

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, May 16, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their Third Report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 9 - An Act to amend The Public Health Act.

No. 14 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.

No. 15 - An Act to amend The Planning Act.

No. 16 - An Act to validate By-laws Nos. 3/68, 5/68 and 6/68 of The Town of Swan River.

No. 30 - An Act to amend The Department of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs Act.

No. 68 - An Act to amend The Companies Act.

No. 69 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.

No. 77 - An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded.

No. 78 - An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation.

No. 83 - An Act to incorporate Westminster United Church Foundation.

No. 85 - An Act respecting The Town of Russell.

No. 88 - An Act to amend The Election Act (2).

No. 89 - An Act to amend The Controverted Elections Act.

No. 90 - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.

No. 91 - An Act to amend The Trade-Schools Regulation Act.

No. 99 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 27 - An Act to amend The Horned Cattle Purchase Act.

No. 32 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

No. 47 - An Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act.

No. 51 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter and to amend an Act respecting The City of Brandon and to Validate By-Law No. 3930 of The City of Brandon.

No. 57 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, the question being whether or not the Honourable Minister of Welfare is interested in the subject of Medicare, and if he is, why he's in the House at this stage of the game.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the House Leader, the question being why the House Leader has not seen fit to hear the full brief of the people trying to present their views on Medicare.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I've not made it a habit to answer to any member of this House for my personal actions or whom I shall hear or whom I shall not hear. I also make it a habit, under the rules of the House, except for illness or other disability, to be in the House when the House opens at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, on this very point, may I direct another question to the Honourable the House Leader. There have been occasions when important business of the House is taking place outside of the House, that the House has delayed its opening in order to hear the will of the people of the province of Manitoba, and if my honourable friend has not been in this House long enough to understand that,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) may I suggest that it's time he did understand it, and my question to my honourable friend would be . . . (Interjections) -- I'm not making a statement; I'm asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable gentleman has a question. I'd be pleased to hear it - the question, that is.

MR. PAULLEY: My question is: is my honourable friend the House Leader not aware of the fact that on occasions there has been a delay in the opening of the House in order to hear representations? That is my question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If I could take a moment of the business of the House to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right, where we have 56 students of Grade 9 and 12 standing of the Steinbach Collegiate School. These students are under the direction of Mr. F. K. Isaacs. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here tonight.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister. I don't know whether or not he watched the television news tonight, but a challenge was offered to him by the Mayor of Winnipeg to debate the matter of Urban Renewal in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would be very pleased to hear the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. JOHNSTON: My question is: is he going to take the challenge up?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): The answer is, I didn't see the program.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the House Leader could indicate to us who are now assembled what will be the order of business for this evening, because you know, Mr. Speaker, it is under the complete control of my honourable friend the Leader of the House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think we have indicated that, prior to our adjournment at 5:30, it would be our wish to resume the consideration of the concurrence motion and thereafter to move into the second reading of bills.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to remind the House on what concurrence resolution we're presently on?

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk is of course retrieving them. I'm not anticipating we might move into . . . However, we'll proceed in the proper order. I was wondering if the honourable gentleman was referring to the resolution which I have in my hand, which I said I would hold pending completion. Is that what you want me to read?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was only enquiring of which concurrence motion we were presently on when we're in concurrence.

MR. SPEAKER: The actual number? It'll be called in a moment.

MR. CLERK: Resolved it be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,094,871.00...

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt my honourable friend the Clerk of the House, but as I understand it, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead had introduced a motion in amendment and he was on the floor at the time of the adjournment of the House last evening, and I respectfully suggest my colleague from Brokenhead should proceed at this particular time. On expropriation, if I recall the concurrence resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I'm sure in the Clerk's haste he overlooked that. I wonder if the honourable gentleman has a copy of the resolution he put forward last evening.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't have one. I distributed all the copies, including my own, so it's entirely in your hands, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): It's in Votes and Proceedings - Page 22.

MR. SPEAKER: I have a copy before me now, if the honourable gentleman would care to proceed.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House, I'll read the motion again. "That while concurring in Resolution No. 93, this House regrets the government through its arbitrary expropriation procedures, has created an atmosphere of insecurity by land owners in Manitoba."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you will recall that the government, the Opposition, have over

(MR. USKIW cont'd) the last few years received briefs in this connection. Two briefs I recall, one from the Manitoba Farmers Union and one from the Manitoba Farm Bureau, expressing their concern that the province does not have proper procedure or has not adopted proper procedure in the expropriation of property, and it is for this reason that I feel that we must deal with the problem through this concurrence motion.

People have learned, sometimes a month or so after their property has been expropriated, that they no longer are the owners of their property. Now Mr. Speaker, I know that there are technicalities involved, but it seems odd that the newspapers and the community learn of an expropriation in many instances before the person who owns the property does, and it is in this connection that I want to elaborate.

I recall an incident during the time that the government was considering the expropriation of property in the Birds Hill Park area. The newspapers carried headlines before any one of the property owners were advised that the government was giving consideration to the expropriation of their property. Now, Mr. Speaker, you could imagine the problems that some people might face or may have had as a result of this type of procedure, mainly that some people, had they known of government intentions insofar as expropriation is concerned, probably would not have spent monies in the improvement of property, whether it be in land improvement or building improvement, and that probably they would be much better off financially had they known in the proper time that they were going to be expropriated. So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very important issue and I think it is an issue that the government must do something about.

I know that whenever we have urban development, urban renewal, expansion of urban centres, parks developed throughout the province, or road building, that the government is substantially involved in expropriation procedures, and I know it is a very difficult task for the Land Acquisition Department to perform, but I think that we must overhaul our expropriation laws so that the general public has a great deal more protection than they have now. I know of instances - in fact many people in respect to the Birds Hill Park expropriation have to date not received compensation. I know of instances where people were threatened that if they would not move off their property that they would be evicted, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that there must be a nicer and more human approach to expropriation than what has been in the past; that the community, the people at large, deserve a far better consideration; that we shouldn't be employing strong arm tactics in order that we may negotiate a better deal from the person whose property we are trying to expropriate. And I think it's a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker, that this House has given consideration, to some degree, in that they had set up a committee -- I believe we had a committee during the last session and in between the last session and this one, that is supposed to study the question of expropriation and other matters. The Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, Mr. Speaker, was set up; and I don't know, I haven't the experience in this House for more than the past year, but I'm led to believe that these studies have been going on for a long time. I understand that there was a Law Reform Committee that made certain recommendations; in fact, that they have provided a draft bill for the consideration of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders; and this Committee was charged with the responsibility in the last session to do something about our expropriation laws and other matters.

Mr. Speaker, the government has not moved at all. The Committee, I would say, would be described as probably a lazy committee. I hate to use that term, but I'm led to believe that this was so, that the government was not really serious in pursuing any course of action, and I don't think that the government should procrastinate on problems of this nature. I don't think that the simple announcement that the government is going to reconstitute this committee, to further study the problem, is the way to handle things. We could have had the consideration of amendments to the Act, or possibly a brand new one devised since the last session so that we may have considered it this year. And I, Mr. Speaker, suggest that it's time that the government stop putting things off. Let's get on with the business of Manitoba and let's give the people of Manitoba a fair deal when we are expropriating their property.

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

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the Honourable the Minister of Public Works would speak on this amendment because I, too, think it's a most important subject and one that needs discussion in the House.

I have mentioned on previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, that it has been my misfortune to become acquainted in the last few years with expropriation on a large scale in four or five

May 16, 1968

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) different areas of the province, and I have had the misfortune to have many personal friends and some acquaintances and one relative expropriated. I mention the "relative" part because in the Honourable the Minister of Health's Department, why it seems that that makes some difference and -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I would trade a few off too. But I have seen so much of this in action and there's been so much of it going on that I have become vitally interested in the subject, and I think that what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead said just a moment ago when he mentioned the fact that people that within his knowledge have learned about the fact that they were being expropriated from the papers, from the public media, is really unfortunate.

The other thing that I think is very unfortunate is that there seems to be a tendency on the part of the government or the expropriating authority, whichever one it may to, to hold the price down just as low as possible. Now, one thing that I have not been accused of in this House that I know if, is trying to spend too much money, and I'm not generally an advocate of wasting or even being extra generous with the taxpayers' money. But I think this is one case - expropriation - where the authority, whoever it may be, should make a great allowance on the side of generosity because of the fact that in the most of these cases these people are not only not wanting to lose the property, they're very much opposed to losing it. Now if they're willing to sell, if they're willing to part with the land, then I think there's an entirely different set of circumstances. But where it is being forcibly taken, then I think the government should, if error is necessary at all, err on the side of generosity and they should pay some attention to the fact that this land is being taken in that manner.

Now, as I mentioned, I have been acquainted with expropriation in connection with the Portage la Prairie Diversion, in connection with the Long Lake Drainage Improvement Scheme, in connection with the Metro expropriation for the lagoon out northwest of Winnipeg here, in connection with the Floodway, and in connection with the Birds Hill, all of them expropriations involving several, or in some cases many people, and then in addition to that I have been acquainted with several private ones as well, and this has become to me a matter of extreme urgency. And I'm going to mention only one of the cases, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to mention this one. And this is one in connection with the Long Lake Lake Drainage Improvement Scheme.

Here was a case where several farmers - because, as the same implies, although it's called Long Lake it's really a slough or a natural runway - the improvement affected a lot of farmers and in some cases they were no doubt willing to sell, in others they weren't, but if the project is going to continue, then of course they have to have it all the way along the runway itself, and so in order that the project could be completed it was necessary to take the land - and I'm not objecting to this. Under those circumstances there has to be expropriation. But for those farmers who definitely didn't want to have that scheme, the ones who happened to have good drainage as it was - maybe it had been put in by themselves, maybe they were naturally drained - but whatever the reason they hated to see this land go and they, I suppose, asked a little bit higher price for that reason. But in an area that I am personally acquainted with and consider to be first class land, the government offered - and this was the government itself in this case - it offered and would not after repeated appeals (I mean appeals in the way of letters to the Minister and to others) would not raise the offer of \$100.00 an acre.

