

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock Friday, March 16, 1973

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this afternoon I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 10 students of Grade 5 from Ste. Marie School under the direction of Miss L. Goulet. And also where we have 35 students Grade 6 Queenston School under the direction of Mr. Aurel Richard. The group from the Ste. Marie School are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the group from Queenston are from the constituency of River Heights.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you to this Chamber.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

Resolution 82 (a) (1) The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I was reading some remarks from a pamphlet that had been published under the joint signatures of R. Newbury and G. Mallaher and I indicated that there was even more misstatements to come which are made by this objective, independent, disinterested, non-involved person who is talking about pure science - statement on page 21. This, Mr. Chairman, is about the best example of the kind of emotional innuendo that is attempted to be cast with regard to this activity. It has now been learned, this is the statement from the pamphlet - "It has now been learned that after a Canadian firm of consultants had refused to accept the work, a consultant from Wisconsin has been hired to plan a new townsite higher up the bank. The community of South Indian does not yet know of this." That's the statement from the pamphlet.

The fact, Mr. Chairman: The Department of Northern Affairs in conjunction with the Community Council of South Indian Lake - a community council that was set up under our new system by the way - has been planning a townsite development for that community in the same manner as it has planned similar townsites in other communities, for instance at Wabowden. No Canadian firm of consultants as far as the government is aware refused to accept this work. The present consultant is we believe a Canadian citizen who is studying at the University of Manitoba and who is now continuing his studies in Wisconsin. The planned new townsite is not necessarily higher up the bank and the community of South Indian Lake has been involved in the townsite planning since its inception. It is a normal townsite plan. The reason that many of these Northern Communities ask for townsite plans is that without them there is no way of getting title and ownership to the property on which they live; this is not a reservation, it's Crown land. Their homes are there but there are no subdivisions, there are no surveys, they are unable to acquire the normal security of property to their town. And furthermore, they were interested in townsite planning. This program is now continuing the American Wisconsin consultant is somebody who the Minister of Northern Affairs assures me was employed at or was studying at the University of Manitoba when he was hired and is now continuing his studies in Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to read all of the other statements, I can tell the House that I have taken them all down and these are not statements of opinion that I am dealing with. I am dealing with statements where facts can be readily ascertainable and would be readily agreed to, and I am forwarding them to the Canadian Nature Federation, who I assume they are interested in scientific analysis and scientific accuracy and have published this volume in January of 1973 which they are distributing all across Canada I presume, and I would hope that their interest in scientific accuracy would be so strong as to make them want to publish the inaccuracies which they have already referred to in Dr. Newbury and Mr. Mallaher's article.

Mr. Chairman, there's many questions asked about the community of South Indian Lake the numbers I can't give ready answers to them. I know that there is a great deal of misunderstanding sometimes with regard to these communities. I travelled throughout northern Manitoba, I visited many of the isolated communities as did the Member for Portage and the Member for Swan River, and it is not the fact that they consider themselves living in idyllic situation, that they want no changes at all that they are not anxious for developments in their areas and for further opportunities for themselves. There is a wide number of interests in Northern Manitoba and the same is true of South Indian Lake and the government while saying that it wants to preserve a stay option, in other words it doesn't want to push people one way or the other, is

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) not certainly satisfied that every person in the South Indian Lake community wishes to keep doing for time immemorial exactly those - to have exactly those options which are presently available to them. What we are concerned in doing is making sure that the present option is available but that there are also broader options, and in this, Mr. Speaker, in philosophy we are no different than most governments in Canada and the previous administration.

The Frontier School Division, the School at Cranberry Portage was set up for exactly that purpose, that numerous people from areas in northern Manitoba go to Cranberry Portage to the Frontier School. I believe my colleague, the Member for Flin Flon was an instructor at that school, or certainly was employed at the school and knows that there is need for providing different options, let me put it to you that way, neither better nor worse, but a greater freedom of movement from these areas and that is certainly the government's intention with regard to South Indian Lake. As far as we are concerned, the flooding of the Lake not reaching the townsite, not reaching the homes is a great big plus, because it has a tremendous psychological effect on those wishing to preserve the stay option, and to continue to have the same kind of opportunities as are now available, but it doesn't deteriorate from or detract from the broader options which are going to be available.

And let no one suggest, Mr. Chairman, that somehow in north Manitoba they have found a paradise and that they don't want any changes to take place there. That is not - - (Interjection) - - the Honourable Member for Thompson says that that only applies in Thompson. That is not the impression that I got in my travels in northern Manitoba with the Task Force. On the other hand, I do respect those who say that they want to continue the kind of life that has given them dignity in the kind of environment that they are now in, and the government is resolved to proceed on both of those courses and not accept the rather naive notion that there is no change wanted by any of the people living in isolated communities in northern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82 (a) (1) - - The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of discussions on various diversifications and manoeuvres to try to create issues which are not really valid. I am just going to go back to a point where the Minister was discussing a question of conservation and I would like to make a suggestion to the Minister that measures should be taken to try to establish more wildfowl preserves. I had occasion last fall to go duck hunting in the Ste. Rose constituency - and I might mention the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I visited his place. There is an area near the Turtle River which empties into Lake Dauphin which is a fairly marshy area and I thought it was a real shame that this area has not been set aside as a wildfowl preserve.

I was hunting ducks in there and I must say that I shot a few ducks, was able only to recover one. The problem is there is fairly high reeds in that area. You shoot a duck, it falls into the water, then you go back and forth trying to locate it. Finally you just have to give up. There were many, many hunters around that area who complained of the same - came to the same conclusions that rather than have it an area that is open for duck hunting it should be closed off because there are more ducks shot in that area that are not recovered than ducks which have been actually found.

The area has high reeds about six feet, you're walking, you shoot a duck on the fly, it comes down and you try to locate it and it's just impossible; that rather than continue this type of practice I think it should be closed off. That way it will save the very rapid, what appears to be very rapid depopulation of the wild ducks. I would suggest to the Minister that possibly he would consider setting this area aside as a preserve or else maybe there are some organizations that would undertake to have this area properly closed off, possibly purchased, because it certainly has no other particular value except as an area for breeding ducks. There are a lot of muskrats. I must say that I had occasion, I was going into this marsh and you walked through the marsh area, I had hip waders and in trying to creep up to an area where ducks landed, you sort of forgot yourself, you step into one of the muskrat runs. I found myself right up to my chest in water, and then trying to get out and gone right under, that I thought that it would be best if that whole area was left as a preserve and it would certainly help to maintain and increase the duck population. Because you can go out into the fields around and get your limit, but to shoot ducks, it was just a useless exercise and I think most hunters do, when they go out they like to at least locate it and they spend a lot of time walking back and

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) forth and in that marsh area just is impossible.

I would suggest that the Minister consider the idea of having this Turtle River marsh, which composes about I would say a section of land - the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I don't know if he would appreciate this but it's close to his place - but I would suggest that this area should be made a preserve rather than having it an area for open hunting.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I hadn't intended to have much to say under the Minister's department but it seems to be worrying the Minister that because our Leader took the stance on the Churchill River diversion that it should be delayed until proper hearings are held, and that those who have objections should be heard, I thought I should tell the Minister that the elected members, and as far as I know the nominated candidates for our party, are completely in agreement with our Leader on this matter.

We have had enough of a lesson from my friends in the Conservative Party on my right where they now admit to error when they were committed on a course of flooding the South Indian Lake Community by 30-odd feet. So the very fact that they were humble enough to admit publicly that they were wrong and are willing to take a second look and also look at an alternative, I don't think we are that far apart in the Liberal Party. But my main reason for supporting this contention of a second look and the public hearings is the growing volume and the growing demand of people who dissent and a few days ago I enumerated some of the groups that I know of, both individuals and groups who are publicly questioning the government and I think for that reason alone, there should be some delay.

Now the Minister has said that they can't take the chance on any more delay or much longer delay, I just forget the exact wording, but it would be quite a shock to me if I thought that the main reason for proceeding without delay on the Churchill River diversion and the low level flooding scheme of South Indian Lake is because somehow or another hydro or government or the combination has given a commitment for export to the United States. -- (Interjection) --

Well the Minister says from his seat "No" and I accept his word, but when we read in an American power magazine the report that talks are going on with Manitoba Hydro with this very thought in view, to be put into a negotiated contract, that is, then I do think there is something in it, although the Minister says no, and I suppose he means formally no, nothing has been done. But in the Public Utilities Committee meetings of last year one of the Hydro senior officials did so state that there was continuing negotiations going on with American officials for export of power and not necessarily on a short-term basis. When economic development corporations just to the south of us in South Dakota are writing individual businessmen in Manitoba and stressing as their main point for that reason that a Manitoba plant or firm should move, and they mentioned wage rates and government grants and tax relief, but the main thing they are pushing is cheap power.

My goodness, Mr. Chairman, if we were to enter into a long-term agreement with a country that is trying to lure business and manufacturing interests from this province down there, based on cheap power, and we are selling them the cheap power, well then I see nothing wrong with taking a look at that question, I see nothing wrong at all; and it doesn't necessarily mean to be waving the nationalistic flag or being unafraid or afraid to change policies that have been long-standing in this country. The point was made that we ship processed ore or zinc or copper or refined minerals to other countries for export. Well the export of electric power is a little bit different thing. When you sell a pound of nickel it's gone, and sure it's a non-renewable resource but it's gone, that agreement is done with, but when you commit to the supply of power and another nation starts to depend on that supply, it has been proven in the past that there has been serious difficulties between nations when they have come to renegotiate 10 or 15 years down the road.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that if the reason for haste on the Nelson River project is because we are making an arrangement to sell surplus power for the next number of years, then I say that reason isn't good enough. Also, before I conclude my remarks on this matter I would say to the Minister that our Leader had spelled out our position I thought rather clearly on this and there was no particular compulsion for me to rise to say that I supported him and so did my colleagues, but I didn't think there was any haste like there was an undue rush a few days ago, there was a rash of backbenchers on the government who felt compelled

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) to rise immediately and state that they were on the government side on this issue, although I believe one and then another, and who knows how many others are not on the government side on this issue. And for that reason alone I don't think that there should be the haste to push this thing through when there's so much discontent across the province on the government's decision.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down there's one matter I'd like to draw to the attention of the Minister, and that has to do with the Portage Diversion and the effect that it is having on the Delta Marsh. About three weeks ago the Member for Lakeside and myself were invited to a meeting that was called by a group of trappers and fishermen. There were farmers and cottage owners there and others, naturalists who were interested in the state of the Delta Marsh area, and although there were differences of opinion between the ranchers and the farmers on one side and the fishers and the trappers on the other, I think I can say that there was unanimous agreement that the Delta Marsh had deteriorated very badly to where the muskrat population is practically reduced to nil. The marsh is turned into a scummy morass. It has never been in worse shape in the history of those that I have talked to. And it was felt by one of the officials in your department who was asked to attend, Mr. Weber I'm talking about, Mr. Weber, that there should be a fluctuation in the water levels of the Delta Marsh because this is the only method of flushing out the dead water and the algae, and whatever other conditions are now turning the marsh into almost a lifeless swamp. So I would ask the Minister what the long-range plans are and the close-range plans in his department to have something done about the marsh areas of Lake Manitoba, in particular the Delta Marsh?

One of the - - (Interjection) - - I believe the Member for Ste. Rose said from his seat, well close the dam. Perhaps he's alluding to the Fairford Dam. - - (Interjection) - - Anyways I'm not an expert on the matter and I don't really know. But I do know that from a lifetime of association with Delta and the marsh that the wildlife is almost gone; the duck breeding grounds are seriously damaged. The whole thing used to be a worldwide attraction for naturalists. It's now deteriorated to the extent that if something isn't done, and it's only government that can do this, well then the Delta Marsh will be finished as we remember it.

One suggestion I could make to the Minister is that the government look seriously at buying up Perimeter land on Lake Manitoba that some years is suitable for production whether it's grain or grazing, and other years it would be under water. I would suggest that the government either buy up this land at a decent price to those who have it and give the persons who owned it the option of leasing it back for use that could be made whatever use that could be made of the land. In this way - - and I know this wouldn't make everybody happy but it's a suggestion - - it isn't just the people who border on the lake own the lake any more, recreational lands and the ecology of the country belongs to us all. And I hope that perhaps the Minister when he gets into that area of his Estimates will tell us what the government thinking is and if there are any plans to save the Delta Marsh.

