

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 5, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Adjourned debates. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the report of this committee introduced, I believe, the day before yesterday by the Minister. This is a committee which was charged with the responsibility of studying probably the most major piece of legislation introduced in this House, and that is the revision of The Municipal Act. We were handed Bill 52 at the very tail end of last year's session, Bill 52 dealing with the Local Elections Act - The Local Elections Authorities Act - which was a compilation of all the various sections in The Municipal Act dealing with elections in local authorities. The House adjourned last May, the committee was convened in October and fortunately, having received notification of it, I happened to mention it to a member of the executive of the Secretary-Treasurers Association and so they were present at the meeting to make representation. There were one or two individuals who also appeared - they had obviously gotten word of it - and the first meeting was simply spent in listening to these representations. We didn't receive notification again until I think it was February, at which time we were advised that meetings would be held on the 19th and the 20th of February, and a few days later we received notification that the meeting of the 19th was cancelled and that the only meeting that would take place would be on February 20th.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter that has been kicked around in this House, in this Legislature, for a number of years. For years we heard that changes in The Municipal Act were pending; for years we were told that a real job was going to be done on this particular bill; and finally, when committee is called, it's called once in October, once in February, and I feel frankly that the time spent was not sufficient. I think that there should have been far greater publicity given to the deliberations of this committee, to the proposals put forward at the committee so that the various local authorities whom this was going to affect would have an opportunity to come before committee and express their views on the proposals. I'm thinking in terms of the Manitoba Urban Association, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, all the various organizations which are at the local level and which these bills, or proposed bills, would be affecting in Manitoba. None of this took place as far as I know. We got together; we went through Bill 52 clause by clause, and in this regard I regret very much to see Manitoba taking a very regressive step, something quite new in Manitoba - it's never been done before through The Municipal Act - and that is the introduction of a \$100.00, or up to a \$100.00 penalty deterrent for any man who wants to stand for public office. This is what we're doing. If you want to stand for public office you've got to be prepared to deposit an up to \$100.00 fee. This fee would be forfeited if the candidate in question failed to secure 15 percent of the votes.

I say it's regressive, Mr. Speaker, because to me the whole concept that one has to pay to be a responsible citizen, or to indicate his responsibility, is nonsense. I think it's regressive because at the local level and generally through all public life we should be encouraging people to stand for public office, we should be encouraging people to air their views and to make known their views on their community's business, without having to be handicapped by putting up a hundred or fifty dollars or whatever the fee may be. And I can't for the world of me see what we achieve except to somehow create a new principle that only a man who can raise \$100.00 is responsible and he who cannot raise \$100.00 is not responsible.

Now I can tell you from my own experience, and I'm sure others in this House can do as well, that at local elections people should be encouraged to run; that if a man has something to say to the community even though he knows he is not going to be elected, the only time he can bring the issues to the public, the only time he can make known the issue that he feels is

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . important, is during an election as a candidate, and I think it's essential that this opportunity to air his views be left open to him without having to pay the price of a utilization fee, because this is what we're saying. It's a democracy utilization fee. If you want to have something to say to the electorate in your community, then pay for it. The fact that he's going to have election expenses is ignored. The fact that any man running in any election has to be prepared and is prepared to spend money to project his views, to make known his views, this is ignored completely. What they're saying and what the suggestion here is, that if you have something to say to your fellow residents then you must first get a licence to do so; we're going to charge you up to \$100.00 for the right to make your views known. This is a regressive step, a backward step, and one which I hope this House will reject when this bill is introduced before us.

There's another item I'd like to bring to this Legislature's attention, and it's the fact - and I think it's because again we had no time to deal with it - Bill 107, which was referred to this same committee and, as the Minister in his report mentioned, Bill 107 was not dealt with and so there was no action taken. Bill 107 was introduced last year and it presented a very simple principle, that people who live in cooperative housing, people who live in leasehold units, should be treated as first class citizens and not as second class citizens. These people own their homes, but because they don't own the land on which their homes are situated or located they are denied the right to vote on ratepayer by-laws. Now it seems to me ridiculous that a man can own an eight or ten thousand or twelve thousand dollar unit but because he doesn't own the land on which it's sitting he is denied a vote on anything dealing with money by-laws. Last year we in this House passed a bill dealing with condominiums, and this same bill, Bill 107 would have made the vote available to these people as well.