Now, another friend of mine had purchased land in the same district of what I esteemed to be exactly the same quality for \$175.00 an acre. Just about the same time. And this and other sales in the area had been brought to the government's attention, but they would not raise the price at all. There were only a comparatively small number of acres involved, Mr. Speaker, because it was a case of widening the drain and eventually - and I quite frankly hoped that this particular farmer would take the case to Court because he happened to be one who could afford it, but after consulting with lawyers and others he decided not to. The lawyers convinced him that it would cost him more to fight the case in arbitration than any improvement that he would be likely to get, and eventually he decided against going to arbitration with this case. And eventually he received a letter -- he wrote to the Honourable the Minister and the Minister turned his letter over - I'm not blaming him for this at all - he turned it over to the Land Acquisition Branch and the Land Acquisition Branch wrote him saying that the appeal that he had made had been refused and that the Land Acquisition Act read that the Minister, the authority concerned or utility concerned, shall not pay his compensation in respect of the acquisition an amount other than the amount so certified, which was the amount certified by

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) the Land Acquisition Board, which was \$100.00 per acre. And so the Director of the Branch says: "Therefore, inasmuch as you have stated that you do not wish to take this matter to Court, I am asking your solicitor to authorize payment of the sum of \$2,873.00, plus interest from June 1, 1967 to September 15, 1967, by which date you may expect a cheque in payment thereof to be in your hands." And Mr. Chairman, after the owner of that land had received that letter, which gave him every reason to believe that this was going to be forthcoming, the money didn't come, it still didn't come, and he made a check with the department, and do you know what he was faced with, Mr. Speaker? He was faced with a demand by the department that he sign a release for any damages that might occur.

Now this is a man who didn't want the drainage, didn't want to part with the land, wasn't satisfied with the price, and yet he was asked to sign a release. The honourable gentlemen who have seen these will know the way these releases read. "Know all men by these presents that I" (with the name of the farmer) "in consideration of the sum of one dollar (\$1.00), the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, do hereby remise, release and forever discharge Her Majesty The Queen, in right of the Province of Manitoba, Her Successors" etc., asking him to sign this release. And he had good reason to believe that there might some time be flooding on that place because he knows that it's probably going to be part of the scheme which will later on bring water from Lake Manitoba back into the Assiniboine River. It always seems to me, after all the criticisms that I've made of the fact that that diversion was undertaken west of Portage la Prairie to take water from the Assiniboine River out to Lake Manitoba, spending millions upon millions (and the figure is higher, much higher than it was estimated), spending millions upon millions to take it out of the river, then the next thing would be a costly scheme to take it back into the river, and I have said many times that only a government would do a thing like that. This is just the kind of thing that you could -- (Interjection) -- Well I think they would be more liable to it than any other one that I know of at the moment.

And so this gentleman has the feeling, because of the discussions that have been carried on, that perhaps some day this will be a water course carrying water that is not local to the area at all, to bring Lake Manitoba water back into the river, and yet he was asked to sign a release over getting a small payment for this land that he didn't want to sell in the first place and was dissatisfied with the price.

Now I mention that and I think this is one of the bad examples that I know of; although I do know of some others I'm not going to burden the House with them. But I think these cases - and I could mention others - do bear out the fact that the government, through arbitrary expropriation procedures, does create an atmosphere of insecurity and certainly an atmosphere of disappointment with a great many people, and I do urge, Mr. Speaker, that something should be done to clear up this situation.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead has mentioned the fact that a committee was supposed to be looking into this Act. We did. I am on that committee. We spent some time hearing representations on it. We didn't get to the actual discussion of the Bill and I am not happy with the Bill that has been presented. But in the meantime, the burden of this amendment is the atmosphere that has been created and this atmosphere has been enumerated by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie because he has read to the House on a couple of occasions - and I believe some others have too - news releases from this, the so-called Propaganda and other departments, that have been issued almost daring the people to go to arbitration because the news releases have pointed out - and press releases - that of the number that have appealed, gone to arbitration, against the offer that has been made by the authority, that only such and such a percentage has succeeded, and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie pointed out the case of a Portage la Prairie claimant where the offer of the government was even slightly reduced, and this was the subject of a news release.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me this is intimidation. It is not only unfair but it is actually threatening, and this should not be allowed. I know, Mr. Speaker, that some of my honourable friends on the government bench think that I have become over-emphatic about this particular matter. They think I've almost developed a fixation about it. If I have, it's because I have seen what's going on, I've been personally acquainted with many of these cases. I was very close to the Birch case that got so much attention out in the Metropolitan area here where they expropriated for the lagoon. I have been close to many of the Birds Hill cases. Two or three of those that I am personally acquainted with are before the Court and I couldn't discuss them if I wished to, but I do urge the government to do some thinking about this Act that is before or

May 16, 1968

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) will be before the Committee again, in the meantime, and until the Act is improved, to apply the present one with a good bit more diplomacy and kindness and generosity and tolerance than has been the habit up-to-date, and for goodness' sake, in the meantime don't issue press releases and propaganda statements intimidating people from going to arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary for people to have to go to arbitration because it's a most unfair situation for a private individual to be forced into what is actually a very costly procedure, in order to defend their rights. I certainly think this is a case - and the Ontario committee that investigated expropriation has recommended this - I certainly think that this is a case of where the owner's costs and his auditor's fees and all the rest should be paid for by the authority, because it's most unfair to ask a private individual to have to fight with his private funds against the government with their tax resources toward which he is in a small way contributing. So I must say that I agree with the sentiment of this resolution. There is an atmosphere of insecurity and there's an atmosphere of disappointment, and I think this is one of the greatest trouble spots that we face today, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad to add my voice to the plea that's being made through this amendment for reconsideration by the government.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I can hardly think of a less prosperous adventure than that of endeavouring to speak in opposition to a resolution which of course is charged with emotional overtones and on which, when the chips are down, the facts really don't count. I suppose that of all the hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of land acquisitions - I don't use the word "expropriations" - the land acquisitions that take place, there are a very small percentage in which disputes or differences of opinion arise, and a small part of that small percentage get into a situation where there is a serious and genuine dispute between the body acquiring the land and the owner. And in those that become contentious, it is sometimes of course a dispute as to the amount of money, but more often one must recognize that it is an emotional issue where the person who owns the land doesn't wish - and naturally so - doesn't wish to part with it. But I would want it to be on the record as much as I can put it on the record - and it will be disputed and I have no statistics here - I want it to be put on the record that there are many hundreds, indeed thousands of land acquisitions that are carried out amicably, peaceably without recourse to any proceedings of any sort, and in which adequate prices are paid. So let us start with that point.

Another point I think to be made, and referring particularly to the resolution. It refers to arbitrary expropriation procedures. Well, Mr. Speaker, the expropriation procedures are those laid down in the law of the province, laws which have been adopted by this Legislature, and while I'm not much to engage in the old business of saying, "You did it" or what was done before, it is a fact that the laws that we have and under which we operate are laws which were adopted many years ago by this Legislature, and if they are arbitrary, which I really don't think they are, but if they are, that responsibility is to be accepted by a very large number of people indeed, many of whom of course are not members of the Legislature at this time. And if they're not perfection, then one would say, well, you should be doing something to change the law, and I was one who some two years ago was naive enough to think that such a possibility existed and spent a good deal of time and introduced what I thought was a pretty fair bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, you would hardly think so, the reception that it received. Well, there just, I suppose, proves the case, that what seems fair to one is something else to another person. But I want to say that I think a reasonable effort, a very reasonable effort was made to bring uniformity into our land acquisitions procedures and into the expropriation procedures when expropriation was required, and I was sorry that it didn't find more favor with the House, but I acknowledge that that's fair and that's what this Legislative Assembly exists for. It was referred to the committee, as has been stated, and I would like to make a bet, Mr. Speaker, if that wasn't illegal in here, that that bill won't be approved for a good long time to come, simply because of the emotional aspect that is associated with the very word "expropriation," much less the fact of land acquisition.

Now, something the Honourable the Member for Lakeside suggested, that one ought to be generous in the price. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my experience, which of course is not that long insofar as this particular branch of government is concerned, I believe that there are more instances of generosity in payments than there are the other way around. In fact, I know that that is the case. I know of individual cases where it is done in order to

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) ensure not only fairness but to endeavor to meet the requests of the landowner. But, Mr. Speaker, you see the difficulty is that if you don't want to lose your farm or your property - and there are lots of people who don't, and I would likely be one of I was involved - it doesn't matter what the price is. It's always not enough. And of course the government would have to give its substance away to satisfy some people and even then, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't be happy about it, and I don't blame them. I can understand that that would be a very natural feeling. But, Mr. Speaker, the government and those charged with the responsibility of acquiring land have got to consider -- we assume that it's a matter of policy; it's been decided to carry out some project, and if the land is required for the project then those who are charged with the responsibility of acquiring the land have to take into account, not only the wishes of those whose land is going to be taken - and that's an important factor - but they must bear in mind the public interest, because they're not spending their own personal money; they're spending money that must be raised by taxes from all the people of the province, and so they have the important responsibility of balancing the public interest, the fact that the money comes from the taxpayers of the province. And so, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the problems that are associated with this very emotional and difficult situation.

Reference has been made, I think perhaps inadvertently, to news releases, whereas I think in fairness it ought to be recorded that there was one news release, certainly one news release that's been referred to by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, and that's correct. That news release was issued and did appear. I think, though, that that is the only one that has ever appeared to my knowledge, and it's a question; I'm not too sure what ought to be the public approach to news releases about any proceeding that goes on in the court, because I suppose you could always argue that it's intimidation; it's intimidation to the person who might be thinking about bringing an action for damages arising out of an automobile accident, that the judge in a certain case made certain . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must remind the Honourable Minister that we dealt with the matter of information last night, that is, releases. We dealt with the matter of releases last night, I thought fairly adequately, and I wondered if he would keep away from that particular item.

MR. McLEAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm only endeavoring to meet the arguments presented by the members who have presented the motion. However, Perhaps, then, Mr. Speaker, I might leave it by saying that we are in favor of a new Expropriation Act. I think we've shown our good faith in that regard. I don't have any strong hope that we will be able to satisfy the members of this Legislature, or the members of any committee of the Legislature, or the general public, that the measures proposed will be satisfactory or any amendment thereof. I think it ought to be recorded in this discussion that while there are unhappy circumstances associated with land acquisition, that they are circumstances which are as much personal as they are of a legal or technical or monetary nature, and that there are many hundreds of land acquisitions in which the utmost consideration - price, in regard to price and every other aspect of the matter - is the case, and there are those who would be, I am sure - indeed who have to myself at least, acknowledged that fact, and all we can do is to hope that that number will increase and grow and that there will be as little problem as possible, but we recognize that there will always be problems.