MR. McBRYDE: Could I ask a question of the Member ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: I wonder if the member who just spoke who indicated that he stands behind the present leader of the Liberal Party could indicate if he stood behind the Leader of the Liberal Party with his policy in regards to diversion in 1969.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I didn't know our leader in 1969. I don't know what his views were then.

MR. McBRYDE: . . . the position of the Liberal Party in 1969 ?

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, that's a fair question. As you will remember in 1969 and the year before that, there was quite a bit of controversy, and the most of the controversy was brought about because of the fact that the government of the day was not supplying any information at all, and as they proceeded with their particular plan at that time to seek to have a water licence granted, as their plan of attack unfolded it became evident that there were a lot of unanswered questions. The fact that the government of the day then decided to bring in the Bill 15, which was alluded to by the Minister this morning, and the fact that that administration, the Conservative administration repeatedly refused day after day to supply

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) any information so that the members of this House could make up their mind and at least have all the information that was available to the government side to make up their mind with, we in this party abstained from the voting on the grounds that we are not supplied with any information whatsoever other than a little bit of government propaganda that they wanted to let out as they saw fit. And because of that, Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of information, because the change in policy of the Conservative Party where they went from seeking a water licence to then trying to bring in a bill and grant the right to Hydro without license, since then, since the Conservative Party has changed and they had more information on this than we did, we in 1969 - - and I believe you're referring to Mr. Bend; when Mr. Bend said at Brandon that he could live with the low level flooding was an opinion that he gave, not with any consultation with members who were in the House, nor with even as much information as we have now got. Now the Minister of Northern Affairs may well say, "You're not being consistent." I have said from the very beginning I don't have enough information yet to base a decision on this. And the very fact that the governing party has split on this matter makes my stand, I feel, more justified than ever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he could indicate then, just to clarify that he was in disagreement with the position of the Liberal Party, Mr. Bend and the Liberal Party, as stated in the Winnipeg Free Press of June 20th, 1969, which said if the Liberal Party were elected they would opt for the low level diversion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the question had nothing to do with what I had just said and I'm sure if the Minister had been listening he would have heard my explanation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, I have just one or two brief comments to make. It's been very interesting in the Minister's Estimates to listen to the debate on Hydro once again and I think it's worthy of the debate that's taken place. Certainly none of us are dead sure on exactly how we feel about it and, as has been said before, I don't think that from day to day we get exactly the same answer from the Government side of the House. I was more interested in making one or two comments on the Manitoba Development Corporation in regards to how I feel the government and the Treasury Bench has let the people of Manitoba down a good many times by not taking good care of our money. I think it's spelled out in the Development Corporation Act very plainly that the Corporation shall supervise the expenditure by each borrower the moneys loaned to him in order to ensure that the moneys are duly expended for the purpose for which they were loaned. I think there's so many instances in the past, particularly since this government took office, that this has not been the case. And they'll stand in their places day after day continually saying "the previous administration."

Now I have to say to them that that is not the case, as this government has lent money. I realize that the Manitoba Development Corporation is a lending agency of a last resort type of thing. We know that people don't come to the MDC if they can borrow money from their bank manager. They don't come here if it's a contractor that can finance equipment through finance companies where he has a free hand to operate from that day on and only has one obligation and that's to the lending agency he came from. But when money is borrowed through the MDC, it's high risk capital that's going out. The person that borrowed it is generally in great problems before he comes and the government in that respect lends him money to feed another industry alive that's creating jobs etc.

Now I think CFI was a good instance where - - CFI was a good instance, a very good instance, where MDF of those days said yes, we're interested in seeing a pulp mill in the north. And I think the Premier today can be quoted as saying at a business luncheon one day, "if the Conservative Government hadn't created a CFI in the north, we would have." And I agree with the Premier to that extent and I agree with the Duff Roblin administration that they need jobs in the north. And I think today or when we were out there, I think there were 400 people working there, jobs created by the CFI, and I think there's 850 people there today and I think this is very good. More ducks than the Member for Radisson had to shoot at. But there's 850 jobs created in the north and the Premier agrees that it's good to have this in the north and that if the Conservative administration under Duff Roblin had not instigated this that certainly he would today - maybe not under the same circumstances. So under the same circumstances I say why didn't the Premier step in here July 15, 1969 when he took office, he and his

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. MOUG cont'd) administration march in and stop this? It says in Section 8 sub (1) that it's the responsibility of MDC that these moneys be allocated to where they were going. Apparently, apparently the government of today did not do that.

And then if you go down to subsection (3) in Section 8 it says "if any time in the opinion of the Board any money loaned under this Act has not been or is not being applied for the purpose for which it was advanced or being carefully and economically expended or the security depreciates in value, the corporation may refuse to make any further advance and may call in the whole amount then advanced and all interest . . . declare the amount of interest to be immediately due and payable."

Never at any time and there's one reason. The government on the other side, Rex Grose, you were the boss of Rex Grose as of July 15, 1969. You were the boss of Rex Grose and you keep hollering Rex Grose you've done it. You have been doing that since the time you were elected and you're still doing it today. And there's proof right there. And I have a word for you. I am very thankful to hear, I say to the Member for St. Johns that the Premier is today considering making the Member for Crescentwood the Minister of Finance, and that's good news as far as I'm concerned. Because that's an improvement, it's a big improvement. But on this Order for Return that I requested from the government -- (Interjection) -- it says that, well, this is the word that's out. It's well-known in the business world -- (Interjection) -- in the city of Winnipeg.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm leaving Manitoba.

MR. MOUG: Well, you give me a ticket on that same plane with you, Joe, and I'm with you. On July 15th, 1969, there was \$14,387,389.11 had been handed out by the previous administration, and at that time there was concrete in the ground, there had been plenty of consultants' fees paid out towards the construction of CFI, and that's all they've paid out. Under \$14 million, 13.4 - 14.3 pardon me. Oddly enough, previous to that agreement being entered into or CFI being started, the NDP of Manitoba were strictly opposed to CFI ever being. And all of a sudden when they get in the government side of the House - socialists they may be - and try to get a strong hand, get a strong hand and a tight hold on the throats of the people of Manitoba, they said, "Let it go. We've got somebody to blame it on to. We can blame that on to Duff Roblin, we can blame that on to Walter Weir." Duff Roblin never paid out a cent under his administration, Walter Weir paid out \$14.3 million, and that's where that stands July 15, 1969.

MRS. TRUEMAN: And a bunch of naive guys that we have.

MR. MOUG: Under an agreement, under an agreement that was negotiated by Duff Roblin for 92.1 million, and it says right here, Section 8 sub (1). Any time this money is not being spent correctly cut them off . . .

A MEMBER: According to that statute that you're reading . . . \$40 million.

MR. MOUG: I agree, Mr. Chairman. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I agree with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, certainly you can get it all back according to that. Now if you can't you can't. What's out is lost. But it was all that bad in 1969, July 15, 1969. When the agreement was made for 92.1 there was only 14 point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: I rise on a point of order. Now -- (Interjection) -- no, it's a point of order. The responsibilities or not for what occurred with regard to that incident are now being reviewed by a Commission of Inquiry. That Commission of Inquiry is going to say what they thought should be done and at which time. I understand that the normal rules are that when that is occurring, that there is not debate on the substantive issues that are being considered by the Inquiry in the House. Now, as to when money was paid out and things of that nature, there is no argument about those things. I have absolutely no hesitation about entering into a debate on this question and showing that the Member for Charleswood as usual is not making any sense at all, but I wonder whether that is permitted. The fact, Mr. Speaker, that we lent out, that \$14 million was advanced on this day on a contract which required us to advance \$92 million at a certain day is a fact. Well the Honourable Member the Member for Fort Rouge she's also a lawyer. She's also a lawyer. She knows better than the Commission of Inquiry; she thinks we should disband it. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the rules permit, which I doubt it, I would be prepared to debate the question because there is certainly no sensitivity on my part that for a

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) short period of time, and while we were getting that information Gordie Howe star of the Detroit Redwings, the day that he left the spokesman for the Conservative Party said: "Today Gordie Howe left the Detroit Redwings." I'll read the speech to you. That was the reaction of the honourable members. Now Mr. Speaker, if we are going to . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: May I be permitted to speak on the same point of order raised by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, the House Leader? Mr. Chairman, I believe what the Member for Charleswood was doing, in speaking on this subject, was simply indicating no sensitivity on our part to discuss the subject matter he has raised and in fact merely reciting chronological order of events that is public knowledge and that this House has shown no reluctance to put on to the public record from time to time and certainly either the Speaker - - I'm not so sure about you, Sir, in your capacity as Chairman of this Committee, whether or not you've had occasion to rule on this. But the question raised, the sub judice question raised by the House Leader is one that I don't think stands up in this instance. The Member from Charleswood is not debating the matter of substance that is referred to by the House Leader with respect to possible decisions arrived at by the Commission of Inquiry, he is relating a chronological order of events which is public knowledge as to the amount of money two administrations involved are responsible for with respect to the construction of the CFI complex.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on this very point, I cannot agree with the acting Leader of the Conservative Party because - - (Interjection) - - Yes, definitely, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Swan River would agree with me that I have a firm foundation in which to stand in disagreement with my honourable friend, because one of the terms of reference, as I understand it, to the Commission of Inquiry into CFI does deal with the chronological aspect of the establishment - - (Interjection) - - I beg your pardon, Sir? - with the establishment of the industry at The Pas and it does involve, as the Member for Lakeside properly stated, to government, the previous administration and this administration. And it doesn't matter, really, the date of that reference but it deals, Mr. Chairman, may I say, with the terms of reference to the Commission that is considering all aspects dealing and pertaining to CFI to try to isolate certain instances in the operation of CFI, as I understand that the Honourable Member for Charleswood is trying to do, is beside the point. And I would say in all due respect that as far as I am concerned, and I'm sure my colleagues are concerned, that there will be a day of reckoning insofar as all aspects of CFI. - - (Interjection) - - No, I'm not - oh, I know somebody over there, Mr. Chairman, said that I may not live to see it. There's a heck of a lot of people in this province didn't think that I was going to live to see the day that I have reached at the present time, and he can be right, and I would suggest to that honourable member he may not live a day longer; that is in the lap of the gods. And I'm sure that he will recognize that.

But my whole point, Mr. Chairman, is that I cannot accept the contention of the acting Leader - - (Interjection) - - Pardon? Oh, the Deputy Leader - as I indeed at the present time am Deputy Premier of the Province of Manitoba. I cannot accept his contention that we can take in isolation the points raised by the Honourable Member for Charleswood and say that because he is raising certain points that it is not sub judice because, as I understand the terms of reference to the Commission headed by the former Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba, the Honourable Rhodes Smith, is all encompassing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if this Assembly, either in Committee or in regular business, wants to cast aside what has been historic ever since the foundation of the Mother of Parliaments, then maybe we could consider that, by a substantive motion in the Assembly, that the basic principle of not discussing in this House a matter referred to the courts should be cast aside. But until that is done, Mr. Chairman, I say in all respect to my honourable friends opposite and also my honourable friends on this side of the House, until that is done the points raised by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, the point raised by the acting Leader of the Conservative Party is out of order. We are in control of the rules of this House; we use Beauchesne, we use May's, and we use other authorities, to assist us in the guidance of the methodology or the procedures in this House, and from time to time, Mr. Chairman, we have relied on external authorities. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, may I say this: that even within our

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) own rules of this House it states that where our precise rules do not contain provisions, then the rulings of the federal House are applicable, and if they are not applicable, that is the rules of the House of Commons in Ottawa, then we go to the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to the acting or the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party, the Member for Charleswood, until such time as we change our rules then the rules, if not applicable within the little red book or blue book that we have, that the normal procedures of the House of Commons, the Mother of Parliaments, should decide the conduct of this House and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you should consider this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, before we have your ruling, if I may . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable former House Leader indicated where we get our rules from and certainly the first source is our own rules, and in particular precedents set in our application of our own rules. And I suggested to you in my few remarks earlier that under those circumstances the kind of discussion and debate entered into by the Member from Charleswood is completely within the bounds of the rules that we have established for ourselves in dealing with this matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, furthermore, the former House Leader indicates that it doesn't make any difference to him what date or what happened and the chronological order of certain things. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely of course the point that the honourable member wishes to discuss. It is of a great deal of importance for us, for this Chamber, and to the people of Manitoba to know who in fact was responsible for the paying out of some \$90 million, and it is particularly apropos that it come at this time in the discussions of this Minister who on several occasions today, yesterday and the day before, has stood up and indicated to us how prepared he is and how fully aware he is of his responsibility as Minister to take full and complete responsibility for those who are -- who work and serve under him in the administration of that government. Now what the Member for Charleswood has indicated to you, Sir, and this House, is that as of July 15th with the assumption of that responsibility which this Minister has never denied, and I would hope none others, that that administration has paid out by far the bulk, the majority of the money that has gone into the CFI complex. And that, Mr. Chairman, is what the Member for Charleswood is talking about, which has been talked about before in this Chamber and if he wishes to remind us of that, refresh our memory of those clauses that were contained in master agreements and indeed contained in The Manitoba Development Act itself, then that, Sir, is most proper.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order.