Now I know the committee, in dealing with other aspects of The Municipal Act, took this matter into consideration and are apparently preparing some legislation in that direction, but I'm fearful that because the committee died when this House was called into session and that because of the manner in which the government intends to slow things down and to move very, very slowly, I fear that because the Act is so large and the sections to be covered are still so great and because this is an important bill, there will be many debates in this House, there will have to go through Law Amendments at which I'm sure many of the organizations of Manitoba, as the Manitoba Union of Municipalities, will have to appear before Law Amendments Committee because they weren't aware that they could have appeared before committee during the deliberations, that I'm fearful lest the matter never be dealt with at this particular session and another year would go by and no action taken. Now somebody may feel that I'm unduly alarmed, but if you look back on the record of this government and the way they've handled the business of the House through committees during sessions, then there's no doubt in my mind that this might easily happen and this is why I'm bringing it to the attention of the House. And I would urge the government that if they're going to act on these changes to The Municipal Act this session that the new committee be named quickly, that it convene immediately, that it bring back its recommendations to the House during this Session, and that ample time is left so we're not in the position of passing an important piece of legislation in this House in the dying days of the Legislature when we're sitting at three o'clock in the morning going through section by section on, as I say, on a piece of legislation which we've all been waiting for, which all municipalities have been eager to have dealt with by this House, and which shouldn't be done in a slipshod manner or in a manner which a year later would prove to be inadequate to meet the needs of Manitoba.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, so that members won't be under a misunderstanding as to what is in the bill with regard to a deposit to be put up by a candidate at election, it's simply permissive. It gives the municipality power to require a deposit up to \$100.00, and if we took away that permission we would take away the right which the City of Winnipeg now have in their Winnipeg Charter, and in the City of Winnipeg a deposit of \$100.00 is required for a candidate for mayor, a deposit of \$25.00 is required for a candidate who wishes to be an alderman.

With regard to the people having a leasehold interest for a long term of years being entitled to vote, and people in a cooperative being entitled to vote, that was referred to the counsel for the purpose of drawing up necessary amendments so that they would have the right to vote.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again so that there is no misapprehension and

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . misunderstanding about what the new legislation permits or allows or makes possible, my understanding is - and this information I get from what I consider to be a very reliable source, namely the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks - is that the present legislation is new in that for the first time it permits all of the municipalities outside of the ones that are chartered by separate charter, which would include St. Boniface or Winnipeg, to levy a deposit which they could not levy before, that the existing legislation does not permit these people to put a roadblock in the way of anybody seeking municipal office. It's true that the City of Winnipeg Charter permits this and if my honourable friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre is saying that the law should be uniform, then we agree with the statement that the law should be uniform, but you don't achieve uniformity by taking an existing inequity, which applies only to a certain locality, and spreading that inequity through the entire province. If you wish to achieve uniformity you eliminate the existing inequity. In other words, remove from the City of Winnipeg Charter or any other charter where it may exist, a stipulation which requires the deposit of monies before a candidate can achieve office. And, Mr. Speaker, we make this submission at this time because we recognize it as being one of great principle. We don't agree that there should be an inhibition to participating in the democratic process, and we don't agree with what is furthermore the implication of this statement that the payment of \$100.00 or the payment of \$200.00 will somehow eliminate undesirable people from seeking office. Because, Mr. Speaker, there are far more undesirable qualities that should be subject of elimination rather than the payment of \$100.00. But furthermore, we don't agree that it's true and we've put forward to the House a practical example of this situation.