One final comment, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the courts, in the final analysis the courts - a judge of the courts - the courts have the final say in these matters, and I think that one must acknowledge that the courts have -- always their decisions have been fair and reasonable and that those who have appeared have received an adequate hearing; and after all, that is the final arbiter in all these matters as indeed in so many other matters that concern us, and I think that we can rely on their good judgments in matters of this sort.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's most amazing to hear the Honourable the Minister of Public Works attempt to defend the government from the indefensible, and I say "indefensible" because my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works, as so often happens from the members of the front bench opposite, attempted to raise a red herring in connection with the resolution that we have before us. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works, who is in charge of expropriation proceedings in the Province of Manitoba, has attempted to raise the question as to the price to be paid for expropriations as the main defence of the

May 16, 1968

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) government. You know, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works had have taken the time - and I'm sure he has lots of it - to read the resolution proposed by my colleague of the New Democratic Party, the Member for Brokenhead, he will find that there's no reference to all to price. The reference is to the arbitrary expropriation procedure, not the price, and I agree with my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works that the courts of Manitoba are in essence the final arbitrators insofar as price is concerned. But when we find, as we find daily, or almost daily, that the Minister of Public Works, as the chief expropriator for the Province of Manitoba, expropriates property and then some months or two months later informs the owner of that particular property that they no longer own it, then I suggest that there's something wrong.

I've got on the Order Paper at the present time a request for information of an expropriation - and my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works I'm sure would acknowledge that I sought from him information in respect of this expropriation for a month or two, or possibly a month, before I placed my Order for Return on the Order Paper. In this particular case, Mr. Speaker. property was expropriated in the northwest corner of the Greater Winnipeg area; the party didn't know that his property was expropriated for over a month after the deed had been done, according to the information that I have received. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works shakes his head, and well he may. He may be in possession of knowledge that I'm not in possession, although I am seeking that information and the Order for Return has been in the hands of the Minister of Public Works for about two or three weeks and I haven't received the answer as yet. My honourable friend, as I say, Mr. Speaker, shakes his head I'm wrong. Why doesn't he give me the information as to my error? He's had the opportunity. I haven't the correspondence before me between the Honourable Minister and myself in respect of this particular expropriation, but Mr. Speaker, if it's required by any member of the House I'll be perfectly willing to table it. But here was a case of a person whose property was expropriated a month before he knew about it, according to my information.

Now I say this is an arbitrary action on the part of government. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works was complaining, and I could almost feel the tears, not only see them, that were coming out of his eyes, because of the fact that he introduced a draft bill on expropriation a year or so ago, and he was lamenting and wailing the accompanying tear-jerking because of the fact that the bill hasn't been adopted. Well, I want to ask my honourable friend, who has the majority in this House? The government or the Opposition? He says if we would only allow him or the government to adopt the bill . . .

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): . . . did a bad job of preparing it in the first place.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, first -- yes, my colleague from St. John's first of all says, quite properly, it was a bad job of preparation in the first place, but there's been no real effort on the part of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works to bring the draft bill into line. There's no reason at all, Mr. Speaker, why that bill should not or could not have been before this session of the Legislature for adoption, except the reticence - I'm using that term advisedly and it should possibly have been the "inefficiency" instead of "reticence" - of the government to bring in a reasonable proposition insofar as expropriation is concerned. So I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works: don't come crying to us unless you would agree with me - and I think that I am right - that the Government of Manitoba is so inefficient insofar as expropraition, among other considerations as well, of course, Mr. Speaker, that they are not prepared to introduce or to proceed with legislation that may give to the citizens of Manitoba some security of tenure insofar as their land is concerned.

My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works, when he was speaking a moment ago, said that many hundreds of expropriations have been amicably settled; and he's right. I know that there have. But I'm wondering how many of these settlements that my honourable friend suggests have been amicably settled are only because of the fact that the people of Manitoba don't know where they stand. You know, Mr. Speaker, there's so many people in Manitoba that think that the government can do no wrong, and because some agent of government says to them that their land is no longer theirs, they accept it without debate, and this is where I say, and my colleague from Brokenhead says, that the proceedings in arbitration are arbitrary. I've had correspondence between my honourable friend the Minister of Highways and myself in regard to a new allocation on Highway 59, which incidentally I've never yet come to a conclusion as to the practicability or the reason for the re-allocation; a new highway costing hundreds of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) thousands of dollars in Manitoba located a couple of hundred yards east of the present 59 North; in my opinion, thousands and thousands of Manitoba taxpayers' dollars going down the drain; but in this particular case, expropriation of property of people who abided by the laws of my City of Transcona insofar as the frontages were concerned which had to be originally so many feet back from the highway frontage, and now the Government of Manitoba, using Metro as its agent, have placed a new highway or a turn-off from the new Highway 59 within about 15 or 20 feet or more of this house and offering them what? About \$690.00. And ruining their property. And my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works says "we've been overly generous." I wonder how many cases my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works has looked into. Emotional overtures, to use the phraseology of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works. I don't really know whether my honourable friend the Minister has really and seriously looked into the proposition and the effect of expropriation on people.

My honourable friend the Minister just a few moments ago said we should be doing something about changing the law. My honourable friend is correct. We should be doing something about changing the law. When he introduced the draft amendment on expropriation procedures into this House a year or two ago he said then that we should do something about changing the law for the benefit of people and those who may be concerned with the process of expropriation. He's had lots of opportunity to change the law. So I suggest to my honourable friend that when he stands in this House and argues, as he did a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, that the law should be changed, he is in essence giving support to the proposition of my honourable friend from Brokenhead when he says that the government, through its arbitrary expropriation procedures, has created an atmosphere of insecurity by landowners in Manitoba. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works agrees with this contention because he wants the law changed.

I suggest to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works that he should support the contention of my colleague from Brokenhead and vote in favour of the resolution that should change the arbitrary procedures in arbitration which are now the law, and he should immediately take steps, even at this Session, to introduce those changes in the expropriation procedures to bring about what even he agrees is desirable in expropriation procedures. He admits the law is wrong. He has delayed and procrastinated, as has his government, for two long years insofar as expropriation is concerned. I challenge my honourable friend to stand up and vote in favour of the resolution of my colleague for Brokenhead, who says essentially what my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works just agreed with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter this debate until the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities got up and gave us this tear-jerking discourse on the problem that they have with expropriation, and I might say to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that he has discovered some injustices with respect to some expropriations that he has personal knowledge of. I might say that in 1965 Session it was the same problem then, and a similar motion was moved by myself and I will read it. This is a motion on concurrence. "Mr. Johnston moved an amendment that, while concurring in Resolution No. 66, this House regrets the land-buying practices of this government with respect to land purchased for the Arts Centre, the Bain Estate and for the Birds Hill Park, which reflect the policy of negotiating with the influential and expropriating from the others."

Mr. Speaker, it was only a few short months ago in a committee that sat between sessions to consider, among other things, land expropriation procedures that a farmer came in from the Portage plains to place his case before the committee, and my honourable friend the Minister of Utilities took it upon himself to cross-examine this person as to the validity of his statements. And if I may briefly recount the farmer's case at that time, it was something like this: that in verbal negotiation with the land buyers for the province for the purpose of the No. 1 Highway expansion to two lanes, the farmer was given a verbal assurance that he would have direct access onto the highway if he would be co-operative. If he was easy to get along with, there would be no problem. He would have direct access onto No. 1 Highway. And what happened? What happened? The farmer took the verbal assurance of the engineer and the land buyers that this would be so. He took the initial price that was offered him, although the going price for land on the Portage plains was considerably higher, but he tried to be fair; he tried to be reasonable. Then, after the highway is constructed - and by the way, he was given

May 16, 1968

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . his direct access; it was there' it was in operation; the farmer was quite happy - about three or four months later a construction vehicle, a bulldozer moved in and tore up the access, the direct approach to the highway. And my honourable friend has the audacity to get up here tonight and say that they try to do their best by the people but on the other hand they have to look after the public purse.

And he knows of the case of which I speak. He did his best to pin that farmer down in committee, and I think it was the general consensus of the members of the committee that he did not. As a matter of fact, in a press interview out in the hall later on after the committee had risen, one of the reporters had the occasion to ask questions of the Honourable the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General said in effect, and if I can recall the press interview or the press report correctly, the Honourable the Attorney-General said that if this was the way the Minister of Highways handled land expropriation, then there was a need for an ombudsman in this province. Is this not a fair summation of what had happened that day?

MR. LYON: . . . my honourable friend that that is what the press said I said.

MR. JOHNSTON: Is the Honourable Minister -- is he saying that he was misquoted?

MR. LYON: My honourable friend asked me. I said that's what the press said I said.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well is my honourable friend denying that he said this or words to that effect? Let him so deny if he's denying it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie requires no advice from me that he must be able to substantiate any statement he is making, and if he is prepared . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm prepared, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to stand by my statements. And then what really aroused me, when the Honourable the Minister of Utilities was speaking tonight, when he said as far as he was aware there was only one case, only one case where there was a news report which had come out substantiating, or bearing, or confirming the province's stand on land acquisition. Is this not a fair summation of what the Honourable Minister said? That he could only think of the one case where the province had been - and he didn't say this but I say it - where they had been so indiscreet as to publish where they had won in one case? Well, for his information, there were two cases that I know about and I'm sure there could have been others. In fact I think I can recall others. But there were two cases that I know about, and I have in front of me to document what I say, one of the Propaganda Branch's releases.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question goes through my mind as to whether or not it would be in order to continue making quotations from documents similar to what the honourable gentleman has in his hand. I wonder if the House had not thrashed out that matter pretty thoroughly over recent days and weeks without continuing to do so.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you 100 percent. But when the Minister arises in his place and said there's only one case only one case where they took it upon themselves to publish where they had won a case, I have to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, and in the same news release that it mentioned two cases: one on the Portage Diversion from the H. W. Gallaway Estate, and one on the Red River Floodway. The former owners were Walter and Hedwig . . . of R. R. 3, Winnipeg. Now I only set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, that I know of two, and it seems to me I can recall other cases but I can't document them at this time.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose on a point of order I'd better just tell the honourable member what I said when I was speaking. I said I was only aware of one news release. I wasn't talking about number of cases. It could well be that there were two or maybe more cases referred to in the one news release.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well I'm prepared to accept the Honourable Minister's words but I understood him to say he could only recall the one case. However, it's not my intention to prolong this but I just couldn't help, Mr. Speaker, arising to refute the words of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution so I'd better make some remarks in support. We have come to use different quotes. We now talk of "land acquisition" when we probably mean "expropriation." We are talking of "orderly marketing." This is the type of quotations that we are getting, and I know from one of the new bills that's coming in it won't be any more "indigent relief." I think it's something like "municipal

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . allowances" or something to that effect.