MR. GREEN: . . . if the honourable member will let me. I have no objection to proceeding. I indicated that I thought it was before a Royal Commission. I have no objection to proceeding. If that will shorten the point then perhaps we could proceed.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thought I was recognized.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I was going to offer a similar warning, that a ruling at this time may not be desirable. If the government is willing to have the matter discussed and then it doesn't place you in the position of having a ruling that's almost certainly going to be challenged. So if the government are indicating they are willing to entertain debate on this matter I think that's the end of it.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, point out, and I am accused from time to time of being a traditionalist, I want to point out to all members of this House that we may be establishing a new precedent for this House. There is a provision in our rules that if there isn't any precise rule of the House dealing with the question of sub judice, then we refer to the other Houses. But I do want to say, and I agree with my colleague, the Member from Inkster, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that because this matter is before a Royal Commission and technically before the courts, that if we do agree here today now --

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) (Interjection) -- You haven't even heard what I've said and may I suggest to you you unplug your ears. -- May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if in this instance we agree that in this Assembly a full discussion on a matter that is before the courts is permitted, in all due respect to my colleague, that we will be establishing a precedence on every other case that may be before the courts in the Province of Manitoba. And if it is the desire of the members of this Assembly to so establish a precedent, I have no objection, but I do want, Mr. Chairman, to warn members of this House that when we do establish a precedent it is not for today or tomorrow but for all time, and that any matter, be it dealing with the CFI or any other matter that is before the courts, that it can be debated simultaneously in this House.

All I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, as a traditionalist, as one who has, I feel, studied some of the rules of procedure entirely and observed to the letter of the law, I want to say to the members of this Assembly - and I say this in deference to my colleague - - (Interjection) - - You wouldn't understand what the hell I'm talking about. But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the rulings of this Assembly are established by precedent and if we today agree - and I'm not going to say that we shouldn't, all I am trying to infer to my colleagues in the House - - (Interjection) - - Yes, and I want to penetrate the ivory that you wiggled - - all I'm trying to say, Mr. Chairman, that once this principle is established, every matter that is before the courts will be permissible for debate in this House, be it murder, be it abortion or anything else, and that, Mr. Chairman, I suggest is the basis of whatever we decide today.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I must beg you the privilege of continuing on the point of order. Mr. Chairman, the former House Leader insists on demonstrating to us his limited capacity in understanding and even common sense. I repeat to you, Mr. Chairman, and I try to keep my arguments non-inflammatory, the Member for Charleswood requested in an Order for Return certain information. The government accepted that Order for Return and has returned that information dealing with a very limited aspect, an aspect by the way which is public knowledge, and the Member for Charleswood has decided to expand or use part of that information in the address that he now intends to make before this Chamber, and that deals not with abortion, not with murder nor with what the Commission of Inquiry will eventually determine, but it does deal with the placing of responsibility and the acknowledgement of responsibility of who paid what to whom. And within that framework, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you have to consider the legitimacy of the Member for Charleswood's position in furthering his discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland on the same point of order.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I feel very strongly that this should be allowed to be debated because . . .

A MEMBER: All right, let's go. I won't object.

MR. FROESE: . . . the MDC Report falls under his department and certainly that is subject to discussion, which includes parts of the CFI deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, on the same point of order?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would withdraw the point of order so that there would be no ruling because I'd rather, Mr. Speaker, that there - - (Interjection) - - Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rather that the member proceed in the light of what has been said and try to proceed on the basis of not discussing matters which are apt to be determined by the Court of Inquiry, and if we can proceed in that way, Mr. Chairman, we will have no difficulty.

A MEMBER: He can't do it.

MR. GREEN: Well let him try.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns. The same point of order?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I think we are arriving at some sort of understanding. The Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party has said that who paid what and when is what the Member for Charleswood is about to speak about - and to whom. This part I understand, Mr. Chairman. The only concern I have as a person who has appeared as a witness before the Commission and is subject to recall, although there is no indication that I will be recalled, and knowing that there are certain witnesses that have yet to appear before the Commission, some of whom I believe have already appeared and will be recalled, I

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) personally feel a real restraint of entering into any debate dealing with advice received, dealing with decisions arrived at and the reasons therefor, and dealing with really the background of actions by me and by my other colleagues.

Now I don't feel that I have a right to debate. I really don't think that this House can give me a right which I think I'm denied in principle from being able to debate the kind of evidence I gave and the kind of evidence that is yet to appear, and whether this House would follow the thought of the Minister of Labour or not I don't feel that I really could myself debate it, so that when the Member for Charleswood started to talk about the decisions that were made and the reason for decisions made, which I think he was verging on when he was stopped by the Minister of Mines, then I think that the Minister of Mines was correct; but if we come back to the information given in that Order Paper, and who paid what to whom and when, then of course that's a matter of public information, so that I could agree with the last few sentences of the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party if the Honourable Member for Charleswood will have listened to him and will follow that kind of mind then I would not feel restrained, but I would if it was beyond that.

MR. GREEN: . . . they said there was no ruling to be made unless there is objection raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . if in line with, I understand that right now there is no point of order before the Chair. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, Mr. Chairman, really I had no intention of getting into the whys and wherefores and anything that is sub judice in any way. I wanted to make no mention of it. The idea of standing here today in my place was to place opposition against the doings of the government since July 15, 1969 when they took office. I feel that I stayed within the bounds of that very, very closely and I apologize if I stepped out of it. I was saying that as I read Section 8 (1) it's the responsibility of that government to see that the moneys are placed in their proper perspective spent on the complex in question and certainly not in any other way. We have heard a good many stories since that and I have no intention of going into those because that would be infringing and getting into something that could be sub judice and in the courts of today, but certainly I think the government was faulty in not first of all reading the Act that the MDC was governed by and protecting the people's money in the Province of Manitoba.

Our previous administration under Walter Weir, there was never any question on the 14.3 that he spent out that they had placed before the inspectors, the people that went out there to check to see that the moneys were being spent correctly, that there was enough.

MR. GREEN: This is the point. The honourable member is now going to go into the substance of whether that money was advanced properly, if subsequent money was not advanced properly, whether it should have been, whether it shouldn't have been, whether the law requires to or did not require it to and that, Mr. Chairman, is what the Court of Inquiry is considering. Well, of course. And if you say that this is a section of the Act you feel that this section of the Act protected the people, we will see what the Court of Inquiry says with regard to that. But you say that there was no question that the money was properly advanced under Walter Weir or that the agreements were properly made and that subsequently money was improperly advanced under the new administration that is what the Inquiry is looking into.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would caution the honourable member that if he's going to pursue that line I am going to have to make a ruling.

MR. MOUG: The reference, the first . . . what I'm trying to get at is, a small portion of the money was paid out by previous administrations and for what was there, and where section 8 subsection (3) says, "If the government or MDC who is governed by this government of today, could have stepped in and told them we are advancing no more money until we see whether the complex is on the way. Now all of a sudden we find out the complex is not on its way after we get to -- (Interjection) -- no, some \$92 million, some \$92 million - at the date of receivership we find out all of a sudden \$98 million instead of \$8500 was spent out and apparently the money has not been spent at CFI and The Pas. That's the point in question - that this government failed and failed sadly in administering MDC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, the Honourable Member is starting to stray again.

MR. MOUG: Pardon me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're starting to stray again.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. MOUG: Well, I say that the government failed miserably and the government did fail miserably.

MR. GREEN: . . . Mr. Chairman, you know, now we are going to have debate on what happened between . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order please.

MR. MOUG: Well, of course, but that isn't something . . .

CHAIRMAN'S RULING - SUB JUDICE

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would refer the honourable member to citation 149 of Beauchesne section (c) refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending and also refer him to the Journals of the House, the Legislative Assembly Manitoba 1965, March 24, Madam Speaker made the following ruling: "The Order of the Day being read for the consideration of the proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Roblin that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of ways and means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, Madam Speaker ruled as follows: 'Dealing with this debate, which I have had under consideration concerning the sub judice matter raised in the House by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with respect to the reference to the Grand Rapids Water Haulage Commission, seeking guidance from our rules, orders and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, I find in the 1951 edition, Rule 41 reads as follows: No member shall refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending nor make reference to judges and courts of the justice, and to personages of high official and station of nature of a personal attack or censure, and on April 5th the words 'in court of law' were added after the word 'pending' where it appears in the rule. "

Our rules of 1960, which we are presently using, made no reference in Rule 41 as it appeared in 1951. Thus I must rely on other parliamentary authorities and give consideration to the practice followed in the federal House. May's 16th edition page 359 refers to a court of law under the examples of inadmissible questions. Section 6 reads as follows: "Reflecting on the decision of a court of law or being likely to prejudice a case which is under trial. "

Also Page 400 May's refers to matters pending judicial decisions and reads in part as follows: "A matter which is under the adjudication by a court of law should not be brought before the House by motion or otherwise. "

And on Page 457, May's reads as follows - - now if the honourable members wish me to read this whole . . . "And Madam Speaker subsequently ruled the motion out of order, the ruling was challenged, and the following was resolved in the affirmative, that the Speaker's ruling be upheld by a vote of 41-12. " If you wish, I will read the members' names out. Challenged by the Leader of the Opposition. I would ask the honourable member to try to stay within the confines of the rules of this House.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES (cont'd)

MR. MOUG: Well, Mr. Chairman, I apologize again. I find a little difficulty possibly trying to put my point across. I'm trying to say to you that MDC is, not in the CFI instance but in most instances where they're lending money, and as I say they are a lending agency of the last resort and possibly have to pick up the bad along with the very few good, they are picking up a lot of bad ones. We know that, and possibly a good instance is Saunders Aircraft in Gimli and this is not sub judice. I would like to say to you that the government is backing up an area that the Federal Government seems to have no want to get in and put in any great amount of moneys into this aircraft manufacturing. I'm not opposed to it because it's creating jobs in Manitoba and that's what we're looking for is jobs in Manitoba. But it seems funny that you can't take that aircraft into United States and get a certificate of airworthiness; you have to sell them to Columbia or, I don't know where you have to sell them to. I don't think, I don't know but I don't think you can get a certificate of airworthiness in Canada for that aircraft, and it seems to me that it's a funny thing that we're manufacturing aircraft like that when the American government, the Department of Transport there, does not seem to want to back it up.

Now, that's only one area. I say that this Order for Return that you gave me, I thank you very much for it. It's public knowledge and I'll see that it becomes that way very much, and certainly if I can't pass my opinion on it in this House . . .

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce have a point of order?

MR. EVANS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of privilege has been raised.

MR. EVANS: Well Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's making statements with regard to the certificate of airworthiness or the registration of that particular aircraft, which are inaccurate. It is eligible for commercial activity in Canada and indeed three-quarters of the world, but not yet the United States, but this . . .

MR. MOUG: That's what I said.

MR. EVANS: Oh no, but you - - Mr. Chairman, he made reference to availability in Canada and the fact is that it has airworthiness certification for about two-thirds to three-quarters of the world.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order please. I would again refer honourable members to Citation 105 of Beauchesne: "Feud arising . . . two honourable members as to allegation of fact hardly fulfills the condition of a privileged question, and if it's deemed to be a matter, if it was entertained, it would be more convenient to postpone other business rather than extend the area of privilege." The Honourable Member for Charleswood. Are you through?

