Brandon, and while there went shopping for other merchandise." Not what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, but my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce found out after a year of study.

On Improvements Desired by Consumers and referred to as Appendix C, the improvements desired and the frequency of mention in percentages, right at the top of the list - dentists; 68% of those people that took the time to answer the questionnaire said, "We're short of dentists;" 58% said, "We're short of doctors;" 24% said, "We're short of optometrists;" in that order: dentists, doctors, optometrists.

Now I can go through the whole 12, the whole 12, if you like. Here's Carman. What do you think is at the top of the list at Carman as the services that are desired? What's at the top of the list? Doctors. Frequency of mention: 144 times they mentioned it; 46% of those people who filled out the questionnaire said, "We're short of doctors." Half of them.

What do they say at Erickson? Well Erickson, I think, was one of the areas where they said - although the government took time to fill it out - but they said there were not sufficient numbers replied to consider the report. I think this is one. It says, "This report is of very limited value to the community unless its findings are followed up and acted upon by Erickson residents and merchants." Out of 800 questionnaires filled out at Erickson, 78 were returned, but nevertheless, nevertheless they said at Erickson that they were going down to Minnedosa to seek the services of a dentist and a doctor, and going down there they spent their hard-earned cash. I know my honourable friend the Minister of Highways would have no objection to that, I don't suppose, but he does represent the Erickson area and he should be concerned about some of the services that are lacking up there because 70% of those that replied at Erickson, 70% said they were short of dentists, heading the list.

What about Emerson? 88% said they were short of dentists. Gimli - what did they say at Gimli, I wonder? I suppose they would be overstocked with dentists over there; 31% said they were short of dentists, 20% said they were short of doctors. Melita -- I haven't got them all marked off here but, Mr. Speaker, you can go through the whole list. In the professional group the need for additional dental treatment services was stressed by 61% of the respondents in Melita, for improved medical services by 23%, and for optometrists by 22%.

Roblin - overstocked with dentists and doctors up there, they're not -- (Interjection)-- well, I am glad my honourable friend agrees with that because if they are, there has certainly been a change in the last week, but up at Roblin 81% of those that answered the survey said they were short of dentists. I don't think they've got a dentist at all in Roblin. No dentist at all in Roblin, my honourable friend says, no dentist at all. None at Swan River either, eh? Well what do you know about that. 32% said there was a shortage of doctors at Roblin and 60% said they had no optometrist. Surely they can get an optometrist up there.

And Souris; my honourable friend from Souris -- he isn't in his seat now; he ducked out when his resolution came up. Where is he? Well, anyway, at Souris 52 percent said they were short of dentists - 52 percent. Selkirk -- of course that's getting right into Winnipeg and they can always come in to Winnipeg, I suppose, without too much of a hardship, to see the doctors and dentists in here, but lo and behold! In Selkirk, 39 percent of those that filled in the questionnaire, 39 percent said they were short of dentists, and 53 percent said they were short of doctors. In Selkirk!

In Steinbach, - Steinbach, that is home territory and pretty close to Winnipeg again: - 40 percent of those replying said they were short of dentists, and 20 percent said they were short of doctors and no doubt went to Winnipeg to spend their money. Ste. Anne - and then I'm back to Neepawa again.

Well, surely to goodness, Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness that having gone through those 12 reports and each and every one of them nearly identical in their demands for doctors and dentists and the findings of this government, surely to goodness in the last couple of years they've done something to correct this situation. What have they done? What have they done to correct this situation? I have an Order for Return in, Mr. Speaker, on the number of dentists

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . . and doctors that are registered and licenced in the Province of Manitoba, broken down to show the number for Winnipeg and the number for the rural areas, and my guess is that the government has deliberately withheld this Order for Return because they didn't want me to use it along with the other material that I have, but I am informed that there are roughly 295 dentists licenced in Manitoba of which 203 are in Winnipeg.

MR. WITNEY: . . . said the government was withholding that Order, and that's not the case.

MR. SHOEMAKER: What? I didn't hear him but I guess it was all right anyway.