But expropriation is a hard word and it's a very touchy matter, too, especially if an owner has to give up his property to which he has become attached and probably used it lifelong, and I think this is more so in rural Manitoba than probably the urban. The provisions in the statutes, if I'm right, and I think they're still the same, is that once a plan is filed with the Land Titles Office, the Crown then owns the land and the negotiations take place after.

We have not been able to discuss the estimates of the Public Works Department this year. The only time we will be discussing it is under this particular resolution, and therefore I think it's quite timely that we do make some comments. The other members have already commented, and a year ago, I think, the statement was made that we still have some 75 cases pending out of 150 from the Floodway and the Birds Hill Park area. I would like to know just what the situation is today, whether and how many of these settlements have been finalized by now.

It is rather peculiar. When it comes to assessment purposes, then we hear members on the government side say, oh the land taxes are so and so; they're high. When it comes to expropriation or the purchasing of land then it's a horse of a different colour and valuations do not seem to be nearly as high. -- (Interjection) -- Well, maybe the Attorney-General differs with me and he can say so after, if he knows. We, as members here, naturally are here to make sure that we have an efficient administration and also that efficiencies are made wherever possible and not squander money, but on the other hand too, I feel that we should pay the farmer a just price for his property when it is being taken away from him and expropriated. I am just so thankful that we are still under the present law and not under the new Act or new Bill that came out a year or so ago and was referred to the committee, because I felt that legislation was still harsher than what we have today, especially in connection with the abandonment clauses and so on. I still remember the former Member for Brokenhead a few years ago, when he related the number of cases in connection with acquisition and expropriation cases where the people were very dissatisfied with what was being done.

I am not only aware, but I would like to relate one specific case. This had to do with a widow in my constituency. They were widening a road and the government needed additional property and so they took the property from this widow. Her husband had passed on not too long before that. He had originally purchased the property, probably to some degree for speculation purposes, but apparently this property was of a width that if it was narrowed any it would be too narrow for the purpose that he had bought it for, and it was right adjoining the town and he was going to subdivide it and sell it, divide it into lots and sell it, and because of the road being widened and the additional property being taken, this piece of property no longer would lend itself for that purpose, and yet the neighbour of the adjoining property he would not sell unless he could sell a considerable size or portion of his property and at a much higher price. He was asking somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1,000 an acre whereas what the people offered this lady, I think, was about \$300.00. So you can see the position that she was placed in. Then these people come to you for help and advice, and this is really putting one into an embarrassing position because on one hand you want to support the government in their actions when they're right, and at the same time you feel that they were treating this lady unjustly. This case is still not settled. It has been pending for three or more years, I think, by now.

So these are the situations that arise and that we have to contend with, and I think it is so important that we have the right people in the department to handle these cases because it is so important how these people that are there on behalf of the government, the way they approach them and how they are being dealt with. I personally am unhappy with the legislation that we have at the present time and I certainly would feel that we should bring about something that would be better so that more cases could be settled more amicably.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that you may be getting a little, well I shouldn't say impatient, but let's say feeling that there's some repetition going on in this debate. Nevertheless the issue is of such importance...

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Leader of the Opposition I am here to listen and I wouldn't want my attitude being commented on at all.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm sorry, Sir, I didn't hear you.

MR. SPEAKER: I say I'm here to listen. I wouldn't want my attitude to be commented

May 16, 1968

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) on at all.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I was not being serious in my comment, Mr. Speaker. But the issue is one, really, of great importance because it is one of those issues where government really is, in a very major way, interfering with private rights, and when we deal with that type of an issue it's extremely important that government bend over backward to make sure that the individual is protected. This is why we have been taking some time on the motion that is before us, and the reply of the Minister indicates that in his own mind he is completely satisfied with the way the government is acting. And this is why it's necessary, Mr. Speaker, for members on this side of the House to re-emphasize to the Minister that the people of the province are not satisfied. The Minister may be. His colleagues on the front bench over there may be satisfied that they're treating the people in a fair way. But let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, there are a large number of people in Manitoba who are not satisfied, and it's important for the Minister to understand that because his defence tonight, commenting on what was said by my colleague the Member for Lakeside and by other members, was, well there are thousands of these expropriations or land deals going on all the time and very, very few of them come up for discussion. Most of them, he says, are amicably settled, and in his mind that proves that the situation is satisfactory.

But here's what happens, Mr. Speaker. Many of them are settled in what he calls an amicable way, simply because the people don't dare go to Court because the people are intimidated by government, because the people don't have the money to go to Court, because the people are afraid to stand up against the power of the government. And those are the facts. Many people who would proceed to go to Court, thinking of what faces them - government with all its experts, government with all the technical help available to it, government with the taxation powers to dig into the taxpayer's pocket to fight the case against the taxpayer - when people look at that they say to themselves, "There's no point fighting it. It's too big for me." And many of the cases therefore don't go to Court, and then they end up in the records of my honourable friend as cases "amicably settled."

Mr. Speaker, they are not all amicably settled. Far from it. Many are settled, it's true, without going to Court, but the taxpayer and the owner and the individual who it is the government's duty to protect, the taxpayer, certainly doesn't feel that way.

Now the reason we are referring to the press releases, Mr. Speaker, that go out is because they are in our opinion a method of intimidation. Now the Minister said tonight that he could only recall one. Well, my colleague the Member for Portage la Prairie referred to one, and then many days ago now, during the course of another debate when we were dealing with the question of the Propaganda Department, we brought up the case of the release regarding Mr. Tom Lamb and the expropriation up at Moose Lake. Tonight he referred to another one which cites several other cases. Two different releases. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to another one. Now I would hope that you wouldn't think that I'm reviving another debate on the Propaganda Department. I am not. But I think it is very germane to the whole question tonight because this type of release is the very thing that scares people and puts them in a position where they don't dare fight for their rights when very frequently they should. Because this is the type of thing the government says. And this is a propaganda sheet from my honourable friends, and the headline says: "Court awards vindicate Floodway land offers." That's the headline. In other words, the government serves notice on the people of Manitoba by this press release, "Don't argue with us because the Courts vindicate what we say." And then goes on to say . . .

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would be good enough to put the date of this — indicate that it is a press release, then I think it would be fair if he put the date of it on record.

MR. MOLGAT: By all means, Mr. Speaker. The date is the 5th of February, 1965. Very well into the term of office of my honourable friends across the way. And here is what the release says, and I'm not going to read it all. I'll read only that part, Mr. Speaker, which I think clearly indicates a definite attempt on the part of the government to tell the people of the province: Don't argue with us. Take what we give you and be happy, then we'll have amicable settlements. Because this is what it says:

"In transactions involving more than 900 separate parcels of land through which the Red River Floodway passes, only two have gone to arbitration and in both cases decisions of the Courts vindicated land acquisition and expropriation policies of the Manitoba Government as

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) well as the prices offered, Agriculture and Conservation Minister Honourable George Hutton said." It goes on: "One case involved a house and 3.65 acres of land. The County Court Judge gave his award on the basis of the offer made originally by the Floodway authority. In the second case, involving a motel, the County Court awarded the owner an additional \$5,000 but the Court of Appeal lowered the award to the original offer. Offers for the land required are arrived at after due consideration of all factors, including market values of the land, value of the house, and certain human considerations including health of the owner and age and other factors which might affect relocation of the individual or family."

Mr. Speaker, that type of a press release, in my opinion, is intimidation because that type of a press release is telling the people of Manitoba: Don't argue with the government. Don't you dare stand up against what we tell you because we're right, and to prove to you that we're right there's exactly what's happened. Nine hundred cases; two go to Court and we beat them.

That's what the Minister is telling the people of Manitoba. "Don't go to Court against us because we'll take you to the cleaners." Then, having issued that, he expects that the balance of the public are going to say, "Well what's the use?" And that's the trouble, Mr. Speaker. Too many people say, "What's the use? We can't fight the government."

Mr. Speaker, that is why this motion is before us tonight. That is why the Minister's answer is not a satisfactory answer because he's hiding behind this matter, but look at all the cases that have been settled out of Court. Mr. Speaker, that frame of mine which the Minister indicates tonight and which is reflected in the other members of that front bench, is that arrogant frame of mind that's got to be changed, and the Minister tonight showed no indication whatever of the appreciation of the individuals involved. Oh, he talked about sympathy, you know, and about emotion-charged issues and so on, but he doesn't really believe it. He says that but he doesn't really believe it, because he says it's all been settled amicably and you fellows on this side of the House, all you're doing is creating a ruckus. Mr. Speaker, the Minister isn't in touch if that's what he thinks. He just hasn't been talking to people. Let me assure him that there are many of them who call me on the telephone and who come to my office, and it's a real case for them; it's not just emotion; and it's not just a case of the Minister saying they'll settle amicably.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister: Change your attitude on this. Don't take the arrogant attitude that the government is right. That's not the government's responsibility. The government is there to protect the public, but as long as you take your position, you'll never do what is required to really protect the public on these matters.

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

MR. USKIW: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 22, Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,094,871 for Public Works, Resolutions 91 to 94, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,719,146 for Tourism and Recreation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that while concurring with Resolution 97, this House regrets that this government has not co-operated with the Fort Alexander Indian Reserve in the development of tourist facilities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

May 16, 1968

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that in my opinion this government has failed miserably to provide and to assist the very first citizens of Manitoba. I think, before I explain to you why I feel this way, I want to relate a bit of history in a very brief manner; namely, that it is the white community of the world that has in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Past experience and recent past experience suggests to me that I must insist on the honourable gentleman keeping to the matter under discussion. If he has a little history about the Fort Alexander Indian Reserve and its development I'd be very pleased to have it, but not the white population.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I was leading up to my remarks, namely, that the white community of the world, or some of it, had decided some years ago in history that they would launch an invasion of North America, and of course we find ourselves here today . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think the honourable gentleman would want me to allow him to continue in that respect. We don't want a history lesson but rather do with the resolution that I have in my hand, and I appeal to him to do it. Order please. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead has the floor.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is precisely what I am attempting to do. This is precisely what I am attempting to do and I simply wanted to relate that it is the white community, which is ourselves, that have had some responsibility with respect to the development of our native citizens in Manitoba; and the fact that I reflected upon the white community of the world having decided to emigrate to this country some years ago, I don't think should suggest that I'm out of order. But however, Mr. Speaker, I will try and confine my remarks . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I didn't say the honourable gentleman was out of order. I asked for his cooperation to confine himself with the resolution before the House.