MR. MOUG: No, I'm not finished, no. Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Industry and Commerce got up and made mention, I said that to my knowledge there was no certificate of airworthiness for that aircraft that they are manufacturing in Gimli by Saunders to fly in the United States of America. I'm positive of that. And I said I don't think it's even air - - I said I don't think, I personally don't think it has certificate of . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Now you know better.

MR. MOUG: Well, now I know that and I thank you very much for that, but to get up and say that I was saying something wrong, I wasn't. I said "I don't think," and I thank him for that - - (Interjection) - - That's right. Well, if the Minister of Agriculture knew everything he got on his feet about, I don't think that our farmers in this province would have the problems we're having today, because they're certainly badly led. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I think that the people of Manitoba are concerned to a greater degree than what the government realizes today about everything that the NDP's handling, and I know that it's - - they get the customers in the last instance and they're lending money out to - - some are bad risks and, as I said before, it's creating jobs and this is our first concern; but certainly the government has got to keep an eye on where this money's going to make sure that it's handed out in the proper manner; there's no way if you borrow \$20,000 to build a house with today, that there isn't an inspector following you around before the money's advanced to you that you can go ahead and go down to pick up the cheque, so I think this is something the government's got to implement and employ in their department. That's all I have at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll proceed in the usual order and go from the last speaker to the first one who spoke. With regard to the Manitoba Development Corporation, the honourable member has indicated that he thinks that the corporation is advancing moneys without proper procedures being taken to protect those advances. If he is aware of this I would be most happy to learn of it, because that is something that we would immediately want to clamp down on.

The honourable member refers to the Churchill Forest Industries. I agree entirely with what the Member for Lakeside said, that from July 15th on, the responsibility for what took place in that corporation rests with this government. As to whether the government operated reasonably discharging its responsibility is something that's being looked at by a royal commission. The honourable member will find, and it is also a matter of public record, that all of the members of the government were of the opinion as given by written affirmation by the director of a corporation that the borrowing procedures and advanced procedures were all protected, (1) by legal considerations, and secondly, by the on site and other agencies who were hired to determine that the money was being properly spent.

Now, as to what happened beyond that and how money was advanced which perhaps should not have been advanced, I imagine that that is going to be told to us by the Industrial Inquiry Commission. My evidence is on the record, the evidence of the First Minister is on the record, it has been heard by the commission, and they will say whether the government in discharging its responsibility did something wrong or right. There's no doubt that it was our

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . responsibility as there can be no doubt that it was the responsibility of the previous administration to have signed a contract where they had committed 92 millions of dollars to be advanced with the kind of fees that were incorporated in the contract? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying - - now the honourable member takes up a book, you know; now we have another lawyer in the House. Now the Member for Sturgeon Creek - - (Interjection) - - well then don't; if you admit that you are not a lawyer then don't deal with things that you do not understand.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that it should come as no shock to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that when the Manitoba Development Corporation enters into a commitment to fund something and it has no knowledge that the funds are being advanced improperly, that the security is the security that it gauged the advances on, and that all of the things that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek refers to in the section are indeed, to the knowledge of the government, taking place. There is no way that you can say the money stops and "we want our money back."

And by the way, how do you get your money? Well the Member for Fort Rouge, you know, the Member for Fort Rouge is just - is just so silly concerning that matter, that I refer her to the judgment of Mr. Justice Nitikman, where the Manitoba Development Corporation entered into an agreement under the previous administration for which her friends are responsible, and she wants to be silly about it, whereby they undertook to give Great Northern Capital all of the money that they needed to operate Columbia Forest Products. They undertook to give them all necessary working capital, all necessary working capital - - (Interjection) - - What is it? Well, Mr. Chairman, all right, want to talk; I want to talk about a case to show that your reading of the law makes no sense at all. They undertook the great Great Northern working capital - and this is by a judgment of the court, not by what I am saying or the member, or the sea lawyer the Member for Sturgeon Creek, or the sea lawyer the Member for Charleswood are saying, because the Member for Sturgeon Creek brought it up last week, took out the Corporation Act and said "The corporation is entitled to stop payments and demand immediate payment of \$14 million." Small chance.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I read it.

MR. GREEN: Yeah. Well, you read it. Then what you're telling me is that you read it and you know that it doesn't mean what you implied that it means, because Mr. Justice Nitikman said, "Oh no, corporation can't take back the money. If security is exactly what it thought it was, it is being asked to advance money under the exact terms that it's asked to, and when it didn't advance that money it was in breach of contract, and I assumed that in 1970, in the spring of 1970, when we said that we have to fulfill the commitments provided that these people are engaging in the progress of the contract, we didn't get . . . Then the Member for River Heights or the Member for Charleswood or the Member for Sturgeon Creek is saying, "By all means stop. Stop advancing the money. It's a bad deal. What we had is the Member for Riel coming in and saying, "Today Gordie Howe quit the - or was dismissed by the Detroit Red Wings. Do you remember that black day? That's the day that Rex Grose resigned." And the honourable members on the other side said, what would be the equivalent emotion if someone found out that Gordie Howe, the man of the year, Mr. Manitoba, had left the Detroit Red Wings.

Now, in view of the manner in which the Fund had been operating, in view of the manner in which memos had been exchanged back and forth, in view of all of the evidence that the Inquiry Commission has heard I presume that they will answer for the honourable member, for the other people in this House and for all of the people of Manitoba whether they felt that was reasonable for what, when they felt that responsibilities were discharged in a way that were reasonable and when they assumed that responsibilities were discharged in a way that was unreasonable. And by the way, after they say that, let me say it once, that the Member for Charleswood doesn't have to agree with them. He can come in or somebody on any side of the House or the people of Manitoba, they don't have to agree with them; they can say, here is what the facts are, here is what the Commission Inquiry says, I still think that it was that man's fault or the other man's fault or somebody else's fault. And we will wait, I hope, and you know we've had a little bit on it today, and I repeat other than the very sound considerations that were being pursued by the Minister of Labour as to whether you really think - - well does the Member for Charleswood really think that if tomorrow we had a Commission of Inquiry to

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) determine whether the Conservative administration should have entered into the Churchill River development at all and built Kettle Rapids, or something else. What did you do that was good? It's difficult to think of. Let me think of something that the Conservative administration did that was good. When there was an inquiry as to whether, as to whether - - I don't want to use that one because it was a bad one. If it was being inquired into as to whether there was wrongful things happening in Dauphin as a result of the Minister of Highways, the former Minister's having suggested that there was something wrong there does the Member for Charleswood really believe that in spite of that occurring, in spite of it being before a Royal Commission or a judicial inquiry - and I suggest that the rules are exactly the same with regard to each and that's why they appointed - that the members of the House should debate that issue during the course of the inquiry? Because that's what he's talking about, and I think that's all the Minister of Labour was saying and I was hoping that we could more or less have the discussion continue in a way which does not infringe on what the Commission of Inquiry is doing, and I'm saying that we know certain things. The Member for Lakeside is right.

We know that contracts were entered into; we know that up to July 15th \$14 million was spent; we know that after July 15th, 82 or more million dollars was spent; we know from the evidence that we have read in the paper that certain procedures were followed or were not followed; we know that the Act says a certain thing, and all of these considerations have been put before the Inquiry Commission and they're going to try to assess what happened, what should have happened, where were mistakes being made. And before they do, for us to argue them in the House I think is unprofitable and I think that that's why the rule is there. I didn't make the rule. The rule has been there for years. And that's all that we were trying to say. There is no desire to hide anything that was occurring and as a matter of fact there has been reams of evidence published on this thing and I think some more is being obtained. I admit, Mr. Speaker, and admitted last year, that if the government kept Rex Grose on longer than it should have that that was a mistake, that's a mistake. We shouldn't have done it, you know, but I prefer to let the Commission of Inquiry look into the thing and see what they come to.

With regard to Saunders Aircraft I've indicated to the honourable members that it's really not going to be a practice of mine to get into the internal affairs of the Corporation. You will be able to get generally internal matters and you will also be able to get the government's financial position with regard to each of these corporations when it comes before the Economic Development Committee and when the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Fund reports.

I am glad that the honourable member realizes that the Development Corporation is going to be one that is going to from time to time be involved in transactions which will not show black figures, because if it wasn't involved in that there wouldn't be a development corporation. If all the figures were going to be black they wouldn't be coming to us for money. They're coming because it is a problem, various reasons. One is that possibly national concerns are not interested in locating in Manitoba and yet a Manitoba concern would be viable, therefore the development company should try it, but nobody else will. Things of that nature and I really appreciate that the honourable member appears to have a good understanding of that and I have no real disagreement with him on that point.

The Honourable member for Portage la Prairie said that we should know whether the export of power is an essential feature of the hydro plans. I thought that that is without question. The only question that was involved is whether the export is going to be firm or surplus and the length of the commitment. But the entire Churchill River diversion economics as I understand it is based on the fact that you are going to need this program, that if you build it now you will have surplus energy for a certain number of years, that that surplus energy could be used to pay for the program - - not for the entire program but to make the program more economic; that all of those figures have been fed into the computer and the result is that if we proceed in this way it is by far the most advantageous program. So there is no question that there is, and right in the agreement entered into in '66 "that we will try to sell surplus power." And there are discussions, have been discussions with the United States but the statements in the magazine articles are not to be taken as the statements of the government. The government is, or Manitoba Hydro is involved in discussing these things. My information, which I believe to be accurate, is that there are no signed firm power agreements for sale to the United States at this point, that that is not the case.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

I'm not saying that that would be a good thing or a bad thing. I want the Honourable Member for Portage to know what kind of contradictions there are concerning this question, because one of the strongest opponents of the Churchill River diversion at the present time, that is Mr. Ed Kuiper, is one of the strongest, is and was I believe, although he now says something different and I'll indicate what he says to be, was one of the strongest opponents for the sale of fresh water to the United States. Now if you start talking about the merits or demerits of selling power as against the selling of water, you will find many many more people who are willing to sell power than are willing to sell fresh water, yet Ed Kuiper is now opposed to the diversion and in favour of selling water.

Now, Mr. Kuiper may challenge that at this point because I heard him challenge it at the university. When I first met Mr. Kuiper it was in 1968 and the Member for Riel will remember. I made a speech in the House on having met Mr. Kuiper; he was very much anxious to start to think about the sale of fresh water from Canada to United States. He was going to do it by numerous diversions including having the water from Lake Winnipeg go down into the United States, things of that nature. This was his big pitch to me when I met him at the university. We spent at least an hour and a half talking about it. For the last half hour he brought in a new subject which he wanted to discuss with me and that was the Churchill River diversion and he said that he was very much opposed to Manitoba Hydro using this diversion program to create power because of the problems that would be created to the ecology and to the Indian community of South Indian Lake.

Mr. Chairman, these were at both one and the same meetings. One was that he was for and advocating and widely published on the question of the sale of fresh water, and the second was against the Churchill River Diversion. Now the sale of water involved diversions and he was apparently for it for that and also involved changing the ecology. When I brought this to the attention of the students at the University of Manitoba where I was on a platform with Mr. Kuiper he said that when I was for the sale of water I was for the diversion. Now that I am against the diversion I am also against the sale of water. All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that with great respect Ed Kuiper told me about both of these ideas on the same day, that he was for the sale of water, against the Churchill River diversion, and that it did not become a case that when he became against the diversion he also became against the sale of water. At least it wasn't on the day I saw him in '68. And you members will recall that I did not raise the Churchill diversion at that time because I did not think that it was the kind of problem that was being suggested, my opinion on that came much later. But when I was at the university and from certain other sources I've heard, the Communist Party came here and made the rather audacious suggestion, and I can't say whether it is right or wrong. All I can tell you is that much worse things have been said about my position by these people than I would attribute to them, but the Communist Party's position was that the reason that Kuiper and Booy are against the Churchill River diversion is because if it was committed then for power purposes they would be unable to sell water to the United States. Now I don't make that charge; the only charge I make is that Ed Kuiper was for the sale of water and against the Churchill River diversion, on the same day when I met him in the spring of 1968. And if he now says that those two things are inconsistent with one another then he has to live with that because he brought those two subjects to my mind on one and the same day.