Now, you will note, Mr. Speaker, that I have been very kind to my honourable friends in the active part of the resolution. All I am saying is, "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of immediately establishing a policy." I'm not naming it. Let them devise some kind of a policy that will guarantee adequate medical and dental services and accommodation to these rural areas. That's all I'm asking them to do. I have pointed out that not only, not only is the Health and Welfare at stake, but the communities are losing out financially. The Department of Industry and Commerce established that here, because they said if you're not doing 100 percent of your shopping in Neepawa, Carman, Steinbach or so and so now, why aren't you? And about 60 percent of them said, "Because we have to go out of these areas to get medical professional services, and when we go the family goes along and spends their money." I know this is a fact. I know it's a fact. You, the government, Department of Industry and Commerce has proven it to be a fact, and surely to goodness that all of those rural members - my honourable friend from Roblin who says they haven't even got a dentist, and the other areas of the province that are short of doctors and dentists - surely I can expect their support on the resolution that is before us, Mr. Chairman, and I urge them to support me on this one. It's not dangerous at all.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac Du Bonnet): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon,

WHEREAS, for years, the costs to the farmers of Manitoba of many of the instruments of production such as machinery, repair parts, fuel and supplies have been constantly increasing; and

WHEREAS land taxes have also been constantly increasing; and

WHEREAS the price which the farmer receives for grain has increased little if any during this long period;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government of this Province in co-operation with the Government of Canada to do all in its power to obtain agreement among its signators for a substantial increase in both the minimum and maximum prices under the International Wheat Agreement when it is renegotiated.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to dwell at great length with this resolution because I believe that the facts are pretty well set out. The cost to farmers over the past twenty years, the cost of machinery, the cost of repairs, the cost of his implements of production, have considerably increased percentage-wise since, say, the last war, and I don't think there's any dispute in the fact that land taxes throughout the province have considerably increased and the price that the farmer gets in regards to his production of grain has remained fairly stable.

You know, we have heard on many occasions that there becomes some relationship to the supply and demand, to the production and so on in regards to price, but I think if you will take a good close look at the annual reports of the Wheat Board, I think you could work some figures out that more or less dispel this. I know that somebody's going to say, "Well, I don't have too much right to speak for the farmer in regards to wheat production." I don't know whether it's known, commonly known in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that in the constituency which I represent, two of the largest shipping points of wheat are established in that particular area. In 1966, the Town of Killarney from the combined elevator shipping by rail was the top shipping point in Manitoba, and Boissevain was second, so I do have some authority in regards

(MR. DOW, cont'd) . . . . to the fact that wheat is produced in that area and this is one of the principles along the economic line that sets up the stability within that community.

Now if you will take a good look at the Wheat Board tables in regards to supply and demand - and I won't bore you with a lot of figures, Mr. Speaker, but I'll just go back to 1951 when the average yield for the three western provinces on wheat was 21.7 bushels, and the return to the farmer, the gross return with the cost of the Wheat Board deducted, was \$1.836. Now, if you go to 1952, the yield was a little higher, 26 bushels per acre average in western Canada, and the price received by the farmer was \$1.816.

Now in 1963 the yield was 26 bushels and so the price increased six cents a bushel. In 1965 the yield was 23.8 but the price went up to \$1.98, and now we go back to 1961 where the yield was quite low, and if you compare '61 with '63, you find that the 1961 price with an average yield of 10.6 bushels, the net return was \$1.79, so my contention is the supply and demand of what is grown on the farm has no relation to what the International Wheat Agreement is paying to the purchaser, because there doesn't seem to be any relationship in this, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that for every few cents that can be improved to payments to farmers, it reflects in the economy of Western Canada, it is one of the major basic industries we have, and I see no reason why, and I would like to suggest that the members of this House would give support to this resolution, that we, the members of this House assembled, along with the Government of Canada, will do all in its power to obtain agreements among its signators for a substantial increase in both the minimum and maximum prices under the International Wheat Agreement when it is being re-negotiated.