MR. USKIW: Well, this is what I will do, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that we in this country, Canada, Manitoba, have for too long placed the Indian people in an impossible position, and this goes back for many years. And that is the Reserve System, Mr. Speaker. And the Indian community has pleaded with the government-of-the-day over the years that they get a better deal for the reason that they really gave up their country to our race of people, if you want to put it that way, and they gave it to us practically for nothing, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am inclined to believe that we sort of stole it on them - and I don't think that's a misnomer. What I'm trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that we, the new Canadians, do owe the Indian community a great deal because we removed from them the right to make a livelihood for themselves in the traditional way which they have been accustomed for many centuries. And I don't say that perhaps this is bad, Mr. Speaker, but in doing this we did not provide a way for them to derive a reasonable standard of living in the process, that we have allowed them to degenerate into a welfare situation whereby they have now become accustomed to accepting handouts from one government or another.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if I might read this part of the resolution that I am waiting to hear about from the honourable member: "The government has not cooperated with Fort Alexander Indian Reserve in the development of tourist facilities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg." Now what that has to do with what the honourable gentleman is saying now, I wish he would let me know.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm dealing with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm appealing with the honourable gentleman most sincerely to cooperate, as I have tried to do.

MR. USKIW: If you check the resolution carefully, it's dealing with the development of tourist facilities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, and I'm dealing about the fact that this government has not responded to the request of that community of Indians living on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and I'm trying to relate how we have failed to respond to these requests over the years and this government has certainly failed in a similar respect, as have other governments over the years. -- (Interjection) -- Who's their MLA? Well, he's not in the House, let's put it that way. Oh yes, he is.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, a community or a group of Indian people have decided that they would present a development plan for a tourist facility on the Indian Reserve. They had asked that the government give consideration to such a plan and I want to quote from a letter which I received on March 21st, and this letter comes from a Member of Parliament asking me to assist him in urging the Province of Manitoba to do something with respect to this request; and I quote, Mr. Speaker: "As you know, the Manitoba Government has criticized

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) the Federal Government for its reduction in expenditure on Northern Health Services, particularly as this program applies to Indians in Manitoba. I think you will also be interested to know that on rare occasions, when Indian Affairs Department and/or Indian Reserves apply to the Provincial Government for help and cost-sharing, that they are very often turned down. Specifically, I refer to the development plan that the Fort Alexander Reserve had to develop tourist facilities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. The band Chief, Mr. Courchene, and the Indian Agent, Mr. Daggitt, tried to interest the Manitoba Tourism Department to express some interest, but in the end received a letter that they were unable to help. No funds. On these infrequent occasions when the province has an opportunity to help in some tangible project such as this was, they back out, and I can tell you that both the Chief and the Indian Agent, both of whom are moderate men, expressed considerable disappointment with the provincial authorities."

Now let me read to you for the record, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was sent in reply to this request to Mr. D. Courchene, Chief, Fort Alexander Indian Reserve, Manitoba. And this comes from Mr. Danyluk, Director of Parks. "Subject: proposed recreational development, Fort Alexander Reserve. Some time ago an investigation was made by Mr. A. Penner of our Department, accompanied by yourself and Mr. E. Daggitt of the Indian Affairs Department, as to the recreational potential on the Fort Alexander Indian Reserve. It appears that the resources for recreation opportunities are present, and in order to realize the optimum recreational potential, a comprehensive analysis and planning approach will be required." This is agreed to, that there is potential, by one of the departmental people. "Such a project requires considerable amount of time and effort, firstly, to interpret the scale and variety of recreation demands, planning analysis of the resources to obtain the proper utilization of the land; and secondly, a thorough outline into management, promotion, special programs, etc. Due to the amount of consideration required and the scale of the ultimate development, assistance at this time is beyond the scope of our Branch." Beyond the scope of our branch, Mr. Speaker. "I would, however, strongly recommend that the services of a planning consultant be sought. The fees for this type of service are usually reasonable, and results generally well-suited to the situation."

Here's the point, Mr. Speaker. "The fees are usually reasonable and results generally well-suited to the situation." If the fees are that reasonable, Mr. Speaker, why in the world do we slough these people off? Surely if it isn't going to be that costly, that the department could have given some consideration. In their own admission, they say that it was not a costly venture to undertake these studies and by the same token they suggest that the Indian community could pretty well do it themselves.

"If you wish to discuss this matter with me, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. G. Schnepp or myself. Yours truly, Mr. W.W. Danyluk, Director of Parks."

And there's the example, Mr. Speaker. And I want to read for the record a letter that was sent to the Honourable Sterling Lyon, Minister of Tourism and Recreation, Room 104, Legislative Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba and this comes from Dave Courchene, Chief, Fort Alexander Reserve. "Dear Sir: This is in reply to your letter dated February 16, 1968 regarding the proposed recreational development at Fort Alexander Reserve. When Mr. Penner of your department paid us a visit, he was most enthusiastic about the nature and the scope of our plans as outlined to him at that time. Therefore, we are somewhat surprised to receive your letter which appeared to advise us that your department will not be able to offer us any service at all. As we are citizens of the Dominion of Canada as well as we are citizens of the Province of Manitoba, we would most respectfully request an outline of the terms of reference of your department. We find it difficult to see the preferred status given to such recreational areas such as West Hawk Lake and Falcon Lake, rather than developing a new recreational area which happens to be on an Indian Reserve and by which an Indian Reserve could be made more economically viable and self-deterministic."

Mr. Speaker, the Chief of this Reserve is trying to imply that they want to be self-deterministic in their own development, and surely this is commendable and surely this ought to have been recognized by the department in question, that where the Indians express a desire to help themselves, that we ought not to hold back, that we ought to give it all the promotion that we could.

To continue the quote: "Once again, we feel that the province is discriminating against Indians as it has happened so often in the past. The Indian must also bear the brunt of the

May 16, 1968

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) federal-versus-provincial jurisdictional dispute. We look forward to receiving more information on this matter at your earliest convenience."

Now Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you will agree with me that I was not straying off the path, that I was leading up to a very important development in our relations with our first citizens of Manitoba, and that I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government has failed miserably - has failed miserably to assist these people in their own development, and it's not a good thing for people, for government, to look the other way when the native community in Manitoba is looking for some assistance or leadership. They agree with us that they don't want handouts any more; they want self-development programs and they want to maintain or restore their dignity. And for a department to simply brush them off and say that we haven't any funds, admitting that the research that was requested was not going to cost a great deal of money, and to say that the department cannot afford to assist them in any way, Mr. Speaker, is not even fair - let's put it that way. I just can't accept the fact that the government of this province would suggest to any group, simply because they may not agree with the jurisdiction under which these people come - whether they be federal or provincial that is - simply because they are not sure in this area, that they should refuse any form of assistance to a people that deserve a lot more than they've been getting from the white community in Manitoba for 100 years or so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite ready. I'd like to make a few comments on this particular item. I had not intended to until the Honourable Member for Brokenhead got up to speak.

I'd like to start off, Mr. Speaker, by asking my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP Party, the name of the candidate that ran in the last provincial election in the constituency of Virden for the Socialist Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mazawasicuna.

MR. WATT: That's what I thought. I know his name, Mr. Speaker. His name was Vernon Mazawasicuna.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right.

MR. WATT: It didn't sound like that to me.

MR. WATT: I have listened, Mr. Speaker, to the Socialists on this side of the House berating this government for years and years for their treatment of the Indian people, and I want to say to you, for the information of the members in this House, that some of them may not be quite aware of, or probably they are, that in the last election, the provincial election, a full-blooded . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I must also remind the honourable gentleman that he must speak to the content of the resolution. Probably he'll have an opportunity to speak as he wishes in other directions on this particular subject, but on this occasion I must remind him we're talking about Fort Alexander Indian Reserve and the development of tourist facilities on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and this is the only thing I'm prepared to hear about tonight.

MR. WATT: I will not proceed then, Mr. Speaker, if this is the case, but I understood from what the honourable member was saying that he was discussing the treatment of this government of the Indians in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I want to clear up the mind of the Honourable Member for Arthur. That may be true, but he will recall my struggle to get him to come to the resolution, which he did, and I appreciate it.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSEN (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, Fort Alexander Reserve happens to be a responsibility of mine. I'd like you to know that it is one of the finer reservations, including the east side of the reservation. I have no quarrel with them to help them get recreation facilities or to assist them in getting a park. I would be very, very happy to see this happen. But there are a lot of things happening in the Fort Alexander Reservation on both sides of the river, and if you're going to divide the reservation by the river you must take into account that they are on both sides of the river.

I'd like to remind you of some of the things that this government has done for them, when you say we've done nothing. The Manitoba Paper Company granted the Indian band of Fort Alexander the right to a pulpwood operation, which was some three or four years ago, and only the Indians were allowed to cut in a certain limit which was set aside by the paper

(MR. BJORNSEN cont'd.) company. This was operated very successfully, I think, for two years and then I believe that through no fault of anyone, but probably it ran out. And I would like to also recall the time when we had a meeting with all the Indian Chiefs of Manitoba and we had them into the building here. The only two members that I remember being here was the Honourable Member from Lac du Bonnet -- and we at that time gave the right to the Indians at Fort Alexander to take all the rice harvest of the wild rice in the Whiteshell territory, which traditionally was about 70 percent of the wild rice harvested, and we gave that to the whole band and they operated this as a cooperative effort. This was offered to all the Indian Chiefs of Manitoba to come and pick the wild rice in the Whiteshell.

I don't think that we have brushed them off from time to time. I'd like to take you to Fort Alexander right now and see the homes that are being built, see the arena that has been erected, and I would like to invite all the members up for the recreational day that we have at Fort Alexander where they have three and four days of active participation between the, shall I say, the white people, the Icelanders, and the Indians, and to witness the enthusiasm that goes through these several days that they hold their meeting. They have a road race of good length, and may I say to you, it was a very wonderful thing to see a lot of the white people running against the Indians, but the Indians came first, second and third and the Icelander was way behind. However, we did have Go-Go Girls and we had wrestling, and it's a day of really letting down your hair, and if you think that they are under-privileged or they aren't having a good time at Fort Alexander, I will fix a date, I'll invite you all down there, and I'm sure that you'll enjoy it very much. I don't think that you will look at the people that come out of that Pulp Mill when the shifts change. There are quite a lot of Indians working for the Manitoba Paper Company and I don't think that there's any discrimination in their operations at Pine Falls. -- (Interjection) -- Tourist development I was coming to. I have no quarrel with you making the park -- (Interjection) -- I don't think you'll do that. I don't speak too often in this House. I have no quarrel with them having a park on the east side of the river. I would certainly be happy to look into it, and I'll certainly lend my assistance to my honourable friend who was speaking on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope I was right. I thought that everything the honourable gentleman has had to say happened within the confines of Fort Alexander. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Yes Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet always refers to the East side of the river. I was referring to the east side of the lake, not the river. I recognize that the Indians are on both sides of the river.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member who spoke last would permit a question. Could he tell us when this meeting that he mentioned was held and under whose auspices; who called the meeting; and did I hear correctly, as well, that all the Indian Chiefs in Manitoba had been invited?