I am not proposing the sale of firm power contracts to the United States; on the other hand, yes, I am proposing that we use our surplus power capacity as long as we make sure beyond a doubt that it is surplus power, which it will be with the Churchill River diversion, to sell and thereby reduce the power costs to the citizens of Manitoba. I don't see how anybody could be against that. I mean don't we do that with everything else. Well I don't know that the Member for Portage la Prairie is against it, he didn't say that he was against it. All he said is are we proceeding with the Churchill River in order to have power for export. No. The Churchill River diversion is being proceeded with because we know if we look at our power needs that on a certain date that part of the system is going to have to be there. It's being proceeded with today because knowing that it's going to have to be there if you proceed with it today you can get part of the costs of it paid for it by the export of power. Now doesn't that make sense to the honourable member as a businessman? I repeat what I said in the House yesterday: If you need 10,000 square feet of space for a warehouse ten years from now and

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) you only need 5,000 today, but you can build the 10,000 and rent out the 5,000 and help pay for the 5,000 that you're using and the economics come out right, wouldn't you do it? Why not? And if that is the entire argument against the Churchill River diversion, that some of the water while we are in a surplus position is going to be used for export to the United States, well, Mr. Speaker, that becomes a very very weak position, because in my opinion it does not make any sense.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland raised some questions about drainage. I'm happy to hear that there are drainage projects proceeding in his constituency. As far as more drainage, all I can tell him is that is a standard position and I expect him to take it and the amount of drainage funds that we have allocated is to keep drainage at the same pace that we've had it in the past plus the cost of inflation. It is then divided among the sectors of the province in relation to priority. I note the honourable member has gotten some priority treatment which I am happy to hear.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM (St. Rose): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say a few words arising out of some of the remarks made by some of the honourable members on both sides of the House. The Member for Radisson, I think, brought up a quite valid point when he mentioned that in the Turtle River Marsh there was an extremely high loss of ducks after they had been shot because of the high density of reeds; in fact in some areas they grow as tall as 8 or 9 feet. I can speak with authority on this because approximately 300 acres of the Turtle River Marsh are on my own private lands, and I would be quite agreeable to turning that area into a waterfowl preserve if it's feasible. I think the member has a very valid point on that.

And the Member for Portage la Prairie mentioned the Delta Marsh and the extremely poor condition that it is in at the present time. I am very pleased that he is concerned about this because I am sure that if he'll recall that I brought the matter of the Portage diversion, I believe last year and possibly the year before in this House. I objected on the grounds that I was not convinced that the waters flowing from the Assiniboine were such that we'd want to have in Lake Manitoba or in the Delta Marsh because I am convinced that those waters are poisoning the Delta Marsh. This is my opinion, Sir, and he mentioned that the level has been quite constant for quite a number of years on Lake Manitoba, in the order of 812/3 thereabouts, but the wind factor is such that you may have four feet at the south end of Lake Manitoba when you have a three-day north wind you have a lot of flow coming in, and I say to you, Sir, that any time that you're going to allow water from the Assiniboine to go into a clean lake you're going to cause some problems, algae problems. I doubt that the point of flushing it out and flushing it somewhere else is the answer but I appreciate your concern. What my opinion is is that we should not allow too much water from the Assiniboine to go down into Lake Manitoba. That is why I brought the matter up last year.

CORRECTION

I want to correct a statement, Mr. Chairman, correct a statement in Hansard and also in the press regarding my remarks I made in reference to the drastic reduction in the pickerel production on Lake Winnipegosis. My statement was intended to say that the pickerel catch on Lake Winnipegosis in a few short years had reduced from three million pounds to 100,000 pounds. In Hansard it shows 300 pounds, as it's printed in Hansard and in the paper, in the media it says 300,000 pounds to 100,000. I repeat this because I think it's very important that people be aware of how big of a reduction there has been in the production of pickerel on Lake Winnipegosis. It's three million pounds down to 100,000 pounds -- and that's a reduction, gentlemen.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES (cont'd)

The Member for Charleswood seemed to be having quite some difficulty in presenting his remarks and he said the former premier of this province had advanced some \$14.3 million to CFI I believe. I think what the honourable member should have been saying, Mr. Chairman, was that the former premier of this province who is an undertaker by trade, undertook to take the people of this province for a ride and he did an adequate job of it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I do protest, if this kind of talk is going to persist then we certainly demand the same privilege on this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Resolution 82 a (1). The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the member would give me four minutes before he talks. The Member for Portage asked me about the Delta Marsh, I didn't answer him. I want to tell him that in September I believe of this year, yes in September the Delta Marsh Wildlife - a decision was made in principle to create a Delta Marsh Wildlife Management Area, that the Department of Mines will establish procedure for public participation in a Delta Marsh program; that within the spirit and intent of these two principles the Department of Mines will proceed with the first stage Delta Marsh Rehabilitation and Development program, namely the preparation of detailed work plans specifying objectives, methods, cost, anticipated benefits and proposed evaluation. In this connection the Department of Mines is now negotiating with the Canadian Wildlife Service toward a joint agreement regarding a program for the Delta Marsh Rehabilitation area. My impression is that the cost of this Phase 1 is \$30,000.00. That is my memory, I don't have that on paper.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . ask the Minister another question. I understand there's a plan in the department somewhere, Water Control Department, to pipe water from the diversion into the marsh. As the Minister knows the diversion cuts across the marsh and stops the west to east flow which used to have a flushing action on a large area of the marsh. The Member for Ste. Rose expressed an interest in this subject.

It's my understanding that the only water that comes into the marsh is from the watershed that comes towards Lake Manitoba from the west and the north. While there is a certain amount of wind action very little of that water from the lake gets into the marsh. There's a dam at Clandeboye and this effectively stops the wind action from flushing the marsh. Some of the tributary creeks have been so plugged up with waste and reeds and what not that there's now no fish where there used to be a great deal of good edible fish in the marsh. The only fish of any consequence that get in the marsh now are the what they call the garbage fish - the carp. They get in there, then they're trapped in there by the dams and don't get out again, and these fish are eating the vegetation that formerly was good for the duck breeding. So one problem is compounding to another. There's no more muskrats to speak of, there's no decent fish and now the duck population is declining because of the lack of decent food. So while this may seem like a localized matter, it's really one of the tremendous resources of Manitoba where every year people come from all over the world to study, to examine and to enjoy that area. So I hope that the Minister will take this as a special project and try and correct some of the neglect that has gone on ever since we started to take an interest in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, a few words with regards to some of the topics that have been under discussion today. First of all with regards to the topic that's introduced by the Member for Charleswood here that has aroused some concern and discussion and a little bit of heat in the House with regards to how the House should handle matters when they are under inquiry by other bodies. I think that it has to be pointed out here that we have on many occasions in the House had this matter break loose every once in awhile and it hasn't been the members of the Opposition that have begun the exchange when it did take place. I think it has to be pointed out that probably the most damaging statement that was ever made in this House, and it's worth pointing out, was made by the First Minister when he stood in his place one day and attacked without provocation from this side of the House, and accused a former member of the House of lying. That member was to appear before the Inquiry Commission within ten days of that statement.

Mr. Chairman, if we're going to be critical of people bringing up this topic in this House the Government and particularly the First Minister should recall the precedence that was set in this House by himself. The main point that is to be made by the Member for Charleswood is one that has to be underlined, and that is that the original pay-out procedure as far as the former government was concerned was in accordance with the provisions of the Manitoba Development Fund Act, Development Fund at that time. In which case the pay-outs were made on receipt of goods or in the receipt of whether those goods were concrete in the ground or buildings in the air or whether they were drawings produced and made bona fide by the consultants who were on the project at that time, namely Arthur D. Little and the staff of the Manitoba Development Fund.

Mr. Chairman, we had shortly after the change in government in 1969 a statement made by the First Minister of the government that -- I don't have the clipping now or the report on it, it made headline news of course at that time -- which indicated to the people of Manitoba that in fact that there had been some readjustments made in the arrangements with regard to the project and it implied, Mr. Chairman, that a one-third - two-thirds cost-sharing procedure had been arrived at. Well, Mr. Chairman, regardless of the details it was fully understood by even those of us who were more familiar with the projects than the average Manitoban, it was understood by ourselves that the government had full check and rein on the activities of the Manitoba Development Corporation in regard to this particular project. The government in effect said we are taking a hold of this project, we're running the show.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but think that if the government had run the show to the extent that the Minister of Mines and Resources has indicated in the last few days that he runs his department and that those that do work for him and are responsible to him as staff people,

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) namely, he must stand up and defend their actions, then they must surely take that same philosophy and apply it to the operation of the Manitoba Development Corporation and the new changes, the new deals that were brought about with regard to the CFI project shortly after they took power.

But Mr. Chairman, the main point that the Member for Charleswood wanted to make was the point that if the pay-out procedures were changed and money was advanced not on receipt of goods but on placement of the order, which there is some indication publicly has been the case, we're not going to take that responsibility, Mr. Chairman. That is the responsibility of the government; they set their course shortly after they took power and they have to assume that responsibility, the doling out of the money and the method and procedures under which it was given out. That I am sure is completely within the realm of discussion of this House and was the main point that has to be made.

The main point, Mr. Chairman, was the pay-out procedure changed with regards to the administrative procedures for the Manitoba Development Corporation in relation to CFI? That is the point at issue and is the point that is going to be discussed repeatedly, and we certainly will not breach the code established . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is not going to be the one who decides when there is a breach. I've again tried to permit the honourable member to proceed without rising on a point of order which I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . call the honourable member to order.

MR. GREEN: . . . but if he is going, Mr. Chairman, if he is going to be talking about how this was done, under whose responsibility it's done and why it was done and whose fault it was and who knew about it - there is no doubt that the responsibility for government after July 15th went to the New Democratic Party and they have to assume responsibility for it; there's no doubt about that. As to whether they did the right things in discharging that responsibility or not is something that the Commission is looking into. As to how the pay-outs were changed, who did it, whether it was done surreptitiously, whether it was done secretly, whether it was kept from the government's knowledge, all of that evidence is before the Commission and they are considering it. And if the honourable member is going to persist that that is the nature of the discussion that can take place, then I'm going to have to raise the point of order that was previously raised.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. I was just going to draw it to the honourable member's attention. While I have the microphone here, I might also add that the ruling that I read or the precedent that was set in the House by a previous Speaker's ruling, I refer to Citation 69, subsection 2: "Speaker's rulings once given belong to the House under Standing Order No. 12." Pardon me. "Speaker's rulings once given belong to the House which under Standing Order 12 is free to reject them if they are accepted without appeal or confirmed by an appeal. If they become precedents and form part of the Rules of Procedure, the Speaker is not vested with the power to alter them of his own accord. If they have been given under misrepresentation the House, not the Speaker shall take initial steps to avoid the consequences or implications." So I would refer the honourable member to what I had said before, that if the honourable member's going to stray, I'm going to have to call him out of order and he is then free to proceed any way he wishes.

The Honourable Member for Riel.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CRAIK: Related to the topic but not directly, there have been comments made by the Minister of Mines and Resources today and I have heard them on previous days with respect to comments that I made in the House at the time that Mr. Rex Grose was let out of his responsibilities by the present government. And there was an exchange and debate in this House. Mr. Chairman, on a man who had spent 20 years or so in the Civil Service, had I think a fairly distinguished war record, came into this House under the Liberal administration and was a senior officer in the government of that day, and when he served with the former Conservative Government became a Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce, and actually spearheaded a fairly significant and important thrust in the direction of industrial development which was one of the major undertakings of the Conservative Government of that day.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.)

Mr. Chairman, that particular person did have a track record which was to be noted in Manitoba in the area of industrial development. It takes all types of people to make a government. He wasn't a popular man, he had probably as many enemies as friends; possibly more enemies than friends in the public service. I don't know of anyone in his Department of Agriculture for instance or in the Department of Natural Resources that had any communication on a very friendly basis with that particular gentleman mainly because he was the type of person who was a pusher and a prodder and ruthless in many respects in getting what he wanted. Mr. Chairman, I was not one of the group that knew him that considered myself in the category of being one of his friends. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I was very much to be included in the other group. But nevertheless, of all the people that knew him whether they were his friends or his enemies, none of them took away from him the abilities or discredited his ability to do the job of industrial development that he was assigned in the Province of Manitoba. And on that basis I stood up and paid credit to the efforts, and I said that he was in the industrial development world of Manitoba, having received the credits he did which were not only Manitoban but North American in nature, he was the Gordie Howe of the industrial development world. So I have no concerns about having said that, Mr. Chairman.