Now my understanding is this is going to come up very shortly, Mr. Speaker, and I think it would be advantageous for this House, and through the members of the government to make its presentation to the authorities to try and get an increase, not set out that we want or demand a price increase over-all, that we give all our assistance to try and get a minimum and a maximum increase for the farmers of western Canada, and particularly Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, those are my remarks and I hope I can get support from the House for that resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. USKIW: No, I wish to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Kildonan.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has tended to focus our attention on the condominium concept of building in this last while, and of course we in our department are exploring every avenue open to us in the housing field. The Member for Assiniboia pointed out that the concept of condominium dated back many years. However, he failed, I think, to tell us that in that concept of condominium there were many examples which lacked clear and concise rules as to maintenance and repairs, and from that many disputes arose, so that some of these countries who had legislation were forced to introduce legislation which prohibited the concept of condominium. It was because of the fact that they really refused to recognize the two concepts in here, one of the common share and one of the exclusive right. But however, our present interest in condominium is certainly not dated back that far; it's in legislation that has been passed in very recent times, and we know that this concept of condominium is working quite nicely in United States and in other countries.

The legislation on condominium really varies from country to country, and this causes us a fair amount of concern. A definition that I picked up from one of the United States' definitions is something like this: "The term 'condominium' signifies a dual form of ownership; individual fee ownership of an apartment space, plus fee ownership of an individual interest in the land and all parts of the building, excluding all the apartment spaces as a tenant-in-common with all other apartment owners.

Now, even yesterday at our housing convention, or conference, this question of condominium was under discussion and one of the members from the floor suggested that this is true, that we have so many varying ideas on condominium that he would like the Federal Government to come up with legislation that would make every province in Canada have the same type of legislation on their book, or make it permissive so they could have it. But

(MRS. FORBES, cont'd) . . . . however, this isn't the case so far and I think the federal Minister took it under consideration, but we ourselves should give real consideration to this concept because it has got possibilities.

Now as I mentioned here, all legislation does have that important factor, that ownership of an apartment is comprised of two separate but very closely related rights: First, the share in the common areas, and second, the exclusive ownership of an apartment. These two rights really can't be separated. In the United States, condominium as I understand it has been directed mostly to apartment blocks, but we think that condominium has a real good reason to be extended to probably all types of occupancy and that the use may be more beneficial to us here in this country than even in the apartment blocks.

Many people who talk about condominium tell us that it works very well for those who are wealthy but for those who are not, then you have all kinds of experiences to undergo. Those who are in favour of condominium are so much in favour of it and they are so exuberant in their speeches on it and in their writings, that I wonder sometimes when I listen to them and read about it, I wonder how we ever got along without condominium, but when you find someone who is so sold on something you are always just a little bit cautious and you begin to think, well, we must weigh the advantages and the disadvantages of condominium before we really go into it too far.

I do know that our idea of condominium has come to us more these last few years because of the price of land in our urban areas and particularly because of urbanization. We have more people coming to the cities seeking work and so we have to house these people, and we certainly can't expect in our cities to find land, so the multiple idea of residences has to be given real serious consideration. And when I think of the condominium aspect, it's attractive to me because I can think of it belonging to older people who would like to own their own home and yet because of their age they probably can't afford to look after it any longer either from a physical standpoint. They really would like to be in this unit, condominium unit; because of loneliness they like to be close to one another. They also like to have a group participation, and I think this doesn't only apply to those who are of an older age but it applies to all of us at any age, that several people who can stand a great deal of their own company would not prefer it, but to those who like to be with other people it becomes very attractive.

I can also think of the man, the breadwinner, who is away from home, and when he comes home he just finds it impossible to look after all the chores that go along with the keeping up of a home, and so the aspect of condominium is very attractive to him.

And then there are those people who simply don't like to look after a home at any time; they'd like to be free of it; they just can't be bothered fixing the fence or painting the roof or doing any of these chores, and so apartment dwelling is very much to their liking. They don't want to rent but they much prefer to have that home ownership. Many of the ladies prefer it too, because when they do rent an apartment it's laid out for them, they have no choice at all; but if it was a home for themselves, if it was under their own ownership, they could arrange it to suit their own special likes. This is true too when you would like to have alterations made. If it's your own home in an apartment you could make the alterations but you're not free to do so if it's on a rental basis.