The Metro Charter, through some accident or perhaps through positive thinking of members opposite, requires no deposit and does not permit The Metropolitan Corporation to require a deposit for standing in a Metro election, and one would then expect, Mr. Speaker, if one followed the logic of those who say that this eliminates undesirables, one would expect that in Metro elections there would have been a flood of candidates. Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are exactly to the contrary. I would think that in Winnipeg at least (and that is in Winnipeg and Metro) there are more acclamations in Metro elections than there have been in Greater Winnipeg elections generally. I can't think of many acclamations in - and when I say Greater Winnipeg I should specify the City of Winnipeg - but there have been almost no acclamations recently in City of Winnipeg aldermanic and trustee elections whereas there have been acclamations in Metro elections every year following the first election. So in order, Mr. Speaker, that we not be dissuaded by the fact that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre says that this merely permits something, it's not true. The province is now adopting a policy, if it passes this legislation, than an existing inequitable situation in the City of Winnipeg, in order to make the law uniform, will be spread throughout the entire province, which is a peculiar form of logic, Mr. Speaker. It seems that it would be much more sensible to eliminate the existing inequity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I think I've learned in the last few years the role that a legislator has to perform in the House, and a member of the Opposition whose task it is to draw matters to the attention of government for action, or at least consideration by the government, and for the right to speak up in the House and point out to the government its failings and point out to the government those matters in which it should be taking a greater interest. I'm not too sure that members of this House have a clear picture of the role which they play as members of a committee. I have heard the pontificating statements from members of the front bench on "You were a member of the committee; why didn't you do so and so?" And the Attorney-General, whose eyes are closed and appears not to be listening, did say "hear, hear" and I'm glad -- oh, he didn't say it then? Oh. It's the Honourable the Minister of Finance who agreed with me. I wish I knew who did agree with me. (Interjections)

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance) (Fort Rouge): . . . Finance. I inform you of that fact.

MR. CHERNIACK: And I called you Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Of mines, I thought.

MR. CHERNIACK: Finance, I said.

MR. EVANS: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CHERNIACK: I thought you were disagreeing with me on the pronunciation of a word. At least we are now in agreement as to the role that the Minister plays in this House; in addition, of course, to other roles such as reprimanding members of the Legislature who have had occasion to deal with the government in action on the question of the dealing in committees, and he is the one who just recently made the statement - was it just a couple of days ago - "The committee is in charge of its own rules." And he nods his head agreeing to his authorship of that.

Well, I was saying that the role of a person, any member of the Legislature, in committee I think is somewhat different from his role in the Legislature itself, because it seems to me that when a matter is referred to committee, it is referred for more extensive studies; it is referred to give the members of the Legislature an opportunity to hear briefs, to hear persons who haven't the right to speak in this Chamber, to come before it and make suggestions and make, well, disagree with certain proposals, but to study, and as a result of its study to then proceed to recommend to this House what ought to be done on the matters with which it has been charged. That is what I imagine is the role of a member of the Legislature when he is sitting in committee. And it is all very well to say the committee makes its own rules, and it is all very well to say you are a member of the committee and therefore should have had an opportunity to do something or other. The fact is that there are two very important features involved in a committee. One I accept. I accept the principle that the government has a right to pack the committee by making sure that it has a majority on the committee.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I think the word "pack" is poorly chosen.

MR. CHERNIACK: Pretty what?

MRS. FORBES: Pack. I think the word "pack" is poorly chosen.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, what I'm trying to say is that the government makes very sure in the appointment of all committees that a majority of the members of the committee are persons who are members of the government party and as such are able to control the conduct. Now in -- (Interjection) -- If the Honourable the Attorney-General, now having become awake, is pointing out that that is democracy, then I must point out to him that had he been awake when I started my sentence some time ago, that I said I accept this as being a logical thing and one which I assure you the New Democratic government will do.

MR. SPEAKER: I, too, am enjoying the comments of the Honourable Member for St. John's but I wonder if he would come back to the matter at hand on which he originally rose; and to the other members I would ask that the Honourable Member for St. John's have the floor until he is finished his remarks, without any interruptions.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your rising to protect me, as of course it is your duty to protect all members of the House when they are being obstructed in their attempts to deal with the matter before us, which in this case is a report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, etc., and I am dealing specifically with that committee and I was talking about the role that I thought that I, as a member of that committee, had to play, and I was also talking about the fact that the government insists on filling up that portion of the committee which represents the majority with its own members, and whether filling up means packing or not, and whether it means stacking or not, the fact is that the government packs the committee with the majority of its members, and I don't object to it.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): You don't object to democracy. We're glad to hear that.

