

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2: 30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 26, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their third report:

Your Committee has considered Bills:

- No. 18 - An Act to amend The Marriage Act.
  - No. 32 - An Act to amend The Predator Control Act.
  - No. 35 - The Manitoba Centennial Day Act.
  - No. 41 - An Act to amend The Garnishment Act.
  - No. 42 - An Act to amend The Land Acquisition Act.
  - No. 51 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
  - No. 54 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (2).
  - No. 57 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Finance Board Act.
  - No. 58 - An Act to amend The Securities Act.
  - No. 60 - An Act to amend The County Courts Act.
  - No. 69 - An Act to amend The Regulations Act.
- And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

- No. 24 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.
  - No. 40 - The Executive Government Organization Act.
  - No. 59 - An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.
- And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.  
All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the report of the committee be received.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to introduce our guests in the Chamber. J'ai l'honneur de vous signaler la présence dans la loge d'honneur de M. Réal Caouette, le chef du Ralliement Créditiste et de M. Gilbert Rondeau, député du Comté Shefford.

Translation: It gives me pleasure to welcome Mr. Real Caouette, leader of the Social Credit Party, and Mr. Gilbert Rondeau, deputy of the Shefford County to the House this afternoon.

On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

We also have 85 Grade 8 students from Springfield Heights and Benito Oak River Schools. The Springfield Heights students are hosting the Benito Oak River students. The teachers, Mr. Bryski, Mr. Harder and Miss Penner are from the Springfield Heights School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister. And 30 students from the Gordon Bell School hosting students from the Roblin School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Shaw, Roblin Intermediate School and Mrs. Pietryk of the Gordon Bell School. The host school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley. 28 Grade 8 students of the Strathclair Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. R. D. Bell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. And 26 Grade 6 students of the Queenston School, that are under the direction of Mr. Scott and student teacher, Mrs. Miserva. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt you for just one moment to remind the House that the youngsters from Benito are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. SPEAKER: My apologies.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, we're discussing the report made by the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources. I stood the debate the other day and then following that we had a very heated debate going which I almost felt sorry for adjourning debate at that point. However, I do not intend to bring forward some of the matters that were discussed at that date. However, I wish to discuss a few points that were made in Committee on Utilities where we discussed the Manitoba Telephone System. First of all, I would want to commend the Board and the management of the Telephone System for the commendable job that they're doing. I think they're doing a good job and certainly looking after the affairs of Manitoba Telephone. I certainly have no complaint in that direction whatever.

However, the questioning that we conducted at those hearings led me to make the following remarks, and one has to do with the definition of government policy and of the authority of the Legislature re an involving capital expenditure re utilities or Crown agencies, not necessarily limiting it to the Telephone System but to Crown agencies as such. I feel that we need a better definition in this matter, because earlier on in the session we authorized capital borrowings of 14 million towards this agency. At the hearings we find out though that the total capital expenditures for the year will not be 14 million but 28 million which is double the amount that we authorized. Mr. Speaker, I feel this is rather odd because I feel that any capital expenditures made by a Crown agency should have the endorsement and the approval of this House and that the Crown agency would not just request the net amount that they will require in expanding their utility. This is what is happening. That 14 million is only a net amount that they require in borrowing from outside their own agency. They have three other reserves that they are tapping, some of their own operating capital that they're using for other capital needs. They're using some of their reserves and some of the revolving funds and in this way they offset some of the total expansion costs that will be made.

Does this mean that the Legislature is not exercising its full authority that they should in connection with Crown agencies? The reason I'm bringing this up is that we're forming more of these. We're now in the process of establishing a Crown insurance agency and I feel there is a need that this be defined properly so that we know exactly where we stand in this matter. I feel that this Legislature should have closer, much closer control of all capital expenditures of Crown agencies. Then, too, the matter of transfer of funds from these utilities to the consolidated fund - if the Honourable the Minister of Utilities could later on tell us at what point are transfers being made, how much of the profits or earnings are left with a utility until transfers are being made. I think these are matters that we should know, when and how the transfers are being made and conducted. We know from the financial statement that the net return of the Manitoba Telephone System is just over one point, one percent on the total assets of the utility. This is a very small margin in my opinion and I expressed it at the committee meetings that if the capital costs continue and we are expanding, and the high interest costs that go along with it, this means that that margin will be cut much nearer in the years to come, and that very likely that higher rates will have to be instituted as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that our utilities and our Crown agencies should generate sufficient revenue so that they would not need to be subsidized in any way, shape or form from the consolidated revenue fund. We also note that the interest costs are eating up 75 percent of the income before debt charges in the Telephone System. This is a very large amount, 75 percent, so that you actually - the net revenue is reduced by 20 to 25 percent, which is roughly 2 1/2 million, not quite. The net profit represents roughly 5 percent. So that I feel very strongly on some of the points that I've mentioned.

There's one other matter that I thought I should bring forward, and that has to do with providing private lines for members of the Legislature. I mentioned it in the committee, I thought I should bring forward an amendment to the report but I decided not to do so afterwards, I felt that maybe this could be done at a future meeting of the Utilities Committee. But I feel that private lines should be brought in for all the members of the House so that since we now have a Privacy Bill coming forward I feel that it is incumbent on this House and this

May 26, 1970

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . government to provide that for all members that have not got such a convenience -- and I shouldn't really call it a convenience because I think it's essential that when you want to discuss confidential matters and make calls to the government departments that they remain confidential.

I do not intend to discuss the Hydro matter at this point because there'll be further reports made from the committee involving Hydro, so at this point that will conclude my remarks. Thank you.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that the debate be adjourned. I would be closing the debate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member, this is not a substantive motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion. Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Churchill. Stand? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan) in the absence of the Honourable Member for Elmwood introduced Bill No. 103, an Act to amend The Transcona Charter.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Earlier today before the group assembled in front of the Legislature, the Minister of Industry and Commerce indicated that the Department of Industry and Commerce had two studies which showed the economic feasibility of the Fish Marketing Processing Plant being located at Selkirk as opposed to Greater Winnipeg. I wonder whether he would undertake to table those reports with the House?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Just before the Honourable Minister answers, there is an Order for Return in which we agreed that one of those studies in any event would be tabled with the concurrence of the Federal Government I believe it was - or of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing.

MR. SPIVAK: Just as a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce referred to two internal Department of Industry and Commerce studies, not studies done together with the Federal Fish Marketing Board or with the Federal Government - to two internal departmental studies and those are the studies that I'm referring to.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the two studies which I referred to earlier today were feasibility studies prepared for the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. Now, normally, as the honourable member knows, such studies are provided for the company or the association requesting the study and it's not normal to provide that information to members of the Assembly or to members of the public. This is the procedure that was followed when the honourable member was Minister of Industry and Commerce. Feasibility studies are prepared for the corporations or the companies requesting such feasibility studies.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): He knows full well that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell my honourable friend - it may shorten the argument - that we did agree to give that study with the concurrence of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, and I'm prepared to include the second one if the same concurrence is received, and I don't anticipate any problem.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to then ask a supplementary question of the Minister. Does the Federal Government agree with his representations before the assembled group this afternoon, that in fact those studies without question show the economic feasibility of the plan in Selkirk rather than Greater Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . honourable member could ask a question of an Honourable Minister calling for a reply on behalf of another government body.

MR. SPIVAK: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister today indicated that without question these studies showed the Fish Processing Plant being located in Selkirk was more economically feasible. Now, I'm asking a question of the Minister, does the Federal Government agree with that assumption?

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that there's no point of order on a Speaker's ruling. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder whether he could indicate the following procedures that have been established in the House: the overdraft of the government of Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System for April 17th and May 17th.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Speaker, we've had this kind of question asked before. Last year I believe that I made information available to my honourable friend privately and indicated that I did not think this is the kind of information that is of any value to be made public.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of - well, on a point of. . . -- (Interjection) -- on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The question happens to be a valid question. The Minister may not want to answer it and he may not want to fulfill that obligation. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has placed his question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I take it then, Mr. Speaker, that we're not going to be given that information?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Yes?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I will again consider the advisability of this kind of information being made available. The trouble with information such as has been asked in the past in relation to bank accounts is that it is absolutely meaningless and the person asking the question should know it. Now the fact that it is meaningless means that it may easily be misinterpreted and therefore it seems to me that financial statements are the kinds of things that are discussed and presented. Therefore, I do not intend to enter into debate on this question. I intend to consider again, especially with the members of my department as to the advisability or the disadvantages involved in answering questions which are obviously meaningless. Now in order to make my honourable friend aware of the kind of information he wanted, I gave him that information and told him he could use it as he pleases on his responsibility. I would be prepared to do the same as I did before, but if he wants to make a public matter of it, then I would have to answer him in the way I did.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The request of the honourable minister -- (Interjection) -- yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a point of order. The request made of the Minister was to follow - the request that was made of the honourable minister was to follow the procedure that he had established in the House. There was never any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, from this side of the House, the information was to be made public, rather it was to be handled privately.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. The honourable member has . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I respond to that?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member had placed his question to the Honourable Minister, the Honourable Minister had replied and I do not believe that there is any point of order flowing therefrom at this point in orders. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, just before Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask permission of the Government House Leader and the House to have the name of Mr. Sherman substituted for the name of Mr. Bilton on the Standing Committee on Public Utilities.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with previous facilitations of this kind, we have no objection. I would ask the Clerk to so record it.

MR. FROESE: I do hope that members on the government side would be so gracious when I make that request.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GREEN: . . . honourable member would advise me which member of the legislature's name he is to be replaced for and if he has that concurrence we will be just as easy to get along with.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It's regarding the delegation that appeared at the Legislature today. Has the Minister or his department made a formal brief to the Fresh Fish Marketing Board with respect to the construction of the plant in Selkirk - that is urging that change. Has a formal brief been made to that corporation?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, what has transpired is that the Department of Industry and Commerce offered to

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . . prepare a feasibility study with respect to the location of the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporations' proposed processing plant, and the Corporation's Board of Directors agreed to have the department undertake this feasibility study. A feasibility study was conducted, the report was prepared and submitted to the Corporation's Board of Directors and a supplementary report was also prepared. The outcome of the study, as I indicated publicly, showed definitely that taking all factors into consideration that Selkirk was the most economic location. There was no brief as such, but the study stands for itself.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker, and I direct it to the First Minister. Then it appears that this government has not made a formal brief to the corporation and I would ask him to direct the proper department to do so.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's quite incorrect and quite unnecessary inasmuch as a great deal of time, effort and money was spent on the preparation of an economic analysis or feasibility study which was done, which was presented in a formal way to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, a copy of which went to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion which concurred in the essential findings. However, the other department of the Federal Government did not. The Freshwater Fish Marketing Board did not.