I can see where many people like it because they are sure of a fixed cost and they have security of tenure in this fixed cost as well, so that they are able to look at their budget and go about it from year to year as to how much they can spend on rentals. It also has great attraction for builders and developers because when there are several in the condominium aspect of a development you are able to spread the cost, and any person who wants to invest, he feels that he has not only invested with one but this is spread over a good number of people who have interest in this condominium. I can see too, where if they sold it they would get an immediate return on their capital, and on the other hand they could save some of them or if they didn't sell them they could give them a return at a later date. The lenders, of course, spread their risk and this is very attractive to them.

I can certainly tell you that in our own department the use of condominium in the field of public housing -- and I again worry about this word "public housing". I rather think we should try to call it Manitoba Housing. I suggested it to the Federal Minister and I noticed he used it on several occasions yesterday and he suggested that we do use it. It gives it a better name, I think. There is sort of a stigma to public housing. I just don't think we can overcome this.

One of the problems, of course, of a housing project that you would have even under the

(MRS. FORBES, cont'd) . . . . condominium, is that it still would have a stigma if you said that every place within there was subsidized or for the use of those of low income. By the use of condominium, however, a municipality might buy into the condominium, not the whole complex but certain units within the condominium development for families that they are subsidizing. I think that this probably would have a good effect on trying to lift them out of an area which has the stigma of public housing and yet bring them into an area where they are mixing, integrating with those who are on their own trying to find home ownership.

But with all the advantages there are probably many problems too and we have to think about this very seriously. Quite contrary, though, to public opinion there is nothing in common law which would prevent independent ownership of part of a building, but there are two main difficulties in the acceptance of this communal ownership of land under our common law. First of all, one feature is the uncertainty of space. If a building was to sag you couldn't occupy the identical space you had before. If a building was to burn down it might be impossible to occupy the identical space. And second, there is the impossibility of enforcing the direct positive covenant that affects land. Restrictive covenants run with the use of the land and are binding upon its successors in title but positive covenants are not. I'm given to understand that there are bound to be positive covenants in buildings where each part is so very dependent on the other, but while there is some form of condominium under common law there are so many risks involved that we would really have to bring in supporting legislation before it would become attractive to people, and once we put legislation on the statutes we must be very very sure of it because, you know, once we put the blessing of the law on anything it is bound to be used and we who bring it into force must be responsible for what could happen.

So therefore I think we have to take a very great and sincere and close look at the disadvantages that go along with it. Legislation must take into account every contingency and one of them that I am thinking of, the obvious one, is that there must be some guarantee of title and protection in the future. Under common law there's no problem as long as the building stands. Secondly, there would have to be changes in the Real Property Act which would permit the registration of titles. Third, some of the rights covered by assessment or by negative covenant, but some of the other rights such as the rights of support, may involve positive covenants which for their enforcement it is more difficult.

There would be grave . . . . even as to the right of anyone to enter to make repairs, for such rights as protection from the elements would have to be given consideration. What about the right to receive even hot water, to park your car in one particular spot or other; maybe to use the elevator or probably to share a pool or a garden or any of these other things that you share in common. This is no solution to the very practical problem of the amount of control to be exercised over each other's use of his own apartment. This is one place where we might have real difficulty. What we think might be good for us in one apartment which we own, our neighbour might not agree with this. And so our rights could be contested.

Sixth, the law must provide for procedure in case a building is partially destroyed by fire. What if the other number of people in the building decided, or the people who were burnt out decided they didn't want to rebuild. What would happen to the building? You'd have to have the owners agree on this.

Seventh, provision must be made for the disposal of the building when it has outlived its usefulness, and just how could you get several people who own a building to agree on when it had outlived its usefulness, because some of the members who owned an apartment may have kept theirs up in good repair while others may have let theirs go by the wayside.

Then there is always the trouble - and this is my eighth note here - that you might have one bad egg in this condominium complex, and the question comes up, how do you relieve yourself of this one bad egg? And as a result there may be great difficulty in getting some type of legislation that would take care of such a situation.

And ninth, consideration would have to be given to problems arising out of legal action in connection with the use of common property.