MR. CHERNIACK: The other matter that I pointed out that the committee has no control over, is when the committee meets and how often the committee meets, and that is where I do not accept the fact that the government has the right to control it, because the danger there is, Mr. Speaker, that the government will abuse its power by preventing the committee from dealing with those matters which are assigned to it. That is not democracy in my concept of what it is. The Attorney-General may have other ideas; he is a proponent of his form of democracy. But to me it is not acceptable that this Legislature, in all seriousness, delegates certain responsibilities to a committee, especially to sit between sessions, and then makes it

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . impossible for the committee to meet in sufficient time and with sufficient time to deal with those matters assigned to it. That, to me, is not democracy, and that to me is an abuse of power, and that to me is something which we ought to protest very loudly - and we are doing that, and we have had occasion already in the last few days to speak about that, and although as a member of the committee I feel aggrieved about the general lethargy or deliberate inaction of this government in this sense, I feel it most grievously in connection with this committee which I think has been charged with, in volume, the greatest responsibility to deal with between the last session and this.

When I had occasion to speak somewhat along this line in committee, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I was not alone in complaining strongly about the fact that the meetings were not called in sufficient time and with sufficient time allotted to it, I think it was the Minister of Transportation who used an expression - he's used it before and unfortunately I don't quite remember it but it goes something like: "It is better to travel . . ."

MEMBERS: Hopefully.

MR. CHERNIACK: Hopefully. Is that the word? ". . . than to arrive." I couldn't remember that word "hopefully" because, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I cannot figure out what word, what possible word could be used that would be a better choice than to arrive at one's objective, and now I know. "Hopefully" is apparently the word which he uses. It is better to travel hopefully than to arrive. And that is exactly, I suppose, the story of the tortoise. We go back to all that history that one does it ploddingly, and one does it slowly, and one does it carefully, and one does it every which way, except to arrive. And what amazes me is that the Honourable the First Minister, who controls all appointments in his Cabinet, took the man who wants to travel hopefully rather than to arrive and put him in charge of transportation, because that obviously is the last place one should put a person if one is involved in trying to get somewhere, and that phrase is one I couldn't just let go without commenting on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we in the committee were charged with a responsibility on May 24th, 1968, and we were instructed that we do inquire into and report to the House on expropriation and, among other matters, to consider the White Paper entitled the Citizens' Remedies Code presented to this House. Would you or anybody else, Mr. Speaker, like to guess the date on which this Citizens Remedies Code was brought to this Legislature? Many of you may not remember that far back. That was on December 8th, 1966 - after a great deal of time had been spent in all the preceding investigations and all the preceding committees, citizens' committees, established by the former Premier; the Tallin Commission which sat; many hearings have been held since this matter was brought up in 1964 when I moved a resolution on behalf of this party. That we establish a Department of Consumer Affairs, I think was the resolution that I had the honour to move at the time since 1964, and now the Speech from the Throne promises that some five years later we will consider whether or not to have a sub-department of that.

Well, it may disappoint the Minister of Transport that it appears as if we're about to arrive, and I must admit that I have been travelling hopefully because I thought that we would get there some day, I don't know in whose time. So that through all that time, back from 1964, we were considering matters referred to in the Citizens' Remedies Code and now this committee, being charged with this responsibility in May, 1968, first considered any matter referred to it other than - well, any matter - in October of 1969. Unfortunately I was unable to be present at that meeting so I can speak only from what I'm told and from the minutes, and I'd better warn the Honourable the Attorney-General, he wasn't able to be present either at that meeting so he'd better not speak with any more knowledge than I do, but from the minutes it would appear that what was dealt with was the routine work of reviewing rules and regulations, and then the chairman informed the committee that a proposed draft respecting registration of personal properties securities was now available for distribution to members of the committee, and Mr. Braid, a lecturer for the Manitoba Law School, would explain the draft legislation to the members. Mr. Braid explained the proposed changes effected by the proposed draft, and the highlights of the proposed legislation. The chairman instructed Messrs. Tallin and Prud'homme to prepare copies for the members of the committee of the first 21 pages of the report submitted to the Attorney-General by a sub-committee of the Law Reform Committee. And I am informed and verily believe, Mr. Speaker, that the committee never discussed it. I am told and I believe that Mr. Braid made a presentation and that it was not discussed by the committee on that date, October 25th. It was received and heard, and I can verify to you that at the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . following meetings, which were held last week, this matter was not discussed nor was the report dealt with by the committee, and the committee therefore comes along and has the effrontery, which I believe it is, to report to this House in that particular: "While your committee has not examined the proposed drafts in detail," - note those words "in detail", I believe "in any respect" would have been a more honest way to present the fact - "your committee recommends that legislation along the general lines of the Draft Act be brought forward when feasible." And of course, as I point out, the Draft Act was not discussed in any way by the committee itself.