However, telegrams and letters were sent to the Prime Minister and Federal Ministers and a meeting, in fact a series of personal meetings at the ministerial level took place. Anything that is done beyond this in the way of a formal brief would be merely to recapitulate all that has been put forward in that feasibility study, which was, by the way, a good study.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation is a Crown corporation and really should not a brief be made to them? Are they not independent of the government?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the feasibility study when it was presented was presented in the sense that the feasibility study was at one and the same time a brief. Because the findings of the feasibility study, the economic factors discussed in the feasibility study, made an argument in the same way as though the argument were being put forward in a brief.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just add to the First Minister's remarks. Perhaps I was taking the honourable member's question perhaps in a very narrow sense, perhaps I was taking it too literally. The fact of the matter is as the First Minister has indicated, many of us have presented verbal arguments which constitute verbal briefs, if you will.

I would remind the honourable member that I spent an hour and a half a week ago last Friday with the Honourable Mr. Marchand and the Honourable Minister of Fisheries, Jack Davis, presenting various arguments over and above the feasibility studies, including the fact that if the fish processing plant were to locate other than the town of Selkirk that the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba would be shouldering a larger burden of social welfare through various increases in families who would be going on social welfare, in my opinion and our opinion at least, in the Selkirk area. So to that extent we presented various kinds of verbal arguments and concerns that the Manitoba government did have. But it wasn't a formal written presentation as such; but I think they got the point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a question I'd like to direct to either the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce in connection with the Federal Fish Marketing Corporation. Has the government been successful in securing another directorship on this Federal Fish Marketing Commission?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the honourable member to say an additional member? I believe that situation is that under the terms of the initial agreement, Manitoba was entitled to one director, and of course there is one such director. There is, of course, a second person from Manitoba on the Board of Directors but he is named by the Federal Crown rather than the provincial.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The high rise in water levels in Lake Winnipeg has caused considerable amount of damage to homes, some homes and summer cottages, at Victoria Beach, Grand Beach and Albert Beach, I understand. Will there be any compensation for these people?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the policy relative to high water and damages in the areas that the member speaks of is the same as it was before and there's no change.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Is the Minister planning any changes in the boundaries of the Interlake school divisions at this session?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, there will be an amendment to the Public Schools Act empowering the government to act on school boundaries, yes.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is he planning any changes in the boundaries of the Whitehorse Plains School Division?

MR. MILLER: That's subject to policy and will be part of the general boundary changes.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will any people who disagree with the potential changes or the proposed changes have an opportunity to appear before Committee of the House or before government?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, people who disagree always have an opportunity to object and will be given a hearing. As the member knows, I have had a number of submissions from people in the general area already.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, it's related to the last topic. I think the question probably is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can we expect to receive the Boundaries Commission Report with respect to rural Manitoba or with respect to the Greater Winnipeg area before the end of the Session?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Well, Mr. Speaker, the indication was in respect to the urban area that it would be made available sometime toward the latter part of June; the rural report would be made available sometime after that point, so that I would not be able to assure him that the report would be made available before the conclusion of this particular session.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could I direct it to the First Minister, and reverse the question asked by the Member for Riel and ask him can we expect the end of the Session before we get the Boundaries Report?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite may reverse the questions but I on this side will not reverse the answer given by the Minister.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. -- (Interjection) -- My apologies, Mr. Speaker. In fact that the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission are made available prior to the end of this particular session, can the Minister assure this assembly that there will be public hearings prior to any changes being made?

MR. PAWLEY: This is certainly a matter which will be public policy and certainly there'll be opportunity for hearings. The nature, the content of those hearings will be made known when the time arrives that decisions have been announced in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wanted to ask the House Leader if he can give us any indication how many more bills we might expect from the government during this session.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was asked that question the other day and I said I would take the question as notice, and I still don't have the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Labour a question. Are you in favour of your government's position regarding establishment of the fish processing plant in Selkirk? Are you in favour of your government's position?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Any decision made by this government is acceptable to the Minister of Labour without equivocation.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I have another question I'd like to address to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last night on television, Mr. Nick Manchur, Insurance Agent in the city of Winnipeg made a statement that he had been promised a position with the Automobile Insurance Corporation. Is that true?

MR. PAWLEY: I couldn't hear his question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McKELLAR: Well last night on television, Mr. Nick Manchur, Insurance Agent in the City of Winnipeg made a statement to the effect that he had been promised a position with the Automobile Insurance Corporation.

MR. PAWLEY: I watched the broadcast the honourable member referred to and what the honourable member has just said is false and misleading.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question then to the Minister. Has Mr. Manchur been promised a job?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. George Tatlock has been promised no job, nor has Mr. Nick Manchur. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add that this type of comment made here which the honourable member must know is incorrect when he asked the question, is out of place in this House.

MR. SPIVAK: The Minister of Municipal Affairs does not have to lecture this side at all.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Have any of the so-called "Pawley Committee" on auto insurance been given an indication that they would receive jobs with the corporation to administer auto insurance?

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I find the honourable member's question rather amusing in fact because I dare say that while we don't have it in mind at all, one way or the other necessarily or not necessarily, nevertheless, I'm sure that my honourable friend's colleagues at the Federal level have on many occasions appointed people who have done some studies and surveys for them to subsequently appoint them to different Crown corporations, boards and commissions; and lest he should have any doubt about it, I'd invite him to go and check with his own colleagues.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to the statement that has just been made by the First Minister. If I may reply to the statement that has been offered by the First Minister. I appreciate his remarks but as Minister . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm on my feet on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member knows that this question period is not an opportunity for debate, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie there's no basis under the rules under which he can now reply to what the Honourable First Minister said.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was speaking on the same parliamentary point that the Honourable First Minister was speaking on.

MR. GREEN: He answered your question.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa)(Minnedosa): The Member for Portage, the House Leader of the Liberal Party asked a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister answered that question. The First Minister got up and essentially made a statement. Essentially he made a statement and it is the right of our party and the right of the Liberal Party to reply to that statement. May I say, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, on the point of order, if the Member from Portage la Prairie, the House Leader of the Liberal Party desires to answer it, I would think that he would be in order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order that has been raised. You will recall, and I think Hansard tomorrow will bear me out, that before I began to answer the question I indicated that I was asking permission. I said, "Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to answer the question put by the Member for Portage." So if honourable members opposite felt that I had no right to answer in further elaboration of the answer given by my colleague the Minister, then they should have objected at the time, but clearly, and I'm sure Hansard will bear me out, I did request permission to answer in further elaboration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if my question should be directed to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The question is this: Since the Manitoba Flood Board has been formed, can the Honourable Minister inform this House as to how many applications have been received by this board since they've been established?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that question should be directed to myself. I can't answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if he would undertake in the next week or so to advise the people of Manitoba on the approximate number of teachers who graduated at the last 1A Course who will not be given employment this year.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would love to do it within a week, but I couldn't possibly do it within three months. It will only be September 1, that I'll have an answer to that question.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I have a question for the House Leader in his capacity as Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Earlier this week a delegation of farmers had come with myself to request the opening of the Portage Diversion and the Minister asked for some time to consider the action. Can he give an answer now as to whether or not the Portage Diversion will be reopened this year?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that there would be another check as to the mercury content in the Assiniboine River. There wasn't a check immediately but the most recent check indicated that conditions were such as to not change the government policy, that is that it would be opened on an emergency crisis basis and that that particular period had passed, and had not to the opinion of the department warranted opening the Diversion again at this point.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, a question on the same subject. Is the decision then not to open the Floodway based on the mercury content of the Assiniboine or is it based on flooding in Lake Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when we first announced the circumstances relative to the Portage Diversion, we indicated that we were going to be opening it and closing it and allowing as little water to flow from the Assiniboine to Lake Manitoba, based on the mercury content. At that time I indicated that although the Department of Health's assurances were such that we felt that the diversion opening was warranted on the balance of probabilities, it was still done on the basis that we would rather not do it, and the decision now is that the emergency situation is passed and therefore no further water is being permitted to flow over from the Assiniboine River into Lake Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I gather from the Minister's comments then, that there is a degree, possibly considerable, of mercury in the Assiniboine. Has the government then checked as to the source of that mercury, and has steps been taken to prevent the continued pollution?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again I want to say that there is no change from the situation as it previously was, that there is a mercury content and there were some fairly high readings just outside of Brandon. There have been attempts to locate the source of the mercury but they have failed. At one time it was thought that the source of the mercury was known but subsequent checks indicated it wasn't coming from the firms which it was suspected had created the source. It is still being checked but the actual source is now known.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to address another question to the Minister of Education. I wonder if he's aware of the plans that will be put in force next fall with regard to the registration of students in the Faculty of Education course. Is there a plan to reduce the number that we are now training? I say this in view of the surplus of teachers.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question either to the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does the government have any intention of acquiring equity in the proposed Tartan Brewery Plant at Transcona?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, whatever would have given my honourable friend that idea?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, that's not answering my question. There was some surmising, no doubt, on my part but there's also other people who give you these ideas.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can answer my honourable friend by saying that there has been no discussions along those lines and none are contemplated.

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

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. In view of the representations that were made by the people of St. Laurent in regards to the White Plains School Division, would the Minister have any new information to give?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Transportation. At the time of his estimates he indicated that the provincial roads in Manitoba had been rated for maintenance purposes. In the light of the very bad weather conditions in the past month in particular, have these ratings been changed allowing for more maintenance or has leeway been given to the local offices to deal with the problems as they rise?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, the roads have been rated but in the recommendations from Roy Jorgenson and Associates, it indicates on one of the pages that the policy is to be flexible. In other words, if the weather is real bad, we may have to scrap the program for a week or two; in other words, grade more often. I have as a matter of fact five booklets made up that I was planning on -- the Member for Ste. Rose had asked me already -- that I will distribute to the Leaders of the Opposition so they will know what the program's all about. I think after you've read it, you'll realize that although there are specific recommendations there is also flexibility built into this program.

MR. WEIR: A supplementary question, if I may. Was it the Jorgenson Report the Minister was going to provide to the members of the Opposition?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm sorry. I didn't get the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, was it the Jorgenson Report that the Minister just referred to that he was going to provide copies to the Opposition of?

MR. BOROWSKI: It was the recommendations of the Roy Jorgenson and Associates Report that was commissioned by the previous administration, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a supplementary question to the Minister of Highways. Was there appeal provided for municipalities so they could appeal the decisions in connection with the program that we were just discussing?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm sure Mr. Jorgenson wasn't concerned about the municipality. He was commissioned by the Provincial Government and therefore he was making recommendations to us. The municipalities really don't have anything to say about the highways. They do have on market roads, school roads, where we pay 50-50, and in those areas of course the municipalities always have the opportunity to appeal to the District Engineer, and if necessary to appeal to myself which they have done on several occasions.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did the Minister say the province is paying 50-50 of school roads and market roads in municipalities?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, yes I said that. We have arrangements as the Leader of the Opposition knows, Local Government Districts, we share certain roads 50-50; we share certain streets 50-50. I don't know the criteria that was established years ago, but we do pay 50-50 on certain roads, yes.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, in terms of rural municipalities, does the Department of Highways or Department of Transportation pay 50-50 grants on market or school roads?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, are you serious when you're asking the question? You should know that. This is a fact.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Railway Commissioner. I wonder if he can inform the House why the Province of Manitoba did not maintain a watching brief before the first Rail Line Abandonment Hearing in Guelph, Ontario? A full watching brief; a watching brief during the whole period of the hearing?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't know really, Mr. Speaker, whether I should answer the question. I want to assure my honourable friend there was a watching brief. I don't know where his source of information was but I have received such.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister then would confirm the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . fact that representatives from the Province of Manitoba were in attendance only for the first day, did not remain for the full hearing?