MR. BJORNSEN: So I understand. The meeting was two years ago, I would judge. It was held in this building.

MR. MOLGAT: And called by whom?

MR. BJORNSEN: I would imagine the Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. MOLGAT: Well then Mr. Speaker, there's further discrimination going on than the one referred to by my honourable friend towards the Indians; there's also discrimination to the other members in this House, because, well I think this is a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If I heard my honourable friend correctly, he said only he and one other member on the government side were invited. I would like to remind the government that there are many others of us who represent areas with substantial Indian population. If there are going to be meetings of all the Indian Chiefs of the province, then I think that all of the Members of the House who deal with Indians and who represent Indian people ought to be invited.

MR. BJORNSEN: May I make a correction here, I didn't say who was invited; I said "who attended."

MR. MOLGAT: It's pretty hard to attend a meeting about which we are not told.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we may deal now with the amendment.

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

MR. USKIW: Ayes and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Dealing with the amendment of the Honourable

May 16, 1968

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) Member from Brokenhead.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Dow, Doern, Fox, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs: Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, ... McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir and Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK; Yeas 19; Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,719,146 for Tourism and Recreation, Resolutions 95 to 99 ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party would take his seat for a moment. I was wondering if you had an amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I wondered if you would pause for a little moment until we

MR. PAULLEY: Providing there's a break in the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, very well.

MR. CLERK: for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1969.

..... Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I move . . .

MR. LYON: I wonder if the Honourable Member for Emerson would wait until we hear what the resolution is before he moves his expected amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Clerk continue to read that resolution for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,719,146 for Tourism, Resolutions 95 to 99, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Did the Honourable Member wish to speak to 99?

MR. LYON: On the point of order, I think if the Clerk could be permitted to read the resolution, then my honourable friend would move his amendment, we would all be in the picture and know what we are talking about.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,547,849 for Treasury, Resolutions 100 to 107 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that while concurring in Resolution Number 103, this House regrets that in spite of the promises of the First Minister to hold the line, he has substantially increased taxation in the six months since he has assumed the office of Premier, particularly in the following ways:

1. By imposing additional realty taxes on all homes, farms and commercial property of 4.1 mills.

2. By announcing an intention of increasing Hydro-Electric rates.

3. By increasing hospital premiums by 80 percent.

4. By refusing to enter the federal Medicare plan and causing a very large increase in MMS premiums.

MR. SPEAKER commenced presenting the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Minister please take his seat. I regret to have to continually do that but I am insisting that we have order in the House when the House is being addressed. I'll commence again.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about holding the line in taxation.

Before and during the provincial Tory leadership convention, the present Premier promised to hold the line in taxation. He was elected Premier on the basis of this promise. It did not take him long to disappoint the people of the Province of Manitoba. The phrase "hold the line" was simply a political catch phrase. It is six months now since the Premier has assumed the office of the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, and in the six months he has managed to substantially, as the resolution says, increase taxation in our fair province, both directly and indirectly and this he did by, as stated in here - 1. Imposing additional realty taxes on all homes, all farms and all commercial property of 4.1 mills. This is an increase of almost 50 percent, and this in spite of the 5 percent sales tax hoisted on the people of Manitoba in 1967, which was hoisted on the people and at which time the people were promised that this sales tax will relieve the taxation in the Province of Manitoba. And this was a hoax because it didn't do it. This government has no policy except spend and tax, and tax some more.

No. 2. Another very good example of the Premier's hold-the-line policy, is the announcement that was just made lately of an increase in Hydro-Electric rates, and I would say that this was necessitated as a direct result of some of the policies of the Weir government.

The sales tax is an example of one and just lately - last week in fact - I spoke to some of the people who are working on the Telephones and I asked them why. Working on the Hydro lines. They said, "We can't help it; we have to pay sales tax on materials. The money has to come from somewhere. So this is what I mean by raising the tax indirectly."

Now No. 3. Instead of holding the line, and I would like sometimes to refer to it as not holding the line, but the Hot Tax Line - that's what HTL should stand for - the hot tax line of this government. The Premier still persists -- what does he do? The government announced an increase this time, an 80 percent increase in the Manitoba Hospital premiums. Is that holding the line? No.

No. 4, and just to add insult to injury, the Premier is still adamant in referring to the federal Medical Plan. He refused to accept this for the people of Manitoba. He is depriving

May 16, 1968

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) them of the taxes or depriving them of the services for which our people in the Province of Manitoba are already paying through a tax, and on top of that, last week or a few days ago, we were promised that there will be an increase in the MMS premiums. The Premier by his action has doubly penalized the people of Manitoba in this manner. Mr. Speaker, the people cannot afford this government with its hot tax line. The Weir government is not holding the line in taxation but constantly increasing taxation. No wonder - and it is still true - that in the past there was a slogan, "Tories and Taxes go hand in hand" and they sure do. And the Premier is proving this by his hot tax line, by escalating expenditure, and by rising mill rates all across Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this government has betrayed the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WATT: I want to say a few words some time on some of these items and maybe I could say a few words now. Well I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might go out of the province for a moment to talk about taxes. Would I be in order? I missed on the Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few tax comparisons, if I could, because over the past few years we have listened, Mr. Speaker, to honourable members in opposition telling us about the tremendously high taxes in the Province of Manitoba, and they have belaboured this issue to the point where I believe that they have got a lot of people in the Province of Manitoba believing that they are overtaxed in relation to other provinces. And so, I have gone down to Toronto in Ontario and up to Edmonton in Alberta and into Saskatchewan to find out exactly what the people are paying there in respect of property taxes. We all know what their sales taxes are. We all know what the sales tax is in Alberta. It is nil. And it's quite understandable, because up there the Government of Alberta have only one problem and that is to keep their heads above oil.

Now I have taken a few tax comparisons on homes and on farm lands, Mr. Speaker, and I have simply taken them at random. One in the City, Metro Toronto, and I have the assessment on a home down there, \$6,425 assessment. The total tax on that home is \$517.79. The general tax of that amount is \$232.84 and the education tax there is \$284.95 - and these figures are tax figures from 1967, not 1968. The expected increase in the school tax down there was approximately \$40.00 on that assessment at the time that I received these figures. This was in Metro Toronto.

And up in the City of Edmonton in Alberta I got the assessment and taxes on a house up there, on a home. An assessment of \$4,520 of which the total city tax of Edmonton is \$257.00, and of that amount the education tax is \$148.00 or 33 mills, and since that time the City of Edmonton has announced an increase of 7-1/2 mills on their education tax.

And I have these figures on Winnipeg, a home in Metro Winnipeg, where the total assessment on that home, or the assessment is \$6,670, and the total tax on that home is \$249.00, and of that amount the school tax was \$96.00.

Now those are three residents in three provinces. I'm sorry I'm waiting on some figures from Vancouver and Regina and they have not arrived. But my understanding in corresponding with Regina and Vancouver is that the taxes there, as in both these other provinces, are higher than the City of Winnipeg, Metro Winnipeg.

And I have some figures, Mr. Speaker, on two provinces as far as farm lands are concerned, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I used the assessment on a quarter-section of my own land in Manitoba near the Saskatchewan boundary as far as the taxes per thousand dollar assessment is concerned. Now the assessment on this quarter section of my own land is \$3,850 and the total tax on that land is \$136.20, and of that amount the general is \$87.39 and my school tax after school tax rebate in 1967 was \$48.89, and by comparison in Saskatchewan just across the line from me, a quarter section of land assessed at \$2,400, the total tax was \$170.40 and of that portion their school tax was \$91.20. These figures are all from 1967 assessments, and taxes levied for and paid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to know from the Opposition members - and I'm sorry that the Member for Inkster is not in his seat tonight because, as I recall during the debate about a year ago on the Tax Revenue Bill, he informed the House that the people from his constituency of Inkster were leaving, were leaving the Province of Manitoba because of high taxes, and I would like to know from him now before this Session closes the names of the people that left and where they went to. Some time ago, during this Session, the Honourable Member the Leader of the Official Opposition made a statement in this House that the people of Manitoba

(MR. WATT cont'd.) were sick and tired of high taxes and tax increases, and that they were leaving the Province of Manitoba, and at that time he also said to us that he was proud of Manitoba and that the people of Manitoba were proud of Manitoba, but in the same speech he told us that they were leaving. And so I ask him now who these people are and where they went to find lower taxes than there are in the Province of Manitoba, because as near as I can find, and I'm giving you figures, Mr. Speaker, they do come from statistics; I didn't read them out of a book; the figures I can give I can give the properties, where the properties are, and the amounts. They're actual taxes levied and paid, in these instances I've handed here tonight. And so I would like to know from my honourable members. I think that we should have a list of the names of these people that are leaving the province and where they are going.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has asked a question of me and I'd be delighted to answer. I will refer him to the reports of the government's own commission, the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, who give the explanations as to people leaving the province and indicates those who are leaving, the numbers. I might add to that that I have asked this government to undertake a study of that very matter of the numbers who are leaving and where they are going, because I think that this would be part of our case with the Federal Government insofar as obtaining more federal funds.

The third matter which I think he raised was: why did I say that people were proud of Manitoba and yet didn't like the taxes? What the people aren't proud of in Manitoba and are very unhappy about is the present government, not the province. They're proud of the province but it's the government they're unhappy about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone on this side doubts the statistics that the Member for Arthur has just given to us but I think he misunderstands the entire situation. We are not saying that . . .

MR. WATT: I don't misunderstand figures.

MR. DAWSON: I said the situation, that you misunderstand the situation in this way: that you make comparisons with other provinces and I said that we don't doubt your comparisons, but you forget to mention the fact that the Province of Manitoba is a "have not" province in comparison to the provinces that you've mentioned. For an example, wages are much higher in Ontario than they are in Manitoba. The standard of living is higher. The type of highways they have. The hospitals they have. The schools they have. The great cities. And when we say that people are leaving Manitoba, they're leaving Manitoba because there isn't enough money left in their pocket once they pay their taxes and they're going elsewhere. And if you want some names, I can give you some names and I can give you affidavits of people who have left this province because they can't make a living. It's ridiculous to say that people are able to live if . . . we're taxing them right out of business; we're taxing them right out of their homes.