The First Minister on the same day used a terminology in comments about Mr. Grose which may not have cast it in that light but nevertheless used a terminology and description of his past performance in Manitoba which were considerably more detailed and laudatory than any comments I made. So let's, Mr. Chairman, recognize that any civil servant who has placed 20 years of service in for his province and has a track record which given the area of responsibility as complete and effective as his has to be given his due and his credit. And if this government is not prepared to - I've stood up here and I've complimented the Minister's recent Deputy Minister, who I consider to be a real credit in his particular area of expertise, namely in the biological area in which he was trained and lived and worked in, made a great contribution to Manitoba. Well as of the day I made the statement, Mr. Chairman, about Mr. Grose, I can clearly say that I felt the same way about him, I had different personal feelings towards these two different men but I had no reason to not stand up and say effectively that that man like the second man had made a clear-cut contribution to Manitoba in the responsible area which they were assigned to. So I don't back away from the claim and I don't give the government credit at this point in hindsight for them trying to back away from the sort of laudatory comments that the First Minister had for Mr. Grose on the very same day. But if that's the way they want to play it, Mr. Chairman, they're fully entitled to go ahead and play it that way. If it's going to be a game of innuendo, we'll use the same tactics. --(Interjection)-- That's fine.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the argument with regards to export power since it's come back in the picture today. There has been some discussion which I think is good on this matter and perhaps now we can get down to what are the positions of the parties in this House with regards to export power.

I took exception to the comments that were made by the Leader of the Liberal Party in the last two weeks when I spoke last night and I do believe we're getting some clarification of the Liberal Party's position from the Member from Portage today. I want to make it clear that we stand fully behind the position that exports to the United States can be advantageous to the Province of Manitoba, particularly Mr. Speaker, in the case of surplus power. And again, I understand from the Public Utilities meeting last year and from the year before that the sales that have taken place to the United States are surplus sales. Mr. Chairman, there is certainly no reason at all for Manitobans to be concerned about undertaking arrangements for the sale of export power to the United States if it is surplus power. If you're going to get into permanent long term arrangements --(Interjection)-- Well, 15-year surplus, as long as it's known to be surplus power and is determined by the price and quantity determined by the procedures that are accepted under the categorization of surplus power there is no problem. There's no question, however, that if you want to go on and consider firm power sales you're probably talking about a much higher rate of return. But at the present time Manitoba Hydro should not be criticized - from my point of view I don't think they should be criticized for entering agreements with regards to the sale of export power. As a matter of fact if that sale can be tied in with the north-south mutual exchange of power with the thermal systems that are in the United

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) States to offset the characteristics of the hydraulic systems in Manitoba, there may be good reason, there may be good strong reason to go on and consider arrangements other than the straight constricted agreement of sale of surplus power along.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat again that I don't think that we should cut off our options here at all and I don't think Manitoba Hydro should at this point be criticized for undertaking and negotiating the sale of power to the United States; and if I understood the Minister correctly today, that as of today any arrangements that have been made deal with surplus power and not with firm power. So, then I don't believe that there should be any concern on the part of Manitobans with regards to getting locked into long-term agreements.

I full realize that there is a problem in regaining your export if you get into a size and scale that requires a massive expenditure on the American side of the border for transportation facilities, and if we get into that position then you're into a position where it may be more difficult to get back what you've started on a temporary basis. However, I repeat again, that the market today is much more a seller's market than it has been in the past, the cost of energy in the United States is, in many cases to burn coal alone is in many of their plants running to 10 to 12 mills and the average cost now, the average price of the power we're exporting appears to be in the 5-mill range. It may well be possible that surplus power can be sold at close to double the price that we're getting for it now which would be very close to the retail price in Manitoba; and still you get into it without long-term commitments and if we do that we should be fully encouraged to do it, particularly, Mr. Chairman, with the development of the larger units on the Nelson project which is the course of action which this government has taken.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: It is just the term "long-term commitments" and I'm wondering if the Honourable Member for Riel would give some suggestion as to what he's thinking of, three-year, five-year, because long-term in Hydro power is relative to . . .

MR. GREEN: In general terms, Mr. Chairman, I would think that to the termination period of the Nelson River development, which may be 20 years, that there are going to be periods where you're going to have blocks of surplus power as you bring in each plant. Yeah. And these are calculated fairly accurately by Manitoba Hydro; they know once their program is set what they're going to have. So I see no problem in them planning for that 20-year period, to indicate surplus power of given blocks that change year by year, they decrease, they increase, they decrease, they increase. As they meet the low growth pattern of Manitoba they might as well sell off the power, since all the facilities are there, the capital cost is all invested and there is no operating cost to speak of in doing it, so anything you sell off as surplus is simply cream or gold or gravy or whatever you like, and as long as you don't get into the position of at the end of your 20-year period of having been committed to a long-term firm power sale then I see nothing but revenues coming into Manitoba that you otherwise would waste; you would waste them with no saving to the environment or the ecology or anything else, you would simply waste them because you had adopted a position that somehow it was bad to provide this energy to a neighbor who you thought traditionally had caused you problems.

So, Mr. Chairman, the issue here seems to be then whether it's surplus or firm power and I want to reiterate again that there is no problem as far as I'm concerned and our discussions have led us always to believe that the sale of surplus power is a very natural thing for Manitoba to get into and there's no difficulties in sight in doing so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Would the member not agree that if there is even surplus as opposed to firm power sales that it would be in the better interests of the people of Manitoba to negotiate, to attract the industry into Manitoba by withholding the power and saying the power is available in Manitoba, bring the jobs to Manitoba?

MR. CRAIK: That argument certainly applies to firm power. The only thing is with surplus power is that you're feeding it in to a large system; if you're going to build an industry to sell that power to you have to guarantee him power on a long-term basis. But if you're feeding it into a large system such as you have across the line, all they do is turn down their coal burners while you're feeding them your excess surplus of Hydro power. So certainly if it's a case of getting committed to firm power that's a rational and sound policy to take that if

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) you can sell it at a rate which is attractive for bringing an industry here certainly that would be the course of action to follow. But it's not that easy because the large system in the United States, or in Saskatchewan if you like, can absorb your off-peak energy that you have surplus and they benefit from it because if it's going to cost them 10 or 12 mills to burn coal and they can buy your power at one or two mills less it's in their interest and it's in your interest as well.

But I want to again reiterate a point which I made last night and that is if we're going to get into energy exchange between a thermal system and a hydro system we'd be much better advised to look at the United States than we would be to Saskatchewan on it because of the geographical compatibility of north-south exchange as opposed to east-west.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The time being 4:30, the last hour - I'm sorry, the hour is 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour. Someone move committee rise? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. Resolution No. 7.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia:

WHEREAS recreational lands throughout the world are becoming more scarce at a time when the world's population growth is dramatically escalating;

AND WHEREAS Manitoba is generously endowed with an abundance of magnificent lakes, rivers, streams and forests which with their adjacent lands can constitute our existing and potential recreational areas;

AND WHEREAS at present other countries have exhausted their supply of such recreational lands and their citizens have begun to purchase Canadian recreation areas;

AND WHEREAS it is the responsibility constitutionally of the Provincial Government to regulate property rights within the province and it is the obligation of the Provincial Government to protect these recreational lands from foreign takeover so that they will be available for Canadian residents as required;

AND WHEREAS the farm lands within the province are a vitally important ingredient in Canadian national interests and like our recreation lands must remain Canadian owned;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of introducing legislation to ensure that farm and recreational lands located in Manitoba will not be owned by non-residents of Canada but will be preserved for Canadian residents only.

MOTION presented as read.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we know that recreational lands throughout the world are becoming scarcer and that the population is rapidly escalating. The world's population has reached 3.56 billion three years ago, a 2.72 million increase over 1969. In North America over half of the population live in cities of at least 100,000. Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the resolution is generously endowed, even our license plates tell us this. The Canadian tax dollar is used for recreation as one of the 11 categories or functions of the Federal Government. Over the past five years 11 international parks have been established and so have 20 historic parks and sites. It is unfortunate to note that half of these federal pennies spent on culture and recreation goes toward the CBC but only \$92.7 million is slated for parks and conservation. Such figures only tell us that the provincial responsibility in the area of recreation is and will increase to be a vitally important one in relation to the present and future consumption of leisure time and leisure activities for Manitobans.

Aristotle said something about leisure. He said that Spartans remained secure as long as

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) they were at war and that they collapsed as soon as they acquired an empire. The Spartans did not know enough how to use their leisure time that came with peace. We could assume that this would not apply to our neighbors to the south who have apparently become a little less warlike. The 20th and 21st centuries, Mr. Speaker, will be known more as leisure centuries, but, will leisure mean sacrifice? Should leisure used through something in a recreational sense require us to give up something even more vital such as our land? In outdoor recreation, Mr. Speaker, we have passed the time when the family could pack a picnic lunch, hop on a street car and go to the countryside. Today recreationalists carry guns or fishing rods or cameras and almost everyone has a car. The car means a visit much further than a municipal park.

We are aware, Mr. Speaker, that at present other countries are beginning to exhaust their supply of recreational areas and that their citizens have now begun to purchase Canadian recreation areas. Several years ago in the United States for each million American cities and towns there were about 200 parks or seven-tenths of an acre per 100 persons. Today some 200 million try to use the American parks; they take the traffic, pollution, overcrowding, crime and drugs into the recreational spaces. Last year two and a half million people attended Yellowstone Park and the National Park Service had to come up with 2, 100 buildings, 30 sewer systems, 10 electric systems, 750 miles of road and 3, 000 campsites. It is no wonder that the Americans are eyeing our recreation space.

This trend, Mr. Speaker, was partly revealed by our Tourism and Recreational Minister here in our House, in October 72 he said the Manitoba Hotel Association - rather he told the Manitoba Hotel Association that the Manitoba Government had to stop featuring camping attractions in its out-of-province tourist and camp campaigns. This was due to an increase of about 62 percent in three years on camper use and was to give Manitobans an opportunity at the camping space. Mr. Speaker, we can only commend such a move; however the danger is that not all outdoor lovers or users of recreational space are purists or campers or that lesser breed called back packers; most urban dwellers in North America like some of the comforts with their recreational space. Over three million Americans who camp prefer a variety of special vehicles. Such new priorities require the over-use and perhaps even ownership of Canadian property. Mr. Speaker, we say that it is the responsibility constitutionally of the Provincial Government to regulate property rights within its province and that it is the obligation of the Provincial Government to protect those recreational lands from foreign takeover so that they will be available to Canadian residents as required.

Mr. Speaker, some members in this House were on a trip to P. E. I. with me in 1964, I believe, and we spoke to legislators in P. E. I. about this very problem, and it had become so bad there that they were considering legislation to keep in Canadian hands the ocean front land of their small island. There were hundreds and hundreds of people coming from Maine and Boston and buying up the ocean frontage and it was becoming so serious that the local people couldn't get down to the beach. So it's my understanding now that a law has been passed saying that only so many acres of land per mile may fall into foreign ownership. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan I believe the farming members of the House will know that American farmers who have money to invest have been known to come up here and buy land as an investment and then wait or make whatever use as they will. Then we find later that our own farmer sons have had price bid up on them so that it makes it more difficult for them to purchase farm land.

I spoke at length this afternoon about the community of Delta. We have a stretch of beautiful beach there about ten miles long, one of the finest recreational areas in the province. What happened was about forty some odd years ago an American fell in love with the area and he's a very wealthy person and at that time land was very very cheap, even good recreational land was very cheap, so he bought this stretch of land and he has kept it in his family or in his possession or his family's heirs ever since.