MR. PAULLEY: I have answered the question of my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, the other day I asked the Minister of Transport if there had been any priorities or discussions assigned to a bridge over the Assiniboine River at Waverley Street and he said he'd take it as notice. I wonder if he can answer the question now?

MR. BOROWSKI: It's still on notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: adjourned debate . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . again with the concurrence of the House to Page 10 and the adjourned debate on the second readings of private bills?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, this being Private Members' afternoon, I wonder if we wouldn't deal with the Orders for Return before we went to Bills. I would think this is considered normal procedure.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Assinibola.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague from Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I believe I will be closing debate if I speak, so if there are others who wish to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I enter the debate because I think it's rather appropriate, and I'm not sure that what I say will not be repeated by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the whole question of commercial fishing in the province be examined and looked at, particularly at this time in view of the representations that were made in front of this Legislature earlier today. I think that there was a desire on the part of those who worked towards the establishment of a Fish Marketing Board and the establishment of a Crown corporation which would in fact deal effectively with the problem of the fish industry. There was a feeling of anticipation on the part of almost everyone that this would in fact work out to be the best situation for the fishermen and for the industry in the province.

The information that is requested by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will be important in determining and analyzing what has really taken place with respect to the operation of the Fish Marketing Board and the nature, or at least the number of fishermen who have in fact been found to be redundant as a result of the rationalization in the industry which the Fish Marketing Board was supposed to have undertaken.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I think we on this side, as well as many people in Manitoba at this point, are completely unsatisfied with the information we now have about the operation of the Fish Marketing Board. I think that there are a number of fishermen in Manitoba who are completely unsatisfied with the manner of operation, and unsatisfied because the information that should be made available to them has not in fact been made available and that there possibly is a misunderstanding of some of the problems, but at the same time there has been a lack of communication with various segments in our society about how this was to operate.

Now from our point of view we recognize that it is a Crown corporation in which there is federal participation and provincial participation and that their responsibilities and their undertakings are really only subject in an indirect way to the scrutiny of this Legislature, but it would seem to me that we in Manitoba, because we were primarily responsible ultimately for the creation and development of the Fish Marketing Board, are entitled to have as much pertinent information presented to us so that we can analyze correctly whether what is happening is in the best interest of the fishermen and in the best interest of the fishing industry and the best interest of Manitoba.

Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for a very detailed report to be presented before the Standing Committee on Economic Development in which the Committee of this House would have an opportunity for review, an opportunity to examine the officials of the Fish Marketing Board and the fishermen who are involved to determine whether what is happening is working out correctly or not. My suspicion is that it is not. My suspicion as

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . well would be that we would find that in addition to several situations where there are irritations that automatically must occur when any kind of rationalization is to take place in industry, that there are distinct problems that remain not solved which in the way in which the Marketing Board is operating will not be solved, and one of the obligations that we have on this side is to determine in fact what is taking place and to make whatever recommendations we feel are necessary as representatives from our constituency - and there are many here who represent the constituencies in which the fishermen reside, who feel that they are entitled to try and give their constituents an opportunity for a hearing so that in fact changes in methods and procedures can be followed. There is no doubt that in examination - and I've had an opportunity of examining this - that in the examination of the fish producers who were supposed to be declared redundant, if they were redundant and were to receive compensation - if we examine that situation, the record of the government is bad, the record of the Provincial Government is bad, and the fish processors, and albeit they are a very small number, have been allowed to fend for themselves and they've been taken out of business by the action of the Board and in effect have lost their operation.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Not because I think the subject matter being discussed by the Member for River Heights is not important - I agree that it is important, and that it should be discussed at some appropriate time. But if one looks carefully at the Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, he will see that it has to do with matters relating to fish conservation and matters relating to size of fishing mesh, conservation of fish, ecology of the fish habitat, etc. and hardly has to do with matters relating to fish marketing and processing. Now I'm not suggesting it's not important.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable First Minister it is important, and I suggest as well my point in making mention of the process - and there will be another occasion to debate - is to simply indicate that in examination of the items the First Minister has suggested, the Fish Marketing concept, that is the development of the fish marketing concept was in fact to do all of these things, to in fact take into consideration the total problems related to commercial fishing and to rationalize it so that in fact there would in fact be conservation, that in turn there would be some reduction of the redundant commercial fishing situation, and in fact the fishing industry would be taken from basically a sick position into a viable operation. All I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that in examining it from one point of view, and that's only from the fish processors point of view, and albeit only a small group, I can say that there is no question that what has happened so far is not sufficient to justify any belief that the Fish Marketing Board has been able to achieve the degree of success that it should have, nor has it satisfied or accomplished the objectives that were set forth.

I suggest as well that in looking at the three items that are now being asked by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, we have items that must be examined in light of the fact that the whole attempt, the whole exercise was to in fact accomplish an objective, that there's reason to believe from all the representations that have been made, all the representations that have been made publicly, appear in the papers and have been made to various members of the House, that a great number of people are not satisfied, that there is reason to believe that it would be very opportune for the Standing Committee on Economic Development to meet so that there could be a proper airing of this situation, so that all the pertinent information could be brought forth and so that we could have representations from all the interested groups so as to be able to form opinions, to be able to advise the government. I feel that although there's some information being requested here which will be of value, that what is really required is a meeting very soon where a full airing of this will take place.

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

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following with respect to the sixty-three (63) new businesses which came to Manitoba in 1969:

- (1) Names and addresses of the above companies.
- (2) Number of employees employed by each company.

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd).

- (3) Approximate amount of investment made by each business.
- (4) Number of these businesses which were established prior to July 15, 1969.
- (5) Number of these businesses which were under discussion or being established before July 15, 1969.
- (6) Number of these businesses which were entirely instituted since July 15, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the government will undertake to provide this information to the best of our ability. I presume there won't be too much difficulty interpreting the definition of some of the words, such as in item 6, the words "entirely instituted" - I presume by that you mean they had actually set up their plant. On the other hand, you may mean they had announced their intention after July 15th. You mean the announcement of intentions?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we will do our best to provide the information to the honourable member.

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

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

- (1) Number of feasibility studies being conducted by the Government at the present time.
- (2) Terms of reference and subject matter being studied in each case.
- (3) Date each study was commissioned or instituted.
- (4) Number of studies completed and referred to the Government since June 25, 1969.
- (5) Names and addresses of firms or individuals conducting the feasibility studies in each case.
- (6) Where studies have been completed state the fee and/or total cost in each case.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the First Minister indicated that there may be some difficulty and if I would specify more clearly in what fields I was interested. I would suggest that primarily the Order is directed to the economic development sector of the economy in which the government is contemplating any involvement or the industrial side of the economic picture in Manitoba, and what areas in that field that the Department of Industry and Commerce or any other department is conducting studies. I would exclude internal governmental matters where there may be from department to department studies. I don't know as I would wish to have excluded, unless by the stricture of another company, if there has been a feasibility study carried on which involves a private enterprise group, I would like to have this information subject to their approval, but if the outside company or group did not wish this to be known then I would accept that. I don't know if this imposes too much of a strain on the government. I'm really interested in all of the feasibility studies that they have done, but mainly in industrial development.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, subject to the various explanations with respect to this Order for Return provided by the honourable member, I think that this will be possible. I would, however, take the opportunity to point out that there is a, in case there may be some concern later, that there is a difference between a market study per se and a feasibility study. The market study of course only looks at the demand side; the feasibility study should not only be concerned with demand but also the supply side, namely all the cost factors that have to be considered in determining whether or not a particular enterprise might be economically viable or not. I would also say, too, that I understand from the honourable member's remarks that he's mainly interested in getting lists of feasibility studies conducted essentially by outside firms as opposed to studies done within the government. I gather from your remarks that this was your intention.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: If no one else wishes to speak, I'll close debate by this short explanation. I would like to see any feasibility study that's been conducted by government themselves as well as outside sources. In other words, I'm asking the question, everybody

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . in the province is talking now or wondering what fields perhaps this government may be considering getting into, and if they are employing civil servants to conduct some of these feasibility studies, I'd like to know about that too.

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

#### PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: It is agreed that we continue with adjourned debates on second readings Private Bills? The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable member was intending to speak today. I believe he's just on the phone at the moment, so if -- (Interjection) -- Okay. If we can have it stand just for the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Arthur. Bill No. 48. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate to have a look at some of the technical details. The government is satisfied there's no problem; we'll let it go to committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Bill No. 70. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, this Bill, too, I adjourned to have a look at some of the details. I now find that we will allow it to go to committee at which time we will have some technical amendments to make in respect to the Bill itself.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 75. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand? If anyone else wishes to . . .

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on Bill 75. I agree with most of the items in the bill. I believe it's keeping up with the times and it's forward-looking legislation. However, I am somewhat at a quandry to understand why it was brought in as a backbencher's bill instead of a government policy.

I think that many items in the bill are worthwhile and are proper and should be considered. I just would like to point out I believe some of them, such things as permission for licensed premises to stay open on Thanksgiving Day and provision for licenses to be issued for sports items and things of that nature are good. I know there's mention been made of liquor to be served on our pleasure boats on Lake Winnipeg, and I'm sure that many of these are updating the present legislation. One point that does give me some concern, and that certainly is the one that some of the other members have raised the matter, and that is extending advertising at the present time. I know that this has received tremendous amount of debate a few years ago when we had amendments to the Liquor Act at that time. I believe it's some three years ago. But I would like to know from the government, because on one hand we're trying to restrict advertising from our local stations, the local radio stations, and the two TV channels, and on the other hand we're getting the advertising coming in through another station, that is Channel 12, and I feel that if this can be regulated on all news media then it may be worthwhile at this time to say that there's no need to extend and have more advertising as far as liquor is concerned. On the other hand I see nothing wrong with the type of advertising where you can advertise the type of liquor or consumption of liquor with meals and so on. There's various types of advertising. I think this is the argument that I have to sort of look at, and I know many members will have to consider in this House, because there's all types of advertising and as long as your advertising is the type that is controlled to some extent I think that there's nothing wrong with it.