So for all of these things we'll have to leave this to our legal advisors, but I believe that we must seriously weigh the advantages and the disadvantages and try to counsel people very carefully before they take advantage of this, because no doubt they will take advantage and I think we have to remind them that there are certain things that they will have to learn all over again if they do take advantage of it. I'm thinking of using it, for instance, in some of our outlying places in Manitoba. Supposing we should try to bring some of our Indian and Metis people together in close areas such as this. Just how would they be able to live in such

(MRS. FORBES, cont'd) . . . . close proximity to one another? This is quite a question. Its use could be good but in a restrictive area and forcing them into communal living such as this may give us many advantages that we might not be able to live with.

There must be some idea, when we think of every person owning an area, as to who would control the whole picture of that building or that development, because let's take for instance the question of insurance. If one had insurance and the next person didn't have it where would they land if a building burned down? We would think again that maybe insurance is costly to have each person insured separately rather than to have one blanket insurance on the whole. We may wonder, too, what we could do about separate mortgages. They may cost more but if it's separately owned the individual suite or house would be a separate mortgage, and yet what do you do about the common interest? How do you mortgage that?

There would be difficulties arising if someone who was in the condominium happened to lose his job and was unable to work and pay his rent, maybe through sickness or through no fault of his own, just how does he carry on with the common interest, let alone his own privately-owned share of it?

I think about all the things that could happen in condominiums. I am aware that many of these could be overcome, but I think that we have to take a close long look at it. I know that it has its advantages and I know that it has its disadvantages. I don't deny that it's a good thing, but when I think about all the problems that could arise unless we have a good counselling job done for the people of Manitoba who might take advantage of this, then I am afraid that I would be the last one to suggest it.

However, I am aware that even with all these problems there is sufficient reason why we should take a real good look at it, and so if we asked our people in the Law Reform Committee to give us their views on bringing about legislation - if that should be their view - then I think this would be the first step that we should take before we even start to consider it because we have no legislation on the books so far. We would not be able to do anything about it until we did get legislation, and so for this reason I hope that the Member from Assiniboia and other members in the House will agree with me that we should ask the Law Reform Committee to study it, which I know they are doing, and to ask them to report; and then our people who are entrusted with housing in this province would be able to give condominiums a real good try and see if we can come up with this method which so many of our people in the housing field tell us would be a real answer to not only public housing but housing for those who are in the bracket just above where they would be eligible for public housing.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia be amended by striking out all the words following the word "that" in the first line of the first paragraph of the operative portion of the proposed resolution and substituting therefor the following words: "The Honourable the Attorney-General be requested to ask the Law Reform Committee to study the problems of condominium legislation and to report on the same."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs would be prepared to answer a question, and if not, the Attorney-General. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, who are the members of the Law Reform Committee referred to in the resolution.

MR. LYON: There are about 30.

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't ask how many, Mr. Speaker. I asked who they were.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. I wonder if the Leader of the New Democratic Party - it would have no binding on the resolution - could we deal with the amendment and then possibly put the question -- or it must come first?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I might be precluded from asking a question of my honourable friend if the motion is formally put by you before that.

MRS. FORBES: My understanding is that they are appointed by Orders-in-Council pursuant to The Attorney-General's Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, again I don't want to know how they are appointed or how many there are. My question is a simple and direct one, I believe. Who are the members of the committee to whom this resolution is directed -- or the amendment as proposed by my honourable friend. If she does not know, may I suggest that she simply say she does not know.

MRS. FORBES: That wouldn't be of much satisfaction to you. I don't know but I am quite willing to try to find out. I will get the information for you if you would like to have it.

(MRS. FORBES, cont'd) . . . . I don't know. I don't think that we can give you that information right at this moment but there is no secret about it. They are appointed and we will give you the list. I'm quite willing to get you this information.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, then the purport of the amendment is to refer this matter to a committee that she doesn't know anything about -- (Interjection)-- I'm not being ridiculous. No, I don't know.

A MEMBER: Read the Act.

MR. PAULLEY: I have read the Act.

A MEMBER: Which Act?

MR. PAULLEY: The Attorney-General's Act. It doesn't say anything in there.

MR. LYON: Read the amendments.