Now the person in question was a very good corporate citizen and a very good person to have around, but the point I'm making is that we have ten miles of beautiful beach tied up by a foreign resident who visits maybe once a year and that's about all, and the rest of the time the people who live nearby, or in Winnipeg or in Portage, are not able to use that land which I think is part of our birthright. And not only should we be looking at making new laws but we should be looking at places like this where the problem has developed, and I don't say expropriation is the answer but certainly there should be some negotiation carried on to see if we can't get back and buy back what is for Canadian use.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say a few words on this particular resolution. I'm not entirely opposed to the principle of the resolution except on the one point, and I also have some disagreement on the resolution, because, first, I'm a bit hung up on it because it states, the resolution says that we should not, we should bring in legislation to prevent the sale of farm and recreation lands in Manitoba to non residents of Canada. Now when it comes to, in my opinion, when it comes to recreational land, I can't make a difference between non residents and residents. As the honourable member has mentioned, I think that we are endowed with an abundance of recreational land and we don't want to see it controlled by non residents. But by the same token I can't make a distinction between a Canadian owning the same land and preventing Canadians from going on it. I can't make that distinction there. Maybe I'm not clear on that but perhaps . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Perhaps there is faulty wording in the resolution and I thank the Member for Ste. Rose for inquiring.

MR. ADAM: Just a moment, you're not on.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I thank the Member for Ste. Rose for allowing me to explain. Perhaps there was a poor choice of words in the resolution. It should have been "foreign" not just "non resident". In other words, foreign ownership only, not a Canadian who lives in the United States and comes back up here. I'm talking about foreign ownership.

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

MR. ADAM: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think I got that implication all right, that you were referring to perhaps American control; but again, I can't see the difference between an American buying up a large stretch of recreational land and preventing people from being able to use that land for recreational purposes or a Canadian buying that land and preventing Canadians from using it. I can't see the difference there. My only hang-up to support that contention is that when you have Americans coming in and buying recreational land you have more competition and you are in fact allowing foreign wealth to come in and buy that land with which Canadians are unable to compete because of the fact that you have some, as you mention, wealthy Americans coming in and it's very difficult then for Canadians to compete to buy that land.

I think, Sir, that this province in the last year has been making strides in that direction by buying up as much recreational land as possible as it comes available, and thereby holding that land as Crown land where people can hunt, where people may be able to go fishing. I think this is what we have to do. I think that under no circumstances should we sell any more land that's suitable for recreational purposes and I am sure that both sides of the House will support this. I think that is what we have to do.

Now I just happened to read an article, I don't know if the Member for Portage read this article or not but I think it is a very very good article: "This Land is Their Land." Perhaps you may have read it. But there is some -- for instance, in British Columbia in one area there's an American ownership of the B.C. Caribou ranching country; it includes the G... Ranch, North America's largest, with 80,000 acres directly owned and another million acres under grazing lease. What is happening is that in Alberta also Americans are showing the area has been discovered and one report indicates that all major sales of one agent in a year went to United States and more than 8,000 acres were involved, most of which had been taken out of ranching or leased back to former Canadian owners. And this is quite true, that a lot of Americans are coming in and buying up Canadian lands, and I think, Mr. Speaker, all the more so that we should have a land bank policy. We should have perhaps a national land bank policy on land use. If you go a little further than that there's 666,000 acres of recreational land, about one-third of this fronting the sea, almost 80 percent of these non-residents are American. And I agree with the member . . .

A MEMBER: In Canada?

MR. ADAM: Yes, this is land that has been purchased in Nova Scotia on the sea front. But one thing that I find very peculiar. "Last spring," it says here and I'm quoting again, "at a municipal tax sale, four Americans picked up 810 acres of land mostly on the Nova Scotia shore for \$32,000. A Maine farmer bought two islands totalling 357 acres for \$18,100.00. One of these had been sought by the Province of Nova Scotia for historical purposes, but an

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ADAM cont'd) official said the next day the prices were considerably higher than we were prepared to pay."

Now this brings me back right to what I mentioned before, that the only objection that I have of Americans coming in and buying land is that here you have a classic example where even a province couldn't afford to compete with an American farmer. This American farmer perhaps had more money than the Province of Nova Scotia, I don't know, but they were not able to compete for one historical island, and this is where I see we're not going on the right path as far as land policy is concerned and I would rather see now that the Crown owned the land where all people may be able to make use of that land.

There is another part here that I underlined: "Access to the land is one of the compensations we have for living here. It is one of the nice things about being a Canadian. Certainly we are foolish if we allow the wealth of the rest of the world to bid up the prices of our recreational areas to a level that Canadians cannot afford." Now that depends whether you are the buyer or the seller. If you are Canadian and you have land, it's your own; if you're the seller, well it's very fine to have Americans coming in and buying it because you want to sell at a high price. But for Canadians who want to buy, well then he has to bid against foreign wealth and I think this is very well explained in this article and I think that more people should -- I'd recommend it to the whole House that they read this article. It's certainly a very very good article in my opinion. I am very fortunate myself to have a little piece of Canada back in Ste. Rose. It's not very many acres but it's endowed with a little bit of hunting, a little bit of fishing and there are quite a few muskrats, and I mentioned the other day there were a lot of skunks there too. This is, I think, of great importance to the people of this country, that we come out with a national land policy and particularly a provincial land policy that would lease land, buy land, to anyone who so desired to sell. I'm not talking about expropriation although there may be cases when you may have to do that, but I think it's time that we all get together and take a good look at this and come up with the right answers. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you know by now how much I welcome the opportunity to address this Chamber on late Friday afternoons because I recognize that it is really those persons who most sincerely are prepared to accept the words of wisdom that so often come from me that remain in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I can of course always understand the modesty of certain members who recognize their capacity to understand certain things and not to understand other things and if they should choose to absent themselves from the Chamber why they would be doing -- I certainly would not take offence. I recognize also, Mr. Speaker, that of course we're approaching that great event, namely St. Patrick's Day, and that may be some reason for the rather slim representation in the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, to address myself to the resolution before us, I would have to say that fortunately, at least from my point of view, we have had the advantage just rather recently to have heard the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who has explained and detailed to us on several occasions when members have asked questions on another matter, namely the question of hunting rights or hunting privileges and the sale thereof, versus the proprietor rights with respect to land on the part of the property owner. And some of the Minister's answers have been illuminating to the extent that they, while not informative to the extent that he has indicated his position, but he has done this I think for those members who are listening, spelled out in fairly clear terms that this is a pretty complicated question and that there are very basic, very fundamental civic human rights or civil rights involved, rights that have been established for a considerable length of time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in addition to this I think that when we cast our vision beyond our immediate jurisdiction and look at what has happened some time ago in the Province of Saskatchewan who, in the first flush of coming into office, flushed with election victory, introduced a land program that called for pretty specific controls and regulations of land that certainly infringed upon the heretofore accepted rights with respect to that land, and you had an uproar in that province of Saskatchewan and indeed the province withdrew from its position with respect to its land bank program. Just last night, Mr. Speaker, I believe our television tube indicated to those of us that were watching that thousands of disturbed B.C. residents, residents

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) from the province of British Columbia, emerged upon the Legislative grounds of British Columbia, to do what? To exercise indignation, Mr. Speaker, at what they assumed to be, or what they all of a sudden learned to be or at least thought to be, a considerable deprivation of what they always held to be their rights with respect to property.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask the question and I think this is a question that has to be asked, you know, why the storm? How come, Mr. Speaker, that governments get elected, and I would suspect that as in most cases whether it is an NDP party or a Conservative party or a Liberal party, that matters such as this would be featured fairly prominently on their election material literature. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when the Saskatchewan New Democratic Party government was running in the election that the subject matter of creating a land bank was often talked about by their candidates in the course of that election. I suspect that in the case of B.C. the similar situation was there, that it was possibly featured as, surely featured as one of the major programs that the New Democratic Party would enact if elected.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's really a phenomena that while I don't think that anybody hides these kinds of programs until they are elected and then brings them into actual being that that causes a storm. No, Mr. Speaker, there's a different reason. The reason is that for political purposes, of course, everybody -- and we're all subject to doing this from time to time; we like to show the shiny side of the coin and not the other side of the coin -- not the other side of the coin. And really, this resolution has merit in being before us at this time if we take the advantage of discussing and trying, if we can, to determine the validity of certain basic rights that we have assumed to be inherent in our society. In this case property, certain property rights. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, even -- I'd like to indicate to you because it was with some degree of pleasure that I think the members of the Liberal Party indicated to me only yesterday about an inconsistency in a position that they thought I had demonstrated in the House by speaking on a resolution in a certain manner. I deny that inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, because I have suggested to -- I'm referring to a tax or exemption of tax on property taxes, education taxes of senior citizens homes. Our position, Mr. Speaker, within the Conservative Party was put before this Chamber, was put before the people of Manitoba, will continue being put before the people of Manitoba as a rounded out position that we believe should be taken, a position that is responsible, one that would have to take in account certain changes. The tax credit program that the government brought out means that we have to reconsider the position that we have taken in the year before with respect to this particular aspect.

I only want to come back to my friend the Member from Assiniboia, and I'm glad he's in his seat, because I want now to refer to him a document that his Party under his Leader, the Member from Wolseley, when they issued to the citizens of Manitoba a copy of the Bill of Rights for Manitoba -- I.H. Asper, Leader of the Liberal Party in Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, and I would like not to be accused of taking things out of context so that different members no doubt can avail themselves of this; in fact, I would suspect that many of us are on the mailing list and we might have got it as I got it.

Mr. Speaker, but I think it's important to say what the Liberal Party, the very Party that is introducing this resolution before us at this particular time, had to say about some of these rights. Every individual, Article 1, has the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness -- it sounds so much like the Leader, I should really move over to his chair. The pursuit of happiness, security of person and his reputation, the enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof, and it goes on. Mr. Chairman, it goes on, a few other sections, and it's not my intention to read this entire Bill of Rights before you, but this was the position of the Liberal Party and what I must assume to be a pretty important aspect of their program that they are putting before the people of Manitoba.

In Article 22 they go on to say that everyone has a right to freedom of movement and residence within Manitoba and has the right to leave and return to the province. Now, Mr. Speaker, that sounds pretty good. It makes me wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not -- you know, this is the right that we now enjoy; we may not have that if we indeed formed a separate republic and fell under the heel of a benevolent or not so benevolent dictatorship but I right now feel fairly secure that I have that right in Canada, that the Confederation that I belong to gives me that right, but nevertheless the Leader of the Liberal Party feels that that's an important thing to put into this Bill of Rights. But I draw this to your attention only

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) for the reasons that if you examine the right to leave and return to the province. Now certainly one would hope that that wouldn't have or impose too many penalties on that person. If I own some property in Manitoba and I decide to leave for a period of my lifetime, or a short period during my lifetime, if I should decide to become a resident of the United States for a period of that time do I automatically surrender my rights to this property, or that the Liberal Party now assures me in this instance that that shouldn't happen? Even more specifically, Mr. Speaker, in Article No. 26 of this same Bill of Rights proposed by the Liberal Party, it states: "Everyone has the right to own property alone, as well as in association with others, (which I can agree with) and to inherit and dispose of property during his lifetime or by detrimental disposition."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that means, I would assume, that if I own my land as I now do, or some of it, that I should have the right under this Bill of Rights to dispose of that land as I see fit, as I will it in my last testament; and if I decide to will it to my last remaining relative who happens to be a resident in Venezuela or in the United States or indeed Russia, then it certainly should be my -- I would assume that under this Bill of Rights proposed by the Liberal Party that on the one hand they are asking the people and telling the people that we are in great need of, and that this certainly should be one of the rights that we should enjoy -- property rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do or suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that -- and I don't mean to be unduly harsh on my Liberal colleagues here -- I suggest to them, in all sincerity though, that they have demonstrated, they have demonstrated I think more so that any other political party in Manitoba as of late, to put forward only the shiny side of the coin to the public of Manitoba. On the one hand, on the one hand the question of individual rights, civic liberties, certainly no one denies is an appealing posture for any political group to propose; they have done that, dressed it up very nicely in rather Christmasy fashion. But on the other hand, they also recognize that there is a general uneasiness in our society and there is good cause for that uneasiness in our society, about the growing amount of land that is all so often taken out of control or is being denied -- the growing amount of land the use of which is being denied to residents of our fair province. And so, Mr. Speaker, they have conveniently taken both sides of two different coins, have chosen to show the shiny side or the silvery side on both sides of that coin and stuck it together without bothering to examine or telling the people what really is involved on the other side. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that really is the question that we should take time and hopefully allow this resolution to receive the kind of debate that it is worthy of, because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very important matter that we enter seriously into the debate about re-defining some long-held traditional belief with respect to some of our rights.