So I'm prepared to let the bill go on second reading to the committee but with reservations as far as advertising is concerned and I hope that the Minister, and of course I'm talking to the Attorney-General in this respect, or the member who introduced the bill will give us some answers in respect to advertising. If it means that we will have no advertising locally but will still accept all the advertising from some other channel I don't think that this is correct. I am sure it would be quite easy to control advertising, some advertising on all channels even if it's Channel 12 because I'm sure that mutual arrangements can be reached with different breweries and people that have their liquor stocked in the Liquor Control stores,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . so I don't think this would be a difficult thing to arrange and I would hope that the Attorney-General will be able to give us some answers in respect to liquor advertising.

I agree with serving beer - one part of the bill where a dining room license is held and somebody wants a glass of liquor in a hotel and this could be served without a meal in his room and I think what we're doing here is updating legislation which I know that I would agree.

Now the other point that I wish to raise is - I'm very glad to see the reference made to the specialty restaurants which is introduced in this act, in the bill, and hopefully that this will enable a place like Shakey's Pizza to get back its license. Now I know that the Commission said that specialty restaurants didn't come within the meaning of the act. Personally, I never thought that was a very good excuse because the Act has never defined a restaurant. I have looked, for example, in Webster's new international dictionary, the second edition, which defines a restaurant and it is as follows: "An establishment where refreshments or meals may be procured by the public; a public eating house." End of the definition. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, the Commission's attitude to the word "restaurant" has been a problem, so I guess we should all be delighted to see the legislation changed which includes specialty restaurants in this act. However, I would appreciate some comment from the Attorney-General, and some assurance from him that it is intended that this inclusion of a specialty restaurant will result, in a place like Shakey's Pizza, will result for these people to get back their license and to be back in business.

I also would like to know from the Minister at this time or the member who is introducing the bill, will a specialty restaurant also have to serve other courses or other course meals. For example, requiring a specialty restaurant where it is only serving pizza, requiring this house to serve other courses or other dishes, and I would like some explanation on this as well. I would like some assurance that the insertion of a specialty restaurant in Section 121 of the act is intended to avoid specialty restaurants being forced to serve other course meals.

I realize from the speech the Attorney-General has already made on the subject it is the philosophy that an awful lot of discretion will be left to the Commission. I want to put this question: How do we know that even with the proposed amendment of the act inserting specialty restaurants the Commission won't still take the attitude that a place like Shakey's will require to serve rolls and other main courses.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I notice about Bill 75, it is changing the word "chairs" to read "appropriate seats". I know that one of the things the Commission took exception insofar as Shakey's was concerned was that it had benches rather than chairs, and the excuse the Commission gave for objecting to these benches was that legislature in Section 121 had used the word "chairs" and that benches weren't chairs, and therefore these benches were not satisfactory. It didn't matter how expensive the benches were or how much better they actually were than the chairs or how much more they cost or how much more the patrons really liked benches rather than chairs, just because the legislature at that time said "chairs" the Commission objected to "benches" and I'm glad to see that the word "chairs" is now being changed to "appropriate seats."

But I want to put another question: Should we also not change the word "table", because you must appreciate it is not beyond the realm of possibility that today with very expensive types of new equipment that we're getting on the market you may have some type of interior design that is suspended from ceilings or attached to the wall, a type of a table which may not necessarily be a table, or the Commission may not construe such a thing as a table, and as I mentioned it may be something jutting out of the wall, no matter how expensive it was and no matter that it may be the latest thing in interior design and so far as it is convenient as patrons are concerned, so surely I think that probably it would be sufficient for the clause to say the type of kitchen and dining room of certain size and equipped as is suitable to accommodate the patrons thereof. Because this concerns me, Mr. Speaker, a table as we have them today and the new equipment that we're getting, you may find in many dining rooms that it may not be tables and may be some other good equipment, so I believe maybe we should have just changed a dining room to a dining area with suitable surface for dishes and so on.

The Attorney-General made it clear he wishes to leave a lot of discretion to the Commission and obviously he is doing so according to this bill. However, I do appreciate it is not the bill that he presented to the House. I believe a lot of things should be decided by experts on this subject, Mr. Speaker. How do we know that the members of the Licensing Board are

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . . experts on what is food of good quality; and how do we know that their judgment is so impeccable that they will decide whether or not there must be tablecloths on the table or not. I'm told that health experts believe that in their opinion, a good clean eating surface is all that should be required by any eating establishment because in great many instances the use of tablecloths sometimes result in unsanitary eating surfaces. The point I'm trying to make is how do we know that members of the commission are experts on the subject of medical health and sanitation, Mr. Speaker? These are some of the points that I wish to raise at the present time and if the member who has introduced the bill cannot answer them, I would appreciate if the Attorney-General would take the time to answer some of these questions, because I think it's most pertinent and very important.

However, with the majority of items that's been recommended I am in full agreement, with the exception of the one that I have mentioned in respect to the advertising and perhaps if the Minister or the Attorney-General is prepared to clarify what is the intention of the government in this case and at that time I'd be prepared to either support advertising or be against it. But I believe permission for -- (Interjection) -- no, I just wanted some clarification in respect to the channels that are carrying at the present time - one channel across the line is carrying your advertising at all times, your two local channels are prohibited, and I'm sure there could be mutual arrangements made that the same type of advertising, TV advertising could be carried on within the three television medias. I'm sure it would not be too difficult for the Attorney-General or the government to work out, by mutual arrangement, and I'm sure that your liquor people and your breweries would really agree because I don't think it's such a difficult problem; but I don't think it's right that we will prohibit the two local channels from carrying advertising and we can have, say another channel from across the line carrying it all day long. This is the problem that I see, a problem that the government has to come to grips with. I don't think it's such a difficult problem to iron out. I'm sure that this could be worked out mutually with our breweries themselves. And furthermore, I think that besides that there's another point. I think that there must be some clear understanding what type of advertising should be allowed. Because on one hand we're trying to curtail cigarette advertising and in this instance we may be permitting more advertising as far as consumption of liquor is concerned, as far as our young people are concerned, the way the advertising is projected to these people. So I see that this is not such a difficult problem that could not be handled by the government and worked out and for this reason I'm asking the Attorney-General to give some explanation to the House and to the members.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Are you for it or against it?

MR. PATRICK: That's not the question. If the Minister can explain how he can control the advertising - personally I would not like to extend much more advertising as far as liquor because I thought we did a pretty good job a few years ago in respect to advertising and the type that I think would not do any harm to our young people. So if the Minister is prepared to answer I will be able to express my opinion again in committee and on third reading. So with these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to let the bill go to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed that the adjournment stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River? (Agreed.)

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West) presented Bill No. 62 an Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2) for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, the intent of the amendment to the Brandon Charter as contained in this bill is to handle two subjects. One is to make an addition to the Charter which would provide for the mutual use of recreational facilities in the city between the City of Brandon and the Brandon School District No. 40. This would not only mean that the city recreational uses would be - the facilities of the school board would be available to the city but also those of the city available to the schools when they would be required. The bill would also provide for the setting up of a commission upon which representation would be held by the school board and the city council, the city manager and the superintendent of schools.

The other matter dealt with in the bill would be an amendment to the City Charter providing for some agreement between the Municipal Act and the City Charter in respect to the holding of Courts of Revision by the city. It would be held not later than the 30th day of November in each year if this amendment should be carried and it would provide also for

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . . additions to the tax roll to be made by council or court of revision if appointed prior to the sitting of the Court of Revision.

I think these are the two matters essentially that are covered by the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that it would receive the approval of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon debate be adjourned.

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates, Private Members' Resolutions. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the other day I was making a few remarks in connection with this bill and in particular some of the statements made as to jurisdictions and the remarks of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, I believe. I had pointed out at that time that there was opinion that we should take a look at the proposition to see whether or not we could arrive at some conclusion; and also I had pointed out that there were different jurisdictions responsible for inspections and supervision in different areas of construction. Since the other day, Mr. Speaker, I've undertaken to find detailed information as to the inspection services of various jurisdictions and I'm sure that they would be of interest to the members of the House. If I may, Mr. Speaker, refer to a document that I have before me dealing with these areas of jurisdiction and inspection services and as they apply in the Province of Manitoba at the present time.

The Department of Health and Social Development is responsible for all plumbing installations in the province with the exception in the Metro area where such inspections are carried out by Metro. The Department of Health and Social Development is also involved in the inspections in industrial and commercial establishments involving environmental health such as adequate ventilation of toxic fumes.

Then we have the Department of Municipal Affairs and this department assists municipalities in establishing planning schemes which involve zoning and to some degree the construction of buildings. Once a municipal council has adopted a planning scheme however, that council is responsible for the enforcement and the Department of Municipal Affairs provides assistance and guidance only in respect of enforcement of the planning scheme.

The Department of Labour is responsible for the installation of gas-fired equipment, oil-fired equipment, elevators and boilers, pressure vessels and refrigeration equipment in all commercial and industrial buildings. The Department of Labour also in addition to this, and this is because of the Public Buildings Act, insures structural stability of public buildings such as theatres, churches, schools and hotels in municipalities which have not adopted a building code and do not have building inspectors to enforce the same. With respect to fire safety, the Fire Commissioner's office enforces these requirements in public buildings, such as schools, theatres and hospitals etcetera.

Then due to changes in legislation a few years ago, the Workmen's Compensation Board is responsible for the employment safety as applied to employees engaged in construction and industrial and commercial establishments. Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg enforces their by-laws pertaining to electrical installations, plumbing, zoning and structural stability of buildings. Manitoba Hydro is responsible for the overall jurisdiction of enforcing requirements governing electrical installations in all areas of Manitoba except in Metro Winnipeg. The electrical installation code for Metro and Manitoba Hydro are all to all intents and purposes identical.

As far as the National Building Code is concerned, this code has been developed as a minimum standard essentially for structural stability for various classes of buildings and provisions are contained in the code to accommodate the various climatic and other conditions in various parts of Canada. These include temperature, earthquakes, snow and wind floating. So you can see that within the province there's quite a considerable variance in some respects as to the code itself as indeed there are differences, as I understand it, with the National Building Code itself.

The suggestion of the proposer of the resolution I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, is felt worthy of consideration and in the resolution it is stated that the National Building Code has

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . received endorsement from many organizations such as the Architectural Institute, Canadian Labour Congress, National House Builders, etc. But as I indicated a moment or two ago, that this is fluctuating throughout the Dominion and really just to apply the provisions of the National Code uniformly across Manitoba may not be sufficient and that we should take a very good and close look at it as to what the requirements should be in the province of Manitoba. Because of the involvement of the respective municipalities, Metro, the suburbs in some respects although I think now it's pretty well under the jurisdiction of Metro - thinking of the City of Portage la Prairie, Brandon, the development of Thompson and Flin Flon -- I think that it is advisable that we should take a look at this on a total picture for Manitoba rather than a piecemeal approach of simply the adoption of the resolution entirely proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, for he says that this code should be made applicable to all residential, commercial-industrial building in all municipalities of the province. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is minimal and we should take a look at the total picture.