But it's not my intention to quarrel with the Member from Arthur. He has his opinions and we on this side have ours. But I think I'd be very remiss if I didn't say a few words regarding the Hydro rates or the proposed increase in Hydro rates. I think that it's very unfair of the government not to have public hearings for the increase in Hydro rates. If you take for an example, any municipality in Manitoba before they can increase their water rates must have a hearing before the Utility Board. And the same thing should apply with the hydro rates. If you look around the province, the City of Brandon are paying the highest hydro rates in Manitoba right now, and this applies to most of that area. And once you increase the hydro rates, the bill goes up by \$5.00 or \$6.00 depending if you're living in a home or a business. Consequently, the tax goes up as well, so it's a twofold increase once again.

And I think that when we say that people are leaving Manitoba, they are leaving Manitoba for the very fact that they're being taxed right out of their homes; they're being taxed right out of their living. They can no longer hang around here because the money isn't here. The same applies to our graduates when they graduate from high school or they graduate from the University. For an example, Brandon University has 120 graduates this year; there are only 30 jobs in Manitoba for them. Where are the other 90 going? People that our taxes have paid and trained are going to leave Manitoba because they know they can't make a living here. And when the Member from Arthur makes comparisons, he should bear in mind that he must compare the standards of living and the standard of wages as well as other things when he's making comparisons.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, we've listened to the speech

May 16, 1968

(MR. MCKELLAR cont'd.) of the Honourable Member for Hamiota just now, and it took me by surprise, some of the statements he was making about different people leaving and about high taxes, and I would like to inform him that if he has people leaving Manitoba for high municipal taxes, I in my constituency have a municipality which has the lowest tax rate of anywhere in Canada. Anywhere in Canada. And I'll bet any money right now. It's the Municipality of Cornwallis. The Municipality of Cornwallis, which surrounds Brandon, in 1966 their mill rate, municipal mill rate, was 10 mills. Last year it was 13.5 mills and I'll bet any money it's lower than that this year. Some people wonder why the industry located in Cornwallis municipality but this is one of the reasons. They got the lowest mill rate of any part of Canada, and when people start talking the way the Honourable Member for Hamiota, my goodness! Of all the gloom and doom I ever heard I never heard anything such like, and if I was the people in Rivers tomorrow I'd all take off for Cornwallis municipality and move to that area where they do get . . . But I am sure that he is not sincere; he's just talking to the people out in Rivers hoping that if they get this word in the next election they'll believe him. But he doesn't want to talk too long on this line of thought, because I know they'll become suspicious and they'll question him on who did leave Manitoba, and I know that he can't come up with the names.

MR. DAWSON: If he wants some names I'll give them to him right now. And they don't come from Rivers. I never once mentioned Rivers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MCKELLAR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think we need to worry. We have the cheapest hydro rates in all of Canada, farm rates. Nobody can deny that. This is the charge he was making just now. We all know that, that we've had the cheapest -- we haven't had a rate increase in, I guess since my farm was lit up with hydro. That was 1939. I know that's a fact, and for him to come here tonight and say that the hydro rates are such in the Brandon area that where everybody's going to move out of the Brandon area, is just totally ridiculous, and I think for many of us here in western Manitoba, we don't need this kind of trash being spread around; we need something of a positive nature, and I'd only hope that from now on he speaks in a positive nature instead of a negative approach.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, as someone has already said tonight, I didn't intend to get into this debate but - but all of the members that have spoken, with the exception of the mover, has got completely off the subject matter of the resolution that's before us - completely.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Had that been the case I would have acted. -- (Interjection) — Had that been the case I would have acted. The Honourable Member for Emerson distinctly said "substantially increased taxation" which to me covers a multitude of sins, which is pretty hard for me to . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: You can say that again. But when the Honourable Member for Arthur got up, he talked about all of the taxes in Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario, and every place else but Manitoba. And what does the resolution say that's before us. What does it say in fact? "While concurring in Resolution No. 103 this House regrets that in spite of the promises of the First Minister" - of this province, not Ontario - "to hold the line, he has substantially increased taxation in the six months since he has assumed office of Premier." Not in Ontario or Saskatchewan or anybody else.

Well now the thing that we must get straight to discuss this, is did he or did he not say he would hold the line and did he or did he not say he would reduce taxes. Let's get this straight, because if he didn't make this promise well then you can't accuse him of not holding the line. So let's get that straight right now. Did he promise it or didn't he promise it? — (Interjection) -- Very good. We will find out whether he made a promise, because certainly I'm sticking to the resolution when I try to draw out this point. I'm trying to defend the First Minister and see whether or not he did make a promise. Well down in — he took his suitcase and all prepared to stay a week in Turtle Mountain not long ago. According to press release, he packed his big grip and went down. And here's what he said at Deloraine: "'The cost of public service is increasing our cost of production and we are not able to compete and we must cut these costs to the minimum. That's what we've got to do,' he told a political rally in this town of 900 deep in the southwestern part of the province."

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): That was an eyeball to eyeball meeting, wasn't it?

MR. SHOEMAKER: In the Tribune Tuesday, November 21st, when he was seeking the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party of the province, the Tribune went to great lengths to give him excellent coverage. In fact that whole page -- "Profiles of the P.C. Candidates." Lyon starts right off because they were sure he was going to make it, but because I bet against him he lost, he told me. "McLean - heavy on facts but short on oratory." Heavy on facts but not able to communicate with the people present. "Weir - my interest is people not things." Well . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DESJARDIN S: Read the ad for gin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable gentleman in reading from the newspaper, he feels confident that he can substantiate what he is reading?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I think I can.

MR. SPEAKER: But I would like to quote for the benefit of the House Citation 157, subparagraph (6). The rule is quite clear that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book, which reflects upon the debate before the House either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I use quotations made by the Minister, then it must be assumed that he made the statements, because most newspaper men are fairly careful when they put quotation marks around something that a politician makes. I must confess that sometimes newspaper men get carried away like politicians, but the whole story -- (Interjection) -- before and after their death, yes, some of them are dead and won't lie down. But the main reason why my honourable friend became leader, the main reason was why? Why did all of you people over there vote for my honourable friend the First Minister? Principally because he said the people were sick and tired of these high taxes that had been going on for ten years under the leadership of the Honourable Member for Wolseley and he said "I'm your boy." -- (Interjection) -- He could kick manure off wheels of a tractor, true, that was one quality, one of the qualities that was necessary and proved effective, but I'm quoting now . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder in view of the rule that I have read if the honourable gentleman would co-operate with me and make his remarks brief or take from the newspaper, without reading it, what he intends to say.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I didn't quite comprehend the import of your . . .

MR. SPEAKER: He could look at it from a distance as a little guidance, but certainly not read the newspaper.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I will make -- I'm reading now a direct quote. "I am running" - I'm quoting what Mr. Weir said.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you have the name of the newspaper and the date please?

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Winnipeg Tribune, Tuesday, November 21, 1967, under the heading "Profiles of P.C. Candidates." -- (Interjection) -- Who was the author? By Frances Russell, Tribune Legislature reporter. Well, I'm quoting right directly here. This is a direct quote. "There must be a limit to the areas in which public bodies extend themselves into the national product", he said" - that's the First Minister - "In future, he believes any increases in government programs must be tied to a matching increase in productivity. 'I'm running for premier, not because I have any particular accomplishments in mind but because I have a belief that Manitoba must live within its existing tax rates'." What's the inference there? That there will be no increases of any kind under his leadership. That's exactly what he said, and continued to say it from that day to this day - nearly. Well he made the promise then that he would hold the line - and that's exactly the quote that is in the resolution before us - "to hold the line."

Now what happened according to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson? What did happen. He says that in spite of the promise to hold the line, a month ago he increased realty taxes on homes and commercial property by 4.1 mills. Well, did he or didn't he? Did he or did he not? That's the next line - not what they did in Ontario or Saskatchewan - did he increase the taxes by 4.1 mills? Mr. Speaker, I don't know what that 4.1 mills did to farms down in the Arthur constituency, in Cornwallis, or in the -- my honourable friend from Nesbitt, what is that rural municipality there - Cornwallis? But my guess is they went up substantially more than 4.1. -- (Interjection) -- They went up less than that? -- (Interjection) -- They went up 12 mills?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what they did in Swan River, but I can tell you what

May 16, 1968

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) happened in North Cypress and South Cypress and that don't take long. They went up. They went up. The assessment went up - and I told this story before - take a quarter-section of land that is assessed at \$5,000 last year and the assessment in North Cypress and South Cypress increased by 50 percent overall, so then the same quarter-section of land would now be assessed at \$7,500. Correct? So 9 mills last year - we are talking about the Foundation program - on \$5,000 is how many dollars? - \$45.00. Right? Now 13.1 mills - your 9 mills plus 4.1 results in 13.1 - on \$7,500 is how much money? - \$98.25, and I don't care what arithmetic you use that's the way it works out. -- (Interjection) -- It doesn't work out that way? Well it may not in your municipality but it works out that way with my pencil and my paper and there's no other way to figure it out. — (Interjection) — Equalized assessment — my honourable friend, does he have this book that he got the other day on statistics and information? Do you have that? Can you figure out what it is on there? Well you are using a different pencil than I am then if you can figure it out other than the way I figured it out. You just can't figure it out any other way. What does Simplot pay in taxes in the R.M. of Cornwallis.

Now the next item in the amendment, "by announcing an intention of increasing Hydro Electric rates." Probably you haven't increased them yet, but there is an indication that Hydro rates will be increased.

MR. WATT: On a point of Order, are Hydro Electric Power rates taxes? We are talking about taxes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, what's in here? But, Mr. Speaker, will somebody please supply my honourable friend with the resolution that's before us? Has anybody got an extra copy? Give him the copy and let him see the content of the resolution that's before us. Let's get the resolution straight anyway; at least let's know what we're talking about.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Arthur, I'm referring now to (2). What does it say on yours? It says on mine, "By announcing an intention of increasing Hydro Electric rates". Now let's get down to the next one and see if we are the same on it. (3) says "by increasing Hospital premiums by 80 percent." Is that what it says on yours? -- (Interjection) -- That's not taxes? Well, a rose by any other name would be just as sweet, wouldn't it, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) — Well I'm entitled to use it as long as I quote Shakespeare. But perhaps like the taxes, perhaps the hospital premiums do not apply across the board. But I want to ask my honourable friend the Member for Arthur and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, do they believe that they will have to pay the 80 percent increase in hospital premiums? I'm sure we are going to have to pay them on this side of the House. But they don't call that taxes eh? Well, I think it's taxes.