I must concur to some extent with the remarks made by the last speaker, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, when he indicates that the practice has been in Manitoba to buy and to acquire as much land as it is possible without impinging on the civic liberties and the civic rights of our citizens but, when the occasion offers, to actively and aggressively retain that land or bring that land back under the Crown's stewardship so that it in fact will be available to future generations of Manitobans; and in that regard, Mr. Speaker, it would be only correct if I would indicate to the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose that it needn't be a socialist government that can bring about this desirable train of events. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that if an honest cataloguing, an honest inventory of the lands that were brought back to the Crown, lands, specific lands of recreation that were developed, specific for recreational use, specific lands that were purchased for a specific reason such as wildlife, wetlands game management and so forth, that it will take a great deal of time for this government to match the record of the previous Progressive Conservative government in that particular aspect. I know, I speak very close to home. The FRED agreement in the Interlake which established, you know, which established thousands upon thousands of acres of land. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a revealing remark by the Member from Ste. Rose. He suggests that we can only buy those lands when they fall into the government's hands. Well, Mr. Speaker, he was not in the House; there were some other members in the House, I refer to the Member from Arthur who was in the House when this government, probably an administration that I wasn't part of but he was, that took one of the heaviest abuse for the purchase of land, namely what was then known as the Bain's Estate that bought up that very

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) valuable property in around the Delta Marsh area and bought it from private interests and the Minister of Agriculture at that time had the foresight to see that this particular piece of property should be in the public domain.

Now Mr. Speaker, I've said enough in that respect. I am satisfied, and I'm satisfied that the record will show that we have an enviable record in that regard, a record that it will be difficult for this particular government to match, unless of course they will act upon the final solution that they are also ready to -- that they have kind of in the wings, you know, that of the total takeover not only of our mines or other areas of interest, but indeed the greatest resource that we have, our land resource.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be allowed to be drawn into any segment of this debate that I choose not to at this particular time. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, and have tried to suggest that the honourable members take the occasion of this resolution to seriously research their speeches and their material that they will be bringing or they will require for this resolution. I think the situation that is present today in B.C., the situation that is hovering and that has been a matter of great concern in Saskatchewan, should indicate to us that this kind of resolution is and can be far more complicated and far more important than what appears in its first initial stage which, when you read it, looks like fine, all we're trying to do is tell the damn Yankee to go home, or try to impose a degree of Manitoba nationalism in respect to control of our own land.

It's all very fine, Mr. Speaker, when we worry about rich American ranchers or if we worry about Englishmen and their holdings here in this country, or we worry about the big Canadians, as the Member from Ste. Rose correctly pointed out, that hold large blocks of land and in thus manner defying what some might conceive to be the proper use of that land, but Mr. Speaker, what we cannot deny and what has to also be talked about is the other side of the coin, and in that instance we are talking about that hard-pressed individual farmer that is working on his quarter section holding; we are talking about the ordinary working man that feels he has a degree of a long-held tradition of believing that his castle is his home, contrary to what the Member from St. John suggested, that we may take a look at that. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, one must look at this resolution in its totality, in its totality. One must not just simply afford ourselves the luxury of using this as an expression of nationalism in whatever form it is, it is a question of very basic long-held human and civic rights. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Point of order. I would just like to make one substitution on the Public Utilities Committee; the name of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, Allard, for Froese. This has been agreed to and I understand that it

A MEMBER: Stacking the committee again, eh?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I am not stacking the committee

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member please sit down. I've heard the announcement, the announcement shall be taken note of. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take too much time. I know that a couple of the members are anxious to speak on this subject. I am again in somewhat of a dilemma; I am philosophically in favour of the resolution, but after listening to the remarks made by the mover of that resolution and the Member for Lakeside I'm having some second thoughts. I must thank the Member for Lakeside that most of his Party are doing an excellent job of opposition. Digging up that little booklet there with the Human Rights or the Civil Rights Act certainly shows the contradictory position of the Liberal Party and I think we should thank him for doing that work and allowing us to see just where the Party stood a brief 12 months ago.

The Member for Portage who introduced the resolution, Mr. Speaker, used several arguments which I can't accept; one of them is, of course, he brought in the old bogey man of world population explosion. Mr. Speaker, that's been one of the main excuses for getting in laws on abortion in this country, the population explosion, is that there's not enough space. I've done some research, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that you can take 3 1/2 billion people -- and that is not an accurate figure, incidentally -- that you can put them all in the U.S. parks and forests and still have one acre of space for each person, so I think that's not a

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) very valid argument to use, to put forth such a proposal.

The other thing that disturbed me also is his comments about some American having some beautiful beach at Portage and he felt that this situation was unfair, and I agree with him. But the interesting part was that he felt it had been wrong to expropriate; he said we should sit down and talk to him and try and buy it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the logic of that; we are on the one hand saying we can turn around and pass laws which are flying in the fact of tradition but because of circumstances we're prepared to accept; yet when we're dealing with a foreign individual, we say no expropriation. The people at Bird's Hill Park were expropriated and they were Canadians. Now are we going to turn around and say we will not expropriate foreigners and yet we will apply a different yardstick to Canadians? I simply cannot accept the logic on that.

I must say to the Member for Ste. Rose, I don't accept his argument when he talks about there's no difference who owns it; I suggest to him there is a difference and I also suggest to him that it's unfair to say that . . . -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Just for clarification, he speaks of expropriation -- I'm assuming that he is not speaking of confiscation without payment but that the right should be therefore expropriation either with no respect to nationalism involved.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I think that the same procedure should apply if foreigners hold land and we want to build a floodway or a park or Hecla Island, whatever it is, then certainly our judicial process should be involved in getting that land and, in the final analysis, the courts will decide the proper payment. And I certainly can't understand anyone suggesting otherwise, that we should apply the judicial process to Canadians but somehow foreigners should be exempt from it.

I have to touch back on the subject of the Dialathon or Dialahunt which has been discussed in here, and I suggest to you, Sir, there is a difference on Dialahunt and the question of giving a person the rights to pass through your land. Nobody is suggesting that a person doesn't have the right to rent or to allow passage through his land, but to allow hunting is certainly a different thing; and to allow a foreign person to come in and buy land or rent it and then go and rent it out into hunting, Mr. Speaker, is something that is -- I don't think is done anywhere in the world. As a matter of fact, we don't allow these people to vote in this country and no one is apologetic over the fact that we won't allow them to vote and yet we're saying that you can turn around and go and rent out our game. I think that's wrong and I think it's time that we changed the policy. We happen to be a young country and we are growing up in many respects and we are running into various problems in the process and I don't think that we should turn around and say because this has been the situation for 100 years that we should keep it. But I think we should recognize the fact that this is Canada and Canadians must always give precedence over anyone else. And we should say, as we have been saying to many individuals, that you can come in or you can't come in; we've had plane loads of people come in on one-way tickets from Jamaica, from India, because they felt that once they got in here even though that was a violation of the law, that somehow we're going to have to accept it and they are going to demand that they have similar rights as Canadians, and I reject that; the federal Liberal Government has rejected it. They put him back on the plane and sent him, and I think the Provincial Government is going to have to take a similar position and say that there are certain rights that belong to the Canadians and there are certain rights we're not going to lease, sell or give away to anyone. And if this resolution here is dealing on that basis, that it's going to restrict foreign ownership of land, then I certainly can support it. And I'm going to wait, Mr. Speaker, and hear more remarks on this thing here, but on the basis of the way the resolution is worded it makes a great deal of sense and I hope the Minister of Agriculture who is going to attempt to speak next will support it and if not give good reasons why the government cannot support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, a question.

MR. BARROW: Would the member permit a question? What do you class as a foreigner?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that's very easy to answer. Anybody that's not a Canadian.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this indeed is a very important area of public consideration and I would want to take a moment or two to give opinions of my own on the subject matter because in my view the question of resource control should always remain within the public domain. And I appreciate the fact that the Member for Portage la Prairie in introducing his resolution did acknowledge the fact that the public does have indeed a right to control resource and the resource use, and that indeed the public has a responsibility to do so, because after all, we have to recognize that there are all kinds of pressures put on the public sector in the interest of yielding controls so that private interests may gain that particular area of control for their own interest rather than serving the people as a whole. So I have to agree with the Member for Portage la Prairie that so far as that is concerned he would not have opposition from me.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would want to draw your attention to the fact that the Member for Portage went far beyond what I would want to go in that he introduced a very nationalistic approach within his proposal, an approach that I don't think that we would want to endorse for the sake of nationalism. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is much greater than whether an American owns land in Manitoba, as opposed to a Manitoban owning land in Manitoba. I think it's a question of whether or not any individual, whether he be American or Manitoba, has undue control over land use, water use and total resource use. I think that is the important question so that it isn't a question of where the individual is from or what his nationality is, it's whether or not it is in the public interest to have an individual, whoever he may be, have control of these natural resources. And in that context, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that I, too, would be very much concerned about absentee ownership of huge amounts of land in Manitoba - land and water for that matter. I think it's important that the public should be concerned about the need to retain that kind of control.

Now there are a number of ways in which the public can make sure that the long view, the long term public interest can be maintained, and that is possible in a number of areas either by public lands that are now owned by the public not being offered for sale, or through regulating lands that are not publicly owned so far as the use of these lands is concerned, or, in the end, if regulation is not sufficient acquisition of private holdings where it is deemed to be in the public interest. I think that kind of public involvement one could anticipate and indeed endorse, knowing that there is an ever-increasing demand for prime agricultural land, prime resource land, prime resort land, Mr. Speaker. The waterfront areas within this province are not unlimited and to the extent that some people may argue that we have huge areas of undeveloped land and water resources in northern Manitoba, I think it is somewhat premature to relate that fact as far as the possibility of the average citizen in Winnipeg having access to those resources. So that while we have water resources, beach resources, land resources, within an hour or two driving distance of Winnipeg, we should make sure that by and large the citizenry of Winnipeg and all the people in Manitoba, in the populated areas of Manitoba, have access to these resource areas.

I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if one huge development company wanted to promote a recreational enterprise and somehow acquired complete control of all of that Whiteshell area and decided to charge excessive fees for allowing people in to use those so-called people's resources, natural resources that rightfully belong to the public of Manitoba. I could imagine what kind of an outcry we would have if that was to take place, and I know it has taken place in a very small way and in certain parts of this province.

I am also aware, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that there are interest groups that wish to obtain huge blocks of agricultural land for ranching purposes. People not domiciled in Manitoba, not domiciled in North America, but people whose interests are international, very large corporations, who have expressed a degree of interest in getting control of public lands for the purpose of launching huge ranching enterprises. Mr. Speaker, if we were to allow that kind of thing to develop as opposed to maintaining a policy wherein we maximize the number of people that would want to use these resources in agriculture, we would be defeating the whole effort of government policy in trying to stabilize our rural communities by giving up huge tracts of land to one or two individuals. Certainly it would be a circumvention of the interests of the Department of Agriculture and this government at this point in time, and I would not want to see that kind of thing develop. I have had a number of inquiries and I'm sure the Minister of

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . Mines and Resources and Environmental Management has had a number of inquiries from people with very substantial financial resources that would want to get control of huge blocks of Manitoba Crown lands. Mr. Speaker, that is not in the public interest and I would hope that we move in such a direction that we plan our land use, our resource use, in the best public interest of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is running out. I would wish to move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that all the words in the final paragraph following the words "to insure that" where they appear in the third line thereof, be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "lands in Manitoba be protected for the most beneficial use by Manitobans."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If it's amenable to the House, it's two minutes to 5:30, would it be all right to call it 5:30 and have the honourable member start his speech next time?

Agreed? (Agreed) 5:30. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia will be on tap.

The hour being 5:30 - - Yes? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to indicate that next week we will use the week on the discussion of the Estimates of the Department of Mines and other resources and such other unimportant matters as may become before the House. There will be some bills that may get to us but otherwise I expect to be on Estimates for the entire week and, I repeat, I expect to be on my Estimates, so . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.