With that objective in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney General that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the word "the" in the first line of the operative section of the resolution and substituting the following: "subject matter to be referred to the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs." In other words, the purport of the resolution or the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is not to push aside the suggestion of my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia, but have the matter referred on a total basis to the municipal committee to see whether or not they can come up with a uniform code for Manitoba taking into consideration the proposals in the resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this resolution amended as it was just to see if there were any challenging statements by some of the speakers that spoke afterwards on the amendment. I find I have no contentious matters to discuss, therefore I'm ready to proceed.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in further amendment thereto, which I am holding. In considering the sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, may I refer honourable members to Citation 202 Subsection 2 of Beauchesne, Fourth Edition which reads as follows, I quote: "As the proposal of an amendment to an amendment originates a fresh subject for consideration, the new question thus created must to prevent confusion be disposed of by itself. An amendment, when undergoing alteration is therefore treated throughout as if it were a substantive motion upon which an amendment has been moved. The original motion accordingly is laid aside and the amendment becomes, for the time, a separate question to be dealt with until its terms are settled." Therefore, in my humble opinion it appears quite in order for the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to propose an amendment to amend the amendment.

May I also refer honourable members to Manitoba Journals 1964, Page 268, where it is recorded that Mr. Shoemaker moved a motion, Mr. Hamilton moved an amendment thereto and Mr. Shoemaker moved an amendment to the amendment which Madam Speaker Forbes ruled in order. In the same volume, honourable members will find recorded on Page 114 a motion moved by Mr. Gray, an amendment thereto by Mr. Lissaman, and an amendment to the amendment by Mr. Gray, which Madam Speaker Forbes ruled out of order because in her opinion it would have produced the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)

In the case of the sub-amendment before the House now, negating the amendment would not produce the same result that's called for in the sub-amendment. The main motion calls for abolition of the provincial portion of estate taxes levied in Manitoba; the amendment proposes exclusive federal administration of estate and succession taxation with equalized compensation for the provinces in lieu of direct provincial sharing in estate tax revenue; the sub-amendment alters the amendment without enlarging the scope of the amendment by suggesting bringing Manitoba estate taxation law in line with that of Saskatchewan and Alberta as an interim measure.

To sum up, it is my opinion that in view of the fact that in dealing with a sub-amendment the amendment is treated as a substantive motion, therefore amendment to the amendment is open to all members except the mover of the amendment. In this instance I feel that the sub-amendment alters the amendment within its scope and it is neither a direct negative of the amendment nor may the same result be produced by defeating the amendment. Therefore, I rule the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Rose in order.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. George in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member doesn't mind, I had something....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that it will come as no surprise to the Minister of Labour that in rising to take part in this debate I don't rise for the purpose of praising the Minister nor do I expect to bury him, I just simply want to reply to some of the statements that have been made in this Chamber by the Minister of Labour himself and the Premier when they saw fit to enter this debate. I thought that in itself was quite surprising, Sir, to find that in order to justify the amendment that is now before us, that both the Premier and the Minister of Labour saw fit to rush to the defence of the Minister of Agriculture in attempting to convince the House that his efforts on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba were such that they were indeed worthy of commendation by members of this Chamber.

Sir, I thought that the resolution proposed by the Member for La Verendrye was one that in its original form would commend itself to the House. It asked that the Committee on Agriculture meet in order to hear representations from the various segments of agriculture and agra business in this province in order to determine from them what they thought were the problems facing Manitoba farmers. As a matter of fact, Sir, I suggested last year that such an investigation be conducted in order to determine, first of all, where the problems were, how it has affected farm income and what areas are affected; and secondly, what farmers and to what extent has it affected the farmer's ability to pay his taxes and his bills, etc.

We all know that although farm income figures in this province may reveal a very slight drop from previous years, farm gross income figures, the fact is that there are certain areas of the agricultural industry that are affected a great deal more than others. Indeed, there may have been increases in income on certain farms while there were substantial drops in income in other areas, and I would have thought that a meeting of the Agricultural Committee would have given some attention to determining where the thrust of government policy should have been made in order to alleviate the very real crisis that exists in certain areas of agriculture, and I would have thought that some serious consideration would have been given on the part of the government to finding out ways in which they could possibly be of some assistance to farmers.

Now I wouldn't object even to the present amendment, Sir, if I was in possession of some evidence which has not been supplied to this House as yet, that the Minister was indeed doing the kind of job that the Minister of Labour and the First Minister has indicated that he has been doing. If I was not convinced that his efforts as a Minister of Agriculture left something to be desired, I would happily approve of the amendment now before us. However, I am not in possession of any such evidence; on the contrary, I am convinced that his efforts as a Minister have

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.). . . . not in any way assisted the agricultural industry in this province. And this, Sir, particularly in light of the fact that the Minister, when he was on this side of the House, in very loud and frequent pronunciations, attempted to convince this Chamber, and everybody else within reach of his voice, that he had all the answers. It seems that his performance since he has become a Minister has not been in keeping with his protestations when he was on this side of the House.

The amendment, Sir, does violence to the facts, and I suppose the government knew this and that was the reason they had to throw in the Premier and the Minister of Labour in an attempt to cover the trail, an attempt to divert the real issue that is before us. I know the First Minister made much of the fact that a great deal of the responsibility insofar as agricultural matters are concerned in this Chamber, a great deal of the responsibility as far as agricultural matters are concerned rests with the federal authorities and that the responsibility of a provincial Minister is nothing more than prodding the Federal Minister of Agriculture. Well, Sir, in some respects that is true; in other respects there is certain initiatives that can be taken on the part of a provincial government in order to assist in the very real problem that does exist in agriculture.

Now, what are the facts? The amendment suggests that the Minister should be commended because - as the amendment reads - "for his initiative and representations to the Government of Canada on behalf of the farmers of Manitoba". Well, let's take a few examples. Take Operation LIFT for example. The Minister latterly has disclaimed any responsibility for that program and indeed has saw fit to condemn it, but the facts do not bear this out.

In a question placed on the Order Paper in the House of Commons on May 6th, 1970, a question placed on the Order Paper by the Honourable Member for Marquette, Mr. Stewart, he asked this: "By province, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, did the Federal Government consult any group concerning the proposed acreage reduction program, and if so, what farm organizations were consulted? (b) What agricultural industries were consulted? (c) Which provincial government departments were consulted? (d) In each case, who were the actual personnel engaged in the discussions and did each organization approve or disapprove of the program?" I won't deal with the entire answer, it's rather lengthy, but I will deal with the one section which relates to the Minister and it says this. In his reply he said, "The Ministers of Agriculture of each of the prairie provinces were consulted prior to the implementation of the program." And the reply goes on to say, "All consulted expressed support for the final version of Operation LIFT as a necessary inventory reduction program to place the western grains industry on a solid footing for long-term industry policies and programs."

Now, Sir, I'd like to know just how the Minister can justify his present position in opposition to Operation LIFT with his approval of the program at the time it was being contemplated. -- (Interjection) -- Well, now he says "It's a lot of bull." He's going to have to answer - not to me, Sir, because I didn't make the reply to this question; that was the Minister, the Honourable Otto Lang, Minister without Portfolio, who replied to that question and he suggests in his reply -- and I don't think that a Minister of the Crown gives a reply to a question like that lightly.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. JORGENSON: No, I am not going to submit to a question because I have the floor, and if the Minister wants to reply or if he feels he's got anything to contribute, he will do it on his time, not mine.

The Minister without Portfolio replied to a question that was placed on the Order Paper in which support for Operation LIFT was indicated by the Minister of Agriculture from Manitoba, but once the program became revealed, or was revealed to the farmers and it was discovered that it met with something less than enthusiastic support on the part of the farmers, then the Minister quickly withdrew that support and attempted to convince the people of this province that at no time did he support the program, and he's going to have to justify that.

Now, Sir, on the matter of feed grains, the Minister presented a brief to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons which has been studying this matter. And, Sir, these are the people who profess to consider subjects on their merits in a pragmatic way, no ideology involved here, Sir, none, none at all, and yet their whole presentation to the Agricultural Committee on the matter of feed grains was based on the ideological concept that the Wheat Board, because it's a Crown corporation, can do a better job of marketing feed grains than the private

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.). . . . trade. Now, Sir, I have no objections, as a matter of fact I fully support the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board as it relates to the movement of grains in interprovincial and export channels, and that, Sir, is the function of the Board, to handle wheat moving in interprovincial and export channels, but what the Minister is attempting to suggest to the Agricultural Committee is that they should take over the selling of grain within the province as well, and that concept, Sir, is utter nonsense. It has been proven it won't work. It's been proven that it would create more difficulties than it would solve and would restrict and inhibit the use and the movement of feed grains out of this province, having the Wheat Board take over full control of feed grain and preventing the feed mills from buying feed grains to supply their customers. For some unknown reason, Sir, honourable gentlemen opposite seem to have conjured up in their mind an impression of feed mill operators, as described by the Attorney-General, as dishonest and untrustworthy people. They're nothing of the sort. They're supplying their customers with a product that is in demand.

MR. USKIW: Who said they are?

MR. JORGENSEN: The fact is, Sir, that to remove the right of the feed mills to buy feed grains for manufacturing into a finished product is just as stupid - and I use that word even in spite of the admonition that I'm liable to get from the Minister of Mines and Resources - is just as stupid as telling a restaurant that their customers must bring their raw materials into the restaurant. They will cook the bacon and eggs for them but they won't supply them. Every man that comes into a restaurant must bring his own raw ingredients to be prepared by the restaurant and then taken out. That is the purport of the suggestion, or the net result of the suggestion made by the Minister of Agriculture in his brief to the Agricultural Committee, and even the smiling Buddha from Thompson, the Minister of Transportation, can see the ridiculousness of that situation, Sir.

MR. BOROWSKI: Of your statements, yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: Even the Minister of Transportation, who made a very worthwhile suggestion in this House when he was sitting on this side here, last year, when he said that this sort of thing of government taking control is a lot of nonsense. I'm paraphrasing him, I'm not quoting him precisely because I don't recall his exact words. He said when a government makes a mistake they make mistakes for everybody, and that's wrong, that's the thing that is wrong with government controlled things, but he says when I make a mistake then I'm the only one that's affected. And that is wisdom that comes from the mouth of someone who had acquired wisdom when he was on this side of the House. And I don't think it's left him, I think he still feels that way, although he's perhaps subdued by the Minister of Mines and Resources who is bringing his influence to bear on him, and the Member for Crescentwood no doubt.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's right.

MR. JORGENSEN: In any case, Sir, the suggestion made by the Minister of Agriculture to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons is one that I am sure in particular the farmers of this province would reject out of hand, and in that way, Sir, I ask how has he served the best interests of the farmers of this province, and how has he earned the praise of the members of this House when he knows full well that what he has done is wrong.

What, Sir - we'll leave that subject - but what, Sir, has he done, what representations has the Minister made on the bill currently before the House of Commons, the Natural Products Marketing Act. Now that bill, Sir, its intention is to set up and provide for the operation of national marketing boards across this province, and on the surface it sounds like a made to order - I won't use the word socialist - a made to order NDP scheme. This is the sort of thing that they would accept and embrace without any reservations.