MR. PAULLEY: I've read it. You better brush up on . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think the leader of the House really should be sitting in his seat should he not if he wishes to participate in . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We'll deal with this amendment now.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: May we have this matter stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that

WHEREAS Churchill's weather conditions and isolation makes it difficult for this area to compete in the labour market and to encourage business and professional people to settle in the area; and

WHEREAS Governments and their Crown Corporations should accept the role of leadership in providing Northern Canada with modern amenities and services as enjoyed by the rest of Canada if they expect to encourage Northern developments; and

WHEREAS private enterprise and community fund raising organizations have found it impossible to provide a stable basis on which Television can be successfully promoted at Churchill; and

WHEREAS Television should be considered an important education media in assisting Indian, Metis and Eskimo youth to integrate to other areas of the Province;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the C.B.C. be encouraged by this Assembly to amalgamate the existing TV operation at Churchill with their present radio facilities to assure continuing operation of both services to this isolated Community.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, and maybe the honourable member can inform us on this, but were not the recent announcements by the Federal Government and the Manitoba Government in this regard, did they not proceed to provide the answers that he seeks by this resolution?

MR. BEARD: No, they don't, Mr. Speaker. I could enlarge on that first part if you wish. --(Interjection)--.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I believe so. The answer given by the Honourable Member for Churchill to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is correct. I see no reason why he shouldn't proceed. Would you proceed please.

MR. BEARD: In speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could explain the purpose of it, particularly now that the question has been brought up as to whether it does in reality deal with the recent announcements that have been made both provincially and federally.

TV in Churchill has had a very short history and does not represent that type of media that is being spoken of now both provincially and federally inasmuch as this is a live TV operation at Churchill and it is a community one. The one that the federal have proposed for northern sites is a canned TV operation which covers a four hour a day operation and roughly costs approximately \$70,000 per community and does not allow for any live local TV from the community itself, and of course the federal-provincial announcement to bring TV to many of the areas in northern Manitoba falls short of Churchill at this time and offers the possibility

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) of bringing live TV to Thompson, The Pas, Lynn Lake, Snow Lake, Cormorant and some of those places -- rather not Lynn Lake. And so it is that the federal one has offered this package deal to Lynn Lake and to many of the areas in northern Canada and the people in Churchill are concerned about the type of operation they have up there and they are concerned about being able to keep it.

As I said before, Churchill has had a short history in the field of TV, and while it has been rewarding, it has also been very frustrating. To begin with, live TV was brought to Churchill through a private promotion, and after a short term it appeared that they were going to promote it right out of Churchill again and it was at that time that the community got together and asked for pledges in the surrounding area that was being serviced and for awhile carried on with a voluntary contribution on free live TV -- or free broadcasting. When the private promotion had come up there they had indicated to the people that they had secured commercial advertising which would assure them of cost-free TV in Churchill for any length of time that they so desired. I think that actually the people were so interested in TV that they didn't take the time to look into this type of proposition, because certainly I don't think any promotion can actually wave a paper in the air and suggest that they have commercial advertising which would last forever --(Interjection)-- I said private promotion.

But anyway, it did bring TV to northern Manitoba's Churchill and it operated very well. It operated very well. Now the people feel that they would like in return to have the CBC take over this operation to assure that it would continue in their townships, and it would seem feasible that since the CBC do operate the radio facilities at Churchill that it would be simple for them to integrate it or to amalgamate it with their TV operations, because they had to have some technicians at least in the Churchill area and they could apply to both TV and radio. And certainly I think that in all fairness that if CBC are going to provide and feel that they should provide TV to larger areas such as Winnipeg, that they should be concerned, if they are going to help develop the north, in investing monies to assure that areas such as Churchill carry on.

Churchill has a longer winter season than most of us; they enjoy less of a summer; and certainly if TV is used or will be used it will be at Churchill. TV is a very intricate part of the personal life of most people in Churchill. They have their own programs; they promote education, not only for the school children but for many of the Indian people and the Eskimo people that are up there. Their own programming allows them to promote educational programs which will allow them to get at the Indian-Metis populations in many cases where they couldn't in any other way.