So now we know that this committee was used in this respect to hear a presentation and receive the filing of a brief by a highly regarded sub-committee of the . . . the Manitoba Bar, and never having discussed it, now says to this Legislature: We've not reviewed it in detail but we recommend the Act along the general lines. I consider that an affront. I think it's an affront to this Legislature as well as to the committee itself, that having charged the committee with the responsibility to review, the committee wasn't given the opportunity to review because the meeting was called on Monday of the day in which the Legislature came to meet, and it sat on Monday and it sat on Tuesday, and the only reference to this particular Act was a reference saying, well, we'll send it on. We'll send it on. For good reason; because the committee worked diligently for two days. That must be said for the committee, not for the government, that the committee worked diligently for two days but didn't have the time to deal with personal properties security. The report deals with the Draft Expropriation Act. The committee that dealt in detail with the Draft Expropriation Act was a committee that was appointed and which ceased to sit a year ago. It was prior to the end of the last session that the committee dealt with the Draft Expropriation Act - with the Draft Act. On this occasion when we met last week, the Minister brought a list of principles - proposals in general of the type of Act we ought to have, as if we hadn't had a Draft Act before us - and we then discussed that, and there were reservations but it was fairly well discussed as principles. The Act itself was not dealt with by the committee, which ceased to operate just at the beginning of this session, but I didn't feel that the principles involved were discussed, and had they been discussed at a time when this committee could have dealt with not only the principles but with a proposed Act, we'd have been much further ahead. We would have been able to deal with an Act, rather than principles; the principles were only dealt with a week ago. But for the record of this government in dealing with committees, that was pretty good for the Expropriation Act, in my opinion. The Honourable Member for Lakeside participated considerably in this aspect and he may have his own view of it, but I think that that was fairly well covered.

Next we come to the Draft Consumers Protection Act, on which a great deal of time had been spent, not by this committee which is reporting but by predecessors of this committee. It was dealt with at great length. We heard numerous briefs. I don't know how high the pile is of the briefs that we have heard and all the consideration that was given a long time ago by a different committee, a committee which ceased to exist quite a long time ago, but not by the committee that's reporting today. And then it proceeded to deal with a review of individual aspects of it and never finished, and it was a hope of the committee, and I'm sure I speak for every member of the committee, and in this respect I don't believe that there's one member on the government side who's a member of the committee who won't agree with me, that this committee was anxious - this last committee - anxious to deal with the matters assigned to it. I am sure that the backbenchers of this government are greatly embarrassed by this government's failure to permit them to sit and do their work, because the members of the back bench have little opportunity to do anything in this House while the House is in session because they are to a large extent muzzled, but in committee they can feel that they are participating, that they are fulfilling their functions, and I have a great deal of sympathy, but not much else, for the backbenchers of the government who have to sit and suffer a lack of an opportunity to do their work because of this government's attitude. But the committee - I'm speaking now, I believe, for all members of the committee - were anxious to proceed with the work of the Consumer Protection Act.

Well, we got around to it. I'm not sure whether it was forced on them or not, because on Monday we insisted that a certain delegation be prepared to be invited to come down - it wanted to come. We said, well, come Tuesday morning. I have the feeling that the government spokesmen were not so anxious to go ahead, but that may be wrong, and since I have so much concrete to accuse them of, I'll even withdraw the insinuation that they weren't anxious to. I