But I wonder if the Minister has taken the time to read the fine print, to read the fine print on that legislation which would give authority to that board, composed of representatives of everybody but the producers, to impose quotas on production on every province. In other words, the production of products outside of dairy products and wheat or coarse grains, those marketed under the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canadian Dairy Commission, would carry quotas imposed by that board. Everybody knows that our markets for poultry products, for eggs, lies outside the province a great deal more than it lies inside the province. We would have to cut back our production and tailor our production in this province to meet only the needs of the Province of Manitoba. What representation has the Minister made on behalf of the producers of those commodities in this province? Sir, I'm willing to bet none.

MR. USKIW: You want to bet? How much?

MR. JORGENSON: And I hope that when he gets up to reply he's going to be able to reassure me that he has made some representations. Maybe that's one way that we can bring him to his feet in his own defence.

MR. USKIW: You haven't been awake lately.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Sir - "you haven't been awake," the Minister says. I have heard of no representation that the Minister's making and I have no way of knowing what he is doing unless it is announced. I've been reading his News Service Bulletins very carefully and I haven't seen anything, and I know that the Minister, whenever he does anything at all, he's not a bit backward about coming forward and bragging about it, and so since I haven't seen anything I am wondering just what he has done.

Now, the Minister, the First Minister yesterday said what a wonderful thing the Minister of Agriculture has done when he informed the Quebec Government that they had introduced, or passed legislation that was contrary to the British North America Act. Now there was a stroke of genius. There's the Minister advising the Quebec Government of something that I am sure they were well informed of long ago, because the poultry industry in this province were very quick to point out some time ago that they felt that the legislation was not in keeping with the terms of the British North America Act, that it was a contravention of that Act and that it be reviewed by the proper authorities. So the Minister's venture into this field was I think superfluous, even though necessary, because what the First Minister said he'd done had already been done by somebody else.

Now they made a big thing, and the First Minister made a big issue of the supplementary cash advance program that was offered by the present government. I don't like to use the term "phoney," Sir, because perhaps it is not a parliamentary term.

MR. USKIW: It's not even true.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, the Minister says it's not even true. Well, I ask the farmers of this country then to judge the offer on its merits. What the Minister offered was an amount of money to the farmers, a cash advance to the farmers, providing that they would be the first ones to get their money back from the farmers -- (Interjection) -- Well now, maybe the Minister again can explain just what his program meant. This is the way I interpreted it. Cash advance in much the same way that cash advances were offered by the Federal Government, the only difference was they would offer, in addition to what was already being offered by the Federal Government, providing the Federal Government would allow them to be the first ones to receive back that money. Now they know full well, Sir, that every farmer has taken, every farmer in this province - I know of very few that haven't, and those that haven't don't need it - that haven't taken full advantage of the offer of the Federal Government under the cash advance legislation, and if they have borrowed to the hilt, to their capacity, then how could they possibly get any more, how are they possibly going to pay back cash advances to the Provincial Government on grain they don't have - on grain they don't have if they can't even pay back the Federal Government.

MR. USKIW: That's nonsense.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, my honourable friend says nonsense, but he's going to find out. So in my opinion the offer was a phoney one, it was one that had no substance to it, and he knew that when he made the offer. And this, Sir, is what they parade up and down this country as a method to save the farmers from the situation that they're in today. Sir, I suggest to you that it contains nothing of any substance and will be of no help to the farmers of this province even if it were accepted.

..... continued on next page

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit me a question with regard to something that he has just said.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, since it's my honourable friend, I can't resist him.

MR. GREEN: I am really and sincerely looking for information. Are you suggesting that there are no farmers who have grain in storage on which they have not received advances to the full value of the grain? That is, the Federal Government has allotted them a certain amount of advances in accordance with the regulations, that they have more grain than they have received advances for, on which they could get additional advances if they were available? Is that not the case?

MR. JORGENSEN: As I said, Sir, those farmers who haven't taken advantage of the federal cash advance legislation -- (Interjection) -- those that haven't. They haven't done so perhaps possibly, or more likely because they don't need it, because they happen to be those farmers who are in a position where they don't require the assistance.

MR. GREEN: I'm referring to those who have already taken full advantage.

MR. JORGENSEN: I suggest to you that those who have taken advantage of the cash advance legislation have taken advantage to the limit, to the maximum capacity that was available to them under the legislation.

MR. GREEN: What if there was additional capacity under the legislation, would they not then be willing to have more cash advances, which is my understanding of what we offered.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, if the government were to make an offer to the farmers of additional cash advances on the existing quotas and on the quotas that are likely to accrue during the next coming year, there wouldn't be a hope that they would be able to pay back any of those cash advances. So the offer in my opinion is a meaningless one, because they would not be able to get it in the first place, because the cash advance legislation is there for the farmers to use today and they've taken advantage of that cash advance legislation as far as they can go, and I'm willing to -- (Interjection) -- Well, it would be dependent upon how much they could deliver, and in the next crop year the amount of money they are going to be able to deliver . . .

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): We don't care if they can deliver or not.

MR. JORGENSEN: My honourable friend doesn't care whether they're going to deliver or not. There is no hope, because I think that what my honourable friend is going to find out, and I think what the Federal Government is going to find out, that there's a great deal less grain on the farms in the Province of Manitoba than they think there is -- (Interjection) -- Well, it's those, it's precisely those farmers who have the difficulty, and so you're helping those who do not really need the help.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would my honourable friend then permit another question, again in the same vein. Are you then suggesting that they do not have an asset on their farms for which they could receive money if there were a ready market for grain? Is he saying they have depleted their asset completely then?

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm suggesting that that amount of grain is not on the farms.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . a further question.

MR. JORGENSEN: I say on the farms in Manitoba and I'm talking about the Manitoba farmers. There's an entirely different situation in the Province of Saskatchewan as everyone knows, where there is a lot of grain on the . . .

MR. USKIW: . . . to a question on that point, at least one question, Mr. Chairman? If that is so, why have my honourable friends opposite in the last few months asked what we are doing about the lack of grain sales to put cash in their pockets?

MR. JORGENSEN: The lack of grain sales affect the farmers in this province as it affects everybody in this country. The lack of wheat sales affects the sales of feed grains and it affects the sales of farm machinery and it has an effect all across the entire economy, so naturally the movement of wheat is an important factor in relieving the agricultural crisis because it's the wheat situation that is plunging all of the other sectors of the agricultural economy into some difficulty. So the key to the whole thing is wheat, and my honourable friend knows that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would you permit a question?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, if I have any time left after I am through I'll be happy to take any more questions. I have two other points that I wish to make.

Now, Sir, another point that has been rather interesting in the last few days, the honourable gentlemen opposite through the years have made much of what a terrible thing it was to

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . support vertical integration. They made much of the Manitoba Development Fund's involvement with Family Friendly Farms and the First Minister was one of those who did a great deal of that. But the other day an announcement was made in the House, Sir, in which under this government the Manitoba Development Fund is supporting a vertically integrated operation at Brandon. I tried to find out from the Minister, and maybe when he replies or if he speaks he'll be able to give me the answer, as to whether or not he made any representations to the Minister in opposition to the development of a vertically integrated operation at Brandon. The Minister of Industry and Commerce admitted that Manitoba Development funds were involved.

So here, Sir, is another example of where they say one thing on this side of the House and then they get the power they say exactly the opposite, and then they do those things for which we were criticized. I wonder if the Minister is going to be able to justify that situation. And it's not, Sir, that I'm in opposition to it. We've often said - the former Minister of Industry and Commerce and the former Minister of Agriculture outlined in detail on many occasions that the future of the agricultural industry, and indeed the great part of the economic activity and the industrial activity of this province, is related around food processing, so anything my honourable friends do in order to further that objective is going to get the support of members of this side of the House, but I do suggest to them that a little bit of consistency in their approach on these matters would be welcome.

Now, Sir, one final thing. One of the real platforms that the honourable gentlemen opposite have been parading up and down this country is the amount of money that they have made available to the farmers and what a wonderful thing they've done by providing agricultural credit - and I'm not in opposition to that - but I remind the Minister that he's not going to solve the agricultural crisis by forcing the farmers to buy their way out of it. I'm not critical of the establishment of the Agricultural Credit Corporation and the provisions that are made for loans, but this seems to be, whenever you ask them what they've done - ah, we have provided \$21 million, what a wonderful thing it is that we've done for the farmer - but under some questioning we find that that money has not been provided after all. It's been set aside for the use of the farmers, but they try to convince the House that this program is going to do so much to alleviate the farm situation, and I suggest to you, Sir, that loans at 8 3/4 percent, with friends like that, farmers don't need many enemies.

But the most surprising thing about it is that they use this \$21 million as a cornerstone of their agricultural policy. The great Messiah of agriculture is going to do so much to help them, and yet - and yet, Sir, on January 24, 1970, according to a statement in the Winnipeg Free Press, the Agriculture Minister said this: "Agriculture Minister Sam Uskiw said 'Ottawa's plan to increase the amount available for loans to farmers will do little to solve the present grain crisis on the prairies,'" and yet this is exactly what they're trying to convince us this loan program will do. Now, you can't have it both ways.

MR. USKIW: I never said that at all.

MR. JORGENSEN: He is the greatest denier we've ever heard. The Federal Government has announced that a total - and get this - a total of \$212 million will be available under the Farm Loan program for 1970-71, which is \$52 million more than during the current fiscal year. He scoffs at \$212 million being made available to farmers and says it's going to do little to help the farmers and yet on the other hand they parade up and down this country and in this House talking about how wonderful \$20 million is going to do, how great a program that is. I like to see him -- yes, he says he's got a reason for that too, and it'll be interesting to hear how he can justify it on the one hand and condemn it on the other. The Minister has a unique way of escaping around issues, he's quite a political acrobat and perhaps he'll be successful in doing that too. But I can tell him, Sir, that he has not convinced the farmers of this province that he's doing anything worthwhile or useful to help them.

His attack of the Federal Farm Loan program, in the light of what he is doing in this province, just doesn't make sense - and I won't use the word that I had in mind. His support of the LIFT program in Ottawa at the time that the program was being devised - and he could have made a useful contribution there by telling the government what they should have done. I rather think that the very simple solution to the acreage reduction program would have simply been to put out - and I made this statement shortly after Mr. Lang came to this province and announced the LIFT program - what he should have done was simply made an offer to rent at current rental rates in those particular municipalities where you wanted to rent land. That would have placed

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . the government in the position where they could have rented land, the kind of land that they wanted to take out of production. It would have given the farmer the option of deciding whether or not he wanted to rent that land or whether he wanted to put it into production. Nobody would have been offended and nobody would have been hurt, and I dare say they could have taken 10 million acres out of production for \$150 million.

As it is, so much of this money is going to be used for administration costs. So much of it is going to be used to take acres out of production that really should not be taken out of production because it was meaningless in terms of total wheat surpluses. So much has been done to alleviate farmers in Western Canada to make them feel that Ottawa has done nothing to assist them in their time of need.