But I think the important thing is to assure this community that they will carry on with the type of broadcasts that they have at this time. I'm just not sure of what time it comes on, but I believe it is sometime in the afternoon and carries through until the late programs such as we have in Winnipeg. And CBC do support this. I have no fight with CBC at this time. They are promoting it; they allot the tapes; they're doing a very good job; but the problem lies in how they're going to get this paid off. If we consider that CBC are ready to bring package deals into our northern areas at approximately \$70,000 a community, then I am assured that they could take over this operation at a price well below this, and so it would carry on with a type of programming that would be over and above what they could offer to the other communities in the north and it would be one in which they could experiment and see how the community reacts to their own personal station as far as live television goes from the community and to contribute toward it. It would cut down on the cost of distribution of tapes, and these themselves can become very expensive.

And so it is, Mr. Speaker, that really the crux of the problem is that we have TV at Churchill and people are satisfied by and large with what they have got. I realize that later on they will be looking forward to being hooked up with the rest of the province, but for the time being they would rather have the type of TV that they have at Churchill. They suggest that they're willing to co-operate with CBC and do anything possible, or everything possible to assist in the carrying on of their broadcasts, and I see no real reason why our CBC people can't look into this and really not cost them what it's going to cost them to put it in on the basis that they have suggested as far as a blanket policy for other northern communities. So we would like, Mr. Speaker, just to carry on the way we are, to get the assistance that is necessary to do this, and the people of Churchill will co-operate and they will at least be keeping up with those things they have got now instead of falling further behind.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I am just wondering if I could ask a question of the Honourable Member for Churchill. Could he give us some indication of approximately what percentage of the families - of the Indian and Metis families - living in Churchill have electricity that would enable them to use a television set - within the TV viewing range of such a station.

MR. BEARD: A fair number - a fair number.

MR. HANUSCHAK: What's a fair number? Do you mean two or three or four?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HARRIS: If nobody else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for LaVerendrye, that WHEREAS the Canadian Forces Base at Rivers is a major economic and social force in Western Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the two 6,000 foot runways are in excellent condition and are used as an alternate landing field for commercial aircraft; and

WHEREAS Canadian Forces Base Rivers loses far less airtime than do most other bases; and

WHEREAS there are 405 homes in excellent condition, modern recreation facilities and a modern elementary school at Canadian Forces Base Rivers; and

WHEREAS the base includes numerous post-war buildings such as a new Fire Hall, Base Supply Building, Central Heating Plant and new hangar;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to retain the Canadian Forces Base at Rivers and other Manitoba bases.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I may not have enough time to finish. I notice the time is almost 5:30, so with your permission I'll start and possibly I can continue later.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection if the resolution were left standing as open in the Honourable Member's name.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would proceed for a moment or two, and we will deal with that subject when 5:30 comes.

MR. DAWSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the threat of a shutdown at Rivers poses a problem for those who support the Federal Government in its attempt to modernize the Armed Forces, and when I argue for the retention of the Rivers Base, I wonder if in fact I am putting the interest of one area of the country over the interest of the nation as a whole. However, in the case at Rivers, I believe the answer is no. Rivers is important to both western Manitoba and to the nation as a whole. I think that the points that I covered in the resolution prove the value to the Federal Government of the importance of the base.

I would like to mention a few things of importance to the immediate area. Now the base employed 1,000 people, including civilians, and it has a \$5-1/2 million payroll. If the base were to be closed down, there would be a \$9 million retail sales loss to the area. Now I think one of the most important things that we should remember is that Brandon and area, which includes the Rivers base area, is in a designated area, so designated by the Federal Government that if any industry comes in, a grant will be given to that particular industry. It seems rather foolish to me, and people in that area, that the government are prepared to subsidize industry but are thinking of closing down a military base and are not prepared to subsidize the base in the same way that they would be subsidizing industry if they found that it was no longer important to them. So I think the fact that it is in a designated area is a very important fact.

Now I have a number of points that are very important to the province as a whole, and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I should start on them right now. They are quite lengthy and I would hate to start and get half-way through them and have to repeat.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. I wonder if the Honourable Member has leave to carry on when this item appears on the Order Paper next (Agreed). It is now 5:30 and I am vacating the Chair to return again at 8:00 p.m. this evening.