Now what about No. 4. I want to ask my honourable friend the Member for Arthur, what does his resolution say on No. 4? Mine says "by refusing to enter the Federal Medicare plan and causing a very large increase in MMS premiums." That's what we are talking about here. Well surely my honourable friend the Minister of Health and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface have pretty well resolved that one, not to the satisfaction of anybody in Manitoba, but it has been resolved that we are not going to join the national plan on July 1, 1968, unless of course my honourable friend changes his mind in the next few days, and there is some indication that he might because there are a lot of people getting pretty provoked at him and the other people opposite. And then, too, by causing a very large increase in MMS premiums - about an 85 percent increase there - and that applies to everybody in this House, not to just people on this side.

I want to ask my honourable friends, does everybody over on that side of the House feel exactly the same as the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in that there has been no increase at all in taxes? All those who think that they will not have an increase in taxes in the current year, would you mind standing up for a moment and let's count them? The question is, will you kindly stand up and be counted? Will you kindly stand up and be counted. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the question -- (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, in consideration . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure with the time that's being taken up with the disturbance that the honourable member would have completed his speech at least 60 seconds ago. Would the honourable member continue.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you very much. Now in consideration of the fact that the Honourable Member for Arthur talked about taxes in Ontario, let's get off onto that subject for

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) a moment. Would you like to discuss taxes in Ontario - you people across the way? Now here is a paper that is called the Dryden Observer dated Thursday, April 11, 1968. That's not long ago is it? Have you read it, Mr. Speaker? "Tax Help for Homeowners." My honourable friend the Member for Arthur hadn't seen it or he wouldn't have got off into Ontario to discuss taxes, I'm pretty sure of that.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the figures that I gave are actual tax notices of assessments. What you are giving us is what somebody else wrote.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon?

MR. WATT: You are just reading something what somebody else has said. What I gave you is a tax notice, the assessment, the amount of money the taxpayer paid.

MR. SHOEMAKER: All right, I want to direct a question to my honourable friend the Member for Arthur. Does he know that the government in Ontario is a Conservative government, and did he know -- (Interjection) -- You know that eh? I guess that clapping suggests that they know that is a fact. Well, do they know this - I bet you my honourable friend the Member for Arthur doesn't know this - quote from the Dryden Observer. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture doesn't know it and my honourable friend the First Minister doesn't know what I am going to read. "A municipal tax reduction scheme which will benefit every homeowner and tenant across the province was announced yesterday in the Ontario Legislature."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Could the honourable gentleman tell me the author of those remarks, otherwise he can't quote them.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I can't quote it. It's from the Dryden Observer and it's the -- who is the editor of the Observer? I think it is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Could the honourable gentleman assure me that the editor of the paper wrote it? I mean I don't want to . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: It's reporting it from the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I've read the rules and it's against the rules to read a newspaper.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'll table it. I'll table this. -- (Interjection) -- No, I think it would be better if I tabled this because I think it would be helpful to the First Minister. I will continue to read it. I'm quoting, starting right at the beginning: "A municipal tax reduction scheme which will benefit every homeowner and tenant across the province was announced yesterday in the Ontario Legislature by the Honourable Darcy McKeel, Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is the largest transfer of provincial funds to municipalities in the history of the Province of Ontario. The new Municipal Tax Reduction Act announced in the Legislature will reduce the burden on property taxes in Dryden and other surrounding municipalities as follows: Dryden - \$42.10 for public school supporters, \$41.25 for separate school supporters; in Red Lake - \$63.80 for public school supporters" . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I really hesitate to rise to interrupt my honourable friend because it usually takes him that much longer to understand what the point of order is, but he is now telling us or reading at length ad nauseum from a newspaper, the effect of which is to say that Ontario has a Homeowner's Grant. - and I think we all understand that - but I don't know that that has anything to do with the debate that we have before us at the present time. Ontario has a Homeowner's Grant; we admit that fact. I wonder if we could get back to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I must in all sincerity say that I am somewhat surprised that the Honourable Member from Gladstone would continue to read the newspaper in view of what I have said, and I wonder if we could call it "finish" on that particular newspaper reading or that particular story. He may continue his address.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, as I said when I got into the debate, the only reason - the only reason I entered the debate was because the Honourable Member for Arthur started comparing taxes in Ontario, Alberta and Saskatchewan with Manitoba. That's why I got into the debate and for no other reason - no other reason - and if you are going to talk about taxes in Ontario and Alberta and Quebec and every place else, let's talk about it.

Now the Homeowner's Grant that my honourable friend the Attorney-General talks about, it apparently, according to the Tory Government in Ontario, is considered one of the most important pieces of legislation that that province has ever had. Now this is a reduction - they are experiencing a reduction in taxes down there; we are experiencing an increase in taxes here over last year. This is what the resolution says. It says the First Minister promised he would hold the line, whereas in fact the taxes have been increased. That's the issue that is

May 16, 1968

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) before us, that is the issue that we are now going to vote on as soon as I sit down, I suppose, in consideration of the time of day. Of course my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface says that he wants to speak on it. I will now table, Mr. Speaker, the front page of the Dryden Observer for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I think I will be at least 10 minutes. I don't know if I can finish -- do you wish to adjourn the debate? -- (Interjections) --

MR. LYON: We should try to finish this resolution.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just could not agree with the remarks that the Honourable Member for Arthur had made and this is the reason I want to get up and just put the record straight.

Firstly, on the immigration, he mentioned that we are not losing any people from Manitoba, and I'm looking at the 1966 Manitoba Economic Consultative Board report.

MR. WATT: I did not say we were not losing people from Manitoba. I asked where the people were going that the honourable members opposite said were leaving the province. I just asked where they were going. I didn't say anything about people leaving.

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps maybe I misunderstood the honourable member, but I thought this was what you intimated. According to the report, we had some 28,700 people come in to Manitoba; we had a loss of 41,000; which is a net loss of 7,300, and it's right here in the report. Mr. Speaker, on the other point, I think I've spoken on this before and I agreed with the White Paper that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce presented to Ottawa on the immigration policies and I have a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't see the word "immigration" anywhere in this resolution before us. If the honourable gentleman wishes to speak to the resolution of course he's at liberty to do so, but possibly he'll forget about immigration for the moment.

MR. PATRICK: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will. The reason I mentioned it is because there was discussion in the debate that has taken place about people leaving Manitoba.

On the other point, I just want to raise the point that the honourable member said that the tax is not any higher in this province than in some of the other provinces. I wish to disagree with him, because as far as the commercial properties are concerned, some of our big developers from Manitoba have left the province and are developing properties in the other areas, and the simple reason is, in the reports that they have presented to the real estate people in Manitoba and Winnipeg, is the assessments on commercial properties are so high that it does not pay them to develop properties here.

On the other point, Mr. Speaker, I have a tax statement for the last four years, a tax comparison for Sturgeon Creek Garage. In 1963 the tax on that property - it is a small service station - was \$614.00; 1964 - \$1,014; 1965 - \$1,035; this year it's \$2,045.00. In a matter of five years, from 600 to 2,045. If that's holding the line, I can't see it, Mr. Speaker. That's not only 100 percent but a few hundred percent increase. We have one here, and I'll quote - the business property is Country Kitchen, who is in the restaurant business - in 1965 his tax was \$1,400; in 1968, in a matter of four years, it's 2,400; a thousand dollars increase. This person personally came to see me and he said I have to sell an awful lot of sandwiches and hot dogs to be able to pay for this tax. So I can't see how the Honourable Member for Arthur feels, or seems to be under the impression that there is no tax increases and no assessment increases in Metropolitan Winnipeg. There certainly is. As far as the residential property . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia, but I thought there was a tacit understanding among all of us that 11:00 would be the adjournment hour for yesterday and today, and I suggest that my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia be permitted to continue the debate the next time we meet. This was my understanding and I suggest that the Honourable the House Leader should call for the adjournment of the House at this time.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it's just - my honourable friend wasn't present - the honourable member indicated he would be a few minutes and he is just being a few minutes, and I suggest we hear him out to the end. We're not punching a clock here.

MR. PAULLEY: In all due respect to my honourable friend the Honourable the House Leader, it's not a question of punching the clock at all; it's an understanding and an undertaking

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) given by the government, and I suggest that, in all fairness, my friend the House Leader should agree, or at least adhere to that undertaking that we had.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is saying that he doesn't wish to carry on with the business of the province tonight, I'm quite happy to move adjournment.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of carrying on the business of Manitoba. We can carry it on again. This was an undertaking of the House Leader and the Government of Manitoba, and if we can't place any faith or reliance in what they undertook to do, then maybe we should carry on. But this was the undertaking of my honourable friend.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, my honourable friend, had he been in the House, would be aware of what the Member from Assiniboia said. He said he would be 10 minutes and that was approximately three minutes to. We are asking the House to hear my honourable friend out. If there are other speakers, I then suggest, with the concurrence of the honourable members, that if there are other speakers, rather than have the vote put, we adjourn. But I don't think it is being unreasonable or a breach of faith to ask the honourable members to sit for seven minutes to hear a member who is already on his feet.

MR. PAULLEY: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may . . .

MR. LYON: If you would just sit down we could get on with the business.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon?

MR. LYON: . . . business of the House, sit down and we'll get on with the business.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, since when does the Honourable the Attorney-General have the power to tell me to sit down? There's only one person in this House who can tell me to sit down, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker -- I can read what the clock says.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the honourable gentleman take his seat.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia wishes to continue for . . .

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if I could just conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Assiniboia feel that he could be finished in a moment or so? I believe the answer to this is that the House should adjourn. We gave the honourable gentleman the other evening the privilege of continuing

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Member for Assiniboia if he is going to be much longer? Well, could I ask for the co-operation of the House to hear the honourable member out, at which time we will adjourn or put the question. That was the understanding before my honourable friend of the New Democratic Party came in and wasted the time when we could have finished the speech.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege, I object most strenuously to the remarks of the Honourable the House Leader of me wasting the time of this House. There was an agreement arrived at and I think we should adhere to it.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might not resolve the problem and ask on this occasion that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party possibly accept the suggestion that was made in order that the honourable gentleman from Assiniboia might take a minute or so to finish his address. I wonder if, on this occasion, I appealed to his good nature and good looks to do this on behalf of the House. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I — just to probably help the House, and I think I completely lost my topic as well, so I'll be prepared to carry on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman.

MR. LYON: I wish to thank the Honourable Member from Assiniboia for his co-operation. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,

MR. SPEAKER: Am I to put the question? — (Interjection) — is the Honourable Member for Rhineland — (Interjection) —

MR. LYON: I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn. — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: When I recognize the quietness, I'll put the motion. I'm waiting for the honourable gentlemen so that all will hear me.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Friday morning.