The Minister has done just as little in this province in alleviating the fears of farmers that their interests are not being taken care of. The Minister in my opinion does not deserve the kind of commendation that is contained in the amendment to this resolution and for that reason I can't support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I would like to ask the honourable member a couple of questions. Would the honourable member submit to a couple of questions?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, I'd rather not.

MR. USKIW: No questions? -- (Interjection) -- I can't, I've spoken already.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I'm sure my friend, I always enjoy listening to him, if he would answer a question for me?

MR. JORGENSEN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to add a few general comments, and you may well wonder why I as an urban representative coming from the gem of constituencies which is only 1.03 square miles in size and in which there is absolutely no farm, you may wonder why I wish to speak on this matter, particularly because I find it at times very difficult to tell a dandelion from a petunia. Nevertheless, I did come close to a farm inasmuch as I married a farmer's daughter and I have two brother-in-laws who operate farms, and in discussions with the brothers-in-law and other farmers who are neighbours, who I've come to know over the years, I am convinced that all is not rosy down on the farm.

I would have to be a blind man, Mr. Speaker, to go into the country and come back and say to the Minister of Agriculture, well done, good and faithful servant, because when I go into the country I am convinced that there is a shortage of cash on the farm. It's all very well to say that the farmer is getting cash advances, but he doesn't really want the cash advances, he wants to sell his grain and move it. When I see that they have their granary full of grain, and last fall when I saw piles of grain being dumped into the fields in piles and the grain is not moving at the rate of which the farmers would like, and when I find and hear suggestions that farmers are shipping grain in order to get some income as screenings, I began to wonder if there are not some real serious problems on the farm.

I look at this resolution and I say what's wrong with it? All the original resolution does is it says let's call in the Standing Committee on Agriculture, call in the people who are directly responsible for the sale of grain and assistance to the farmers, and sit down and discuss with these people the problems that are before them and come back with some suggestions that probably will alleviate the problem.

Then the Member for St. George comes in with a resolution patting the Minister on the back. And I say, what for? You can't pat the Minister on the back when farmers find that they are not able to get the cash that they need and there's stockpiles of farm machinery lying all over the country that is being unsold because a farmer simply can't go and get it and he's patching up old equipment to continue in operation. You can't pat a Minister on the back for that, and you can't pat the Minister on the back when you go into the country like I did. I went two weeks ago to Brandon and back, I've been up 7 Highway, 8 Highway and 9 Highway and I've seen puddles of water. There's drainage problems all over; they can't get on the land.

Well, I can't pat the Minister on the back for these things. I'm only a city representative but I go out there and I observe what's going on, and I can't come back and support a resolution that says "well done, good and faithful servant." Why don't they sit down at a meeting? What's wrong with calling this meeting and discussing these problems? Why don't they try to perhaps

(MR. CLAYDON cont'd) . . . . trade some grain to Japan for a generator that they might need up at Kelsey? What's wrong with that? The Saskatchewan government does it and you're always telling me what a wonderful government the Saskatchewan government was. If they're able to do it, why can't you do it here? Move the grain off the farm and pay the farmer for his grain.

When you come into this House and you can show me some tangible results of what the Minister has done to alleviate the problems of the farmer, I'll support any amendment to pat him on the back, but not up until now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed that the adjournment stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre? (Agreed). The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to make any remarks on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Emerson, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Rouge. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Honourable Member for St. Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly grateful to the Honourable Member for St. Riel for holding it for me through the last three or four Private Members' Days.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Resolution 16 proposed by my colleague the Member for Fort Rouge is the kind of compassionate measure that is long overdue and that deserves the support and endorsement of every member of this Assembly. I don't see in fact how any member of this Assembly could find fault with the purpose or the intent of the resolution, Sir. The resolution asks that consideration be given to those aged and infirm persons, chronically ill, who require intensive care at least partially around the clock, care that is not available to them either in their homes or in the homes of their relatives, but who are not ill enough to be placed in hospital and who find themselves in a position therefore of not being able to receive direct benefit and direct help from the contributions that they have made over a number of years, perhaps an unlimited number of years, to the social security structure in this country which is designed in part to help relieve persons like themselves of financial burdens in their old age.

It's interesting to consider the social security structure that's been erected in this country in the last decade, Mr. Speaker, the motives for which and the rationale for which all of us in this Chamber subscribe to I'm sure. It's in the past dozen years in particular that this edifice of social security has really mushroomed, and I refer to the March, 1970 issue of "Industry", a publication of the Canadian Manufacturers Association published in Toronto to emphasize and underline for the moment some of the federal expenditures and the magnitude of them in the area of social security and in those areas with which elderly, infirm, chronically ill persons are very directly concerned. It's in the past dozen years, as I say, Sir, that this structure of social security as we know it in the country has really expanded upon itself and taken on relatively massive proportions that has been the result of the arrival on the scene and in our society of the Hospital Insurance Act of 1958, the Canada Pension Plan of 1966, the Canada Assistance Plan of 1968 and The Medical Care Act of 1969.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at one or two major social services, we are struck, I think, vividly and graphically by the increase in federal spending in the field of social service in the past ten years, all of it to very worthwhile ends to be sure. To cite just one or two examples of federal expenditures, Sir - and as I say I'm quoting from a table published by the publication I referred to - federal expenditures in the years 1960 and 1970 really tell the story of the growth in the past decade, the past 10 or 12 years of the structure to which I'm referring. Hospital insurance, for example, required in 1960 a federal expenditure of 150 millions of dollars. In 1970 that figure was 625 millions for an increase of 317 percent. Medicare of course provides us with no comparative figures because of its relatively recent appearance on our social scene, but in 1970, federal expenditures in the field of Medicare totalled \$370 millions of dollars.

Now, the publication "Industry" points out - and here I quote, Mr. Speaker - "that the expenditures shown are those of the Federal Government only, a major consideration when it is remembered that provincial governments share with Ottawa the cost of some of these programs,

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . hospital insurance for example, and operate a variety of welfare plans of their own. The fact that Finance Minister Benson will collect nearly three times as much in personal income taxes this year as did his predecessor in 1960 is a sober reminder that the social security bill is a huge one, a rising one, and, if we should be in any danger of forgetting it, one which is paid not by governments but by taxpayers, individual and corporate."

This, it seems to me, is a point that needs and deserves making in consideration of this resolution before us, Mr. Speaker, because the people to which we are referring, the people with whom we're concerned in the motives implicit in this resolution are people who have paid taxes for years in this country, or if they are elderly women, widows, they are people whose husbands paid taxes for years in this country to help construct the social security edifice that we're talking about, to help build the system of security of which all Canadians are so proud.

Now I don't deny that they receive some benefit, depending on their age of course, receive some benefit - and sometimes it's quite a substantial benefit - from the social services to which I've referred such as Old Age Security and in many cases Canada Pension Plan payments. But surely, taken in terms of the average person of longevity who is to be found in a nursing home today, surely when you compare the contributions over the 50 or 60 productive years of that person's life or the 50 or 60 productive years of that couple's life, when you regard that person as a widow or a widower of a partner who served Canada and served our society with them over the course of a lifetime, that when you consider that life span, it seems to me that surely they're receiving no more than their minimal just due from the Old Age Security payments and whatever Canada Pension Plan payments to which they're entitled, and any further assistance that can be made available to them to alleviate the difficulties of age and illness and to remove from them the burden of financial worry is one to be devoutly wished and one to be fervently striven for by us in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution points out that 61 percent of persons who must resort to alternative care such as nursing homes are supported by social assistance and therefore they're exempt of course from hospital and medical insurance premiums, but that leaves 39 percent, Sir, who resort to alternative care outside hospitals who have to pay their own costs, the cost of their own maintenance in those outside institutions, and who therefore do not benefit from the hospital and medical insurance from the social insurance structure to which they contributed over the many preceding years. Thirty-nine percent is a formidable figure and represents a significant sector of our society, of our provincial and indeed our national community.

Mr. Speaker, there are many many things to be said for age. Among other things, age is supposed to bring a peace and a serenity that perhaps we lacked in our younger years. It brings a dampening of the fires of the heart and the arteries of the soul and perhaps that's a state of life and mind that at times appears, even to those of us who are not yet aged, appears attractive and desirable, but from personal observation, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many more things that can be said against age than for it. I recall in the motion picture "Gigi" that Maurice Chevalier sang a song which became quite popular called "I'm glad I'm not young any more." There was an interesting philosophical message contained in the song, but I think that all of us in this Assembly would say that we're glad we're not old yet and we look upon the advancing years, the advance of old age as man has always looked upon it, with some fear, some anxiety, some temerity and certainly considerable, I think, considerable lack of enthusiasm. Old age in particular has a great deal to be said against it and not very much that can be said in favour of it, and, specifically, if age is accompanied by financial worry and concern, it's a condition that all of us would hope to avoid.

I suggest that it's a myth, Mr. Speaker, and grossly unfair to assume that those persons who are in nursing homes and who do not receive social assistance are in those nursing homes because they and their relatives can afford to indulge them in luxuries. In a majority of cases, in the 39 percent element to which I've referred, the people who are in nursing homes are there at some considerable hardship both to themselves and to their relatives, and having had some continuing personal experience with this situation, I think that my facts are correct, Mr. Speaker, when I make that assertion.

I've been in many nursing homes in an investigative capacity and I've talked to many people in nursing homes and I have a relative of my own in one, and I would say unequivocally and without fear of challenge in this Chamber that in the majority of cases most of the people who are there are there at some hardship in terms of expense to themselves and to their

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . relatives. Oh, they get by. They get by. They're not on social assistance, but the fact is it constitutes a significant burden for them, for their relatives, and a significant drain and strain on whatever life savings they have been able to accumulate to be able to be in those institutions. And they're not there because they or their relatives are interested in luxury, they are there because it is impossible for them to maintain their own homes or to be maintained in their relatives' homes.

There are extreme difficulties in the way, Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure you're aware, of maintenance of a chronically ill, elderly person in what could loosely be described as a young family home. The situation makes for difficulties and hardships which are largely of a psychological nature but are extremely onerous for the family involved. I think it's an established fact, and possibly an established personal experience for many of us here, that the attempt to maintain a chronically ill elderly person in a relatively young family home where young children are involved and where there is only an average type of income to maintain the family livelihood is an extremely onerous and unfortunate and destructive situation. It's a situation that's destructive not only for the family trying to do the job but for the elderly person.

As a consequence of this the elderly and their relatives make the supreme effort to find facilities for them in nursing homes and other institutions which don't fall into the category of hospitals and so our elderly, perhaps unfortunately, perhaps reluctantly, all too often end their days in institutions of the type we're discussing here. They receive excellent care, for the most part, in those homes. The attention and the facilities made available to them are for the most part beyond reproach, but the point is, Mr. Speaker, that it still constitutes a significant burden, a significant financial burden in the majority of cases, both for the elderly person and for his family, to support that kind of care.

When one considers, as I have mentioned earlier, the span of years during which the elderly person, be he male or be she female, contributed to this society and therefore through his or her efforts contributed to the social security structure that we have in Canada, when one considers that span, it seems only compassionate, humane and just that our legislation and our regulations be modified so as to permit those people to be able to receive the benefits of the hospital and Medicare insurance programs we have to offset and defray the kind of care to which they're subscribing in nursing homes.

The outlook for elderly, infirm persons who find themselves in nursing homes is of course a bleak one, no matter how hard the nursing homes try, no matter how good the nursing homes are. I referred in an earlier speech in the Assembly, either in this session or in the session last fall, Mr. Speaker, to a survey that had been carried out by the Associated Press in the United States on the nursing home situation in the United States and on life in the nursing homes in that country, and that survey and the resultant newspaper stories pointed up very vividly some of the crueller and colder aspects of life for the aged in North America even though these excellent modern facilities have developed to take care of them.

The survey in question to which I referred had this, among other things, to say, Mr. Speaker, about the whole question of infirmity in old age and the need to rely on nursing homes for help: "Perhaps most distressing, patients may die quicker than ailing patients on the outside. For example, when Dr. Morton A. Lieberman of the University of Chicago examined the cases of 800 elderly persons, he found that the mortality rate of those on the waiting list to enter a nursing home was 10.4 percent while that of those already in a nursing home was 24.7 percent. The researcher also cited five other studies which reported marked increases in mortality rates for aged persons entering mental institutions or homes for the aged."

Now the point of this, Mr. Speaker, is simply to emphasize the psychological wasteland facing people who find themselves directed into institutional care in their declining years. It was not intended as a criticism of nursing homes as such, it's intended as a criticism of a condition of life, particularly in North America where we now find ourselves with a society, most of whose members can expect to live many years longer than our ancestors did. As a consequence we have a society, many of whose members find themselves phased out of the mainstream of life, phased out of the productivity spectrum of life at a midway point or a three-quarter point on their life span, with the result that they have many years left which they must live out in rather bleak and unsatisfying and unfulfilling fashion. If they are attacked by infirmity, by illness, by degenerative disease in those years, then they find themselves in many cases living in institutions of this type with nothing but the bleak evening of their lives to look forward to; nothing, that is, except the occasional visit from relatives or from the thinning ranks of their

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . own friends, and any kind of measure that can be undertaken to bring them greater peace of mind and alleviate their worry and anxiety, I suggest is a humane and charitable one.

Mr. Speaker, in the same report to which I've referred, there is a remark attributed to a 74 year old Philadelphia widow who had this to say about old age and about the prospect of going into a home for the aged: "There is nothing that is so horrible and terrifying to older people than to think they might end their days in a nursing home. They pray to get sick on Tuesday and die on Wednesday." That's the end of that quotation, Mr. Speaker. Once again I reiterate these comments are not intended as any criticism of nursing homes or the institutional concept of homes for the aged in any way, but they do point up the graphic and often unspoken criticism that we ourselves as men and women in 20th century North American society have of this condition that we've created, where we now find ourselves with the possibility of five or ten or fifteen or even twenty years of life at the end of our productivity span, life in rather hopeless, relatively bleak and unpromising surroundings and declining environment.

So the point at issue seems to me to be, Mr. Speaker, that we attempt, wherever possible, to make this journey into old age rather less difficult and less onerous than more so, and the financial problem, as I've suggested, is substantial and significant for the majority of people who are in nursing homes and the majority of families who have relatives who subsequently find their way there. There is the occasional exceptional case to be sure, where families find it no burden, either to maintain an infirm and elderly relative at home or to maintain them in comparative comfort outside the home, but these cases are the exception and indeed rare. For most families it's a great problem. The agony is to make the decision and try to make the sound and proper decision as to whether it's better to transfer the elderly relative to a nursing home and absorb the financial burden thus involved or to keep the elderly relative at home and try to bridge the difficult sociological and psychological cavern and canyon that naturally develops in a household when the pressures are divided among the twin responsibilities of bringing up young and caring for old.

So I would like to commend to the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, the import and the meaning and the purpose of the resolution proposed by my colleague the Member for Fort Rouge and ask in the spirit of the substantive part of the resolution itself, that the government of this province continue to explore with the Government of Canada the inclusion of alternative care such as nursing homes under the hospital insurance plan so that all those people, all those families to which I've referred - and they are legion and becoming much greater in number as our society continues moving in the directions in which it is now moving in terms of defeating disease and environmental problems - so that all those families and people, individual people can look forward to some financial benefit from the contributions that they have made both in terms of specific taxes paid and in terms of energies and labours contributed to this country over the span of their productive years.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I found that I incorrectly took the adjournment of Resolution No. 11, having spoken on it last week. I thought we were dealing with Resolution No. 20 which stood in the name of the Honourable Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: We'll dispose of the present one first.

MR. SPEAKER. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, it was a disappointment to me that the motion . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the honourable member to speak at this time? In that event then perhaps we could -- I wasn't aware that the honourable member would be speaking. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell had raised a matter dealing with Resolution No. 11 on which he had moved adjournment.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell's explanation, may I then move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, regarding the resolution concerning nursing homes, it was a disappointment to me that the government was not prepared to go along with the original motion which would have corrected what I felt was an injustice to some of our elderly people.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) . . . . The amended motion will leave this matter in abeyance indefinitely because of the problems of financing another large program and until the Federal Government is prepared to give this matter priority amongst its plans. However, if this resolution as amended is what we are able to have, then I am quite prepared to go along with it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed).

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I of course regret very much that the Member for Churchill who proposed this resolution is not in his seat. If for that reason and no other, I was hoping that the Member for Roblin would have carried about 10 minutes worth of debate, but he saw fit to let me down which is his right to do of course. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, and because this matter has already been permitted to stand once, I will have to proceed with debate despite the absence of the honourable the mover of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I recognize some of the frustrations that inspires this resolution and in fact inspires some of the people in the community of Churchill to raise the question as to whether a change in political geography will be of advantage to them. I may say that the first trip that the Northern Task Force took was taken approximately a week after the announcement was made by the Federal Government relative to the drastic reduction of its activities at the Churchill site, and within a week the Task Force was on the site and listened to the various people in the area express their frustration relative to their future.

One of the questions which I was asked immediately was whether the Government of Manitoba would consider permitting the Town of Churchill to become a part of the North West Territories. They explained to me at the time that many of the services relative to the North in general would be moved from Churchill and based in the North West Territories because that location was geographically a part of the area. In other words, there seemed to be some suggestion on the part of the Federal Government, and I suppose in terms of straight emotional argument it makes some sense that why have the North West Territories served by a town or a community which is not located within the North West Territories.

On the face of it, Mr. Speaker, that has a certain ring of reason. However, it would seem to be much more reasonable to suggest that a service area for the North West Territories should be a service area which is most logically able to serve the North West Territories. After all, Churchill is not a foreign city as far as North West Territories are concerned nor is the North West Territories a foreign country insofar as Manitoba is concerned. One would think that we are all politically part of Canada and that the various provinces supplement one another. Certainly no province takes the position that everything that is done in its province should originate from cities which are located within its own territorial boundaries. That kind of economic parochialism would lead to a fantastically rigid situation and would lead to a great diminution of the total wealth of the country, which is one of the very reasons that the Member for Morris got up today and indicated that it was so clearly easy for the Minister of Agriculture to say that Quebec could not pass a marketing board regulation which would interfere with inter-provincial trade.

So, Mr. Speaker, I raise these points merely to indicate that I recognize the frustration, and I must say that when I was in Churchill I did indicate to the people in the area that the Government of Manitoba would be prepared to consider any proposal which would in fact result in benefits accruing to the citizens of Churchill, which means that if it became demonstrably the case that could be demonstrated that there was validity, economic validity to Churchill being a part of the North West Territories rather than a part of the Province of Manitoba, that any government that refused to regard that as one of the solutions for the people would be undocinaire reasons rejecting one particular solution.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't see that demonstrable argument in favour of that type of assessment, and furthermore, I don't see that there is any reasonable basis upon which that kind of an assessment would be made. After all, we must remember that changing the political location of

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . Churchill does nothing to the geographic location of Churchill. When one talks about moving Churchill to the North West Territories one realizes that this is not a physical thing that is happening, that Churchill would remain where it is whether it is in the North West Territories, whether it is in the Province of Manitoba or whether it was in the Province of Ontario, and therefore the solution to this problem, as we see it, lies in doing something for the community of Churchill in its location and to do all of those things that are necessary to ensure that this community enjoys whatever amenities it is able to lay claim to as part of being a political fact and a geographic fact in the Province of Manitoba, and if, Mr. Speaker, there are amenities that can be claimed by Churchill if it became politically part of the North West Territories, then there seems to be in my mind no reason why such claims cannot be made right at the present time. As I said before, and perhaps it doesn't bear repeating, there would be no movement taking place if Churchill was within the political framework of the North West Territories rather than in the political framework of the Province of Manitoba.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that this type of resolution - and I'm not criticizing it and I'm not criticizing the frustration of the people in the Churchill community - but this type of resolution comes as a result of despair, comes as a result of frustration, and comes as a result of a long history on the part of those people of one being tied to a very limited economic base dependent largely on two things: one, the Port of Churchill which thus far has not reached its maximum potential; and secondly, being a base for Federal Government's activities which were related to the military installations that were set up during the Second World War. And given the limited base, given the fact that for one reason or another, and I don't want to go into all of the reasons, the port authority has not reached its potential thus far. The situation in that community has been fraught with problems. These problems stem, as I see it, mainly from the fact that the economic base is unable to provide the community with the same provincial and other governmental amenities that are available in another area. And one of the reasons for that, Mr. Speaker, is that the same provincial, or the same structure which exists in Churchill, if it were to use the same tax base would not be able to do for Churchill what it could do for any other community, strictly and mainly because the cost of providing those amenities in Churchill are so much higher than exists in other communities.

A further complication, Mr. Speaker, in respect of this community, deals with the situation that has developed from relocation of peoples without an economic base in which these peoples could be absorbed. There are many people of Indian descent and of Eskimo descent who are residents of the community of Churchill, but there doesn't appear to my - and if it must be a superficial view - to my own superficial view because that is I think all that I have been able to obtain during the period that I have been involved with this subject, but there doesn't appear to have been an economic base upon which the various relocations of people could be founded, with the result that there are many people who have not found a means of developing themselves or contributing to society within the economic atmosphere in which they now exist.

So there's no way, Mr. Speaker, in which we can refer to this resolution as being something that is not justified in the minds of various people who are in the area, but the justification which I am referring to is not really a justification which relates to the finding of a solution for the problem but rather the justification for hearing the problem expressed in such terms of frustration and despair.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I draw my honourable friend's attention to your being on your feet.

MR. SPEAKER: It is 5:30; I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.