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . will say that on the Tuesday we heard a delegation and we then proceeded to deal with the report of the legal, the lawyers consulted to work on the Consumer Protection.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that if one were to study carefully the report that they presented to the previous committee before the last session, and if one would look at what was recommended since that time and this committee which met last week, you would find very little that has changed. You would find some changes. You would find the kind of changes that one normally expects to find in the year following the passing of such an important and extensive Act as was discussed, and if this committee had had an opportunity to deal with it we would have had an Act last year based on the great deal of study that was given to it, and this year we would have been dealing with an amendment to the Act setting out certain changes, but in case it is questioned, I challenge the Minister who is now responsible - who wasn't responsible for it before - to indicate the benefits that may have been achieved by the delay forced on us by this government compared with the contribution that would have been made to the economy of the so many consumers involved had that Act been passed in the form in which it had been recommended by the committee last year. The changes are few, and therefore I say that the government was delinquent in not giving us an important Act last year, much less this year, because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister was very careful to say that, although we hadn't discussed all the report, he could not guarantee that we would be dealing with that this year. You notice, Mr. Speaker, there's no reference to it in the Speech from the Throne - at least I don't recall seeing one - and the reason was a very practical one. The Minister's not sure he can get that Act drafted. He's not sure he can get the mechanics done. I think the committee, the majority of the committee, have agreed on the principles involved. I think the whole committee is anxious to have it go before us. We may disagree on certain aspects, but the Minister is apparently now stuck, not on any question of policy, but on the straight administrative problem of having a bill drafted. Had we met three months ago, had we met four months ago, we would have had a bill ready, possibly ready to be filed in the next couple of days. Had we met ten months ago, twelve months ago, we would have had an Act last year, and the government - not this Minister - the government is responsible for the fact that the people of Manitoba today do not have the many important protections to which they are entitled under the proposed Consumer Protection Act, and it's this government that has prevented the committee from dealing with it.

Mr. Speaker, this committee was charged with the responsibility of looking into the recommendations dealing with the Legislative Commissioner for Administration. That word has now been changed. You know, we used to have an education tax which was changed to a sales tax, in name. Now we have the Legislative Commissioner for Administration which is being changed to be called Ombudsman, which is a word so well-known to members of this Legislature that it is much more clearly understood than is this Legislative Commissioner. Nevertheless, the government, as has been pointed out, fought strenuously against the principle. This year they fought it and we don't have an Act. Oh no; no time for that. We have a "statement of principles" as to what this office should embody, and it's pretty good. There were some reservations but in the main it was pretty good. I'm beginning to think that one of the best moves that was made by this First Minister was to get the Minister of Consumer Affairs cracking on this work, because I have the impression that not only is his heart in the right place but that he would like to arrive. It's only unfortunate that we've been travelling so hopefully without him at the front.

So, we're going to have an Ombudsman apparently; that's been promised in the Speech from the Throne, and we have some idea as to what the principles involved should be, and there's certainly a step forward from the government's own recommendations in its White Paper where it wanted to keep out so many aspects that were good.

Then, Mr. Speaker, this committee was charged with discussing, reviewing, reporting, on the proposals in the White Paper dealing with legal assistance to indigents. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that we dealt with that in committee? I would expect that you would have thought so. I would think that every member of this House who is not a member of the committee would have said, "Well, they must have dealt with the question of legal assistance to indigents," because surely, having been given the responsibility, as we in the House did, probably unanimously - oh yes, unanimously - to deal with it, then every member of the House who is not a member of the committee would be sure that we dealt with legal aid. But this committee's report is: "Your committee heard comments from the Attorney-General." I think maybe it

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . should have been "heard comment", because in effect what he said was, "We're not going to deal with this, boys. In effect he said, "We're not prepared to do anything about it." In effect he said, "We're not even going to ask that this committee continue to have the responsibility of dealing with legal aid." In fact, the recommendation which either he or somebody else on his side or at his hand drafted, says, "Your committee recommends that the government continue its review of these matters with a view to enlarging these programs as and when it becomes financially feasible so to do."

Mr. Speaker, we don't even know whether the people of Manitoba can wait until this government decides what is financially feasible, because what may be financially feasible for this government may be a great hardship to the finances and to the progress of so many of the people in the province of Manitoba, and what the government has decided to do - and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we sat until, I think it was 6:20 in the afternoon of last Tuesday, and in the last 15 minutes, I think it was, when the Minister told us, "Well, we're not going ahead with it and we recommend the government continue its review," I don't believe the government did anything in review of this since the last time we discussed it in this House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, my honourable friend has, I'm afraid, forgotten what took place in the committee. He was so anxious to record what wasn't taking place he forgot what did take place, and on the point of privilege I would merely mention to him, and I am sure he will recall it because he does try to be accurate in these things, that the report, the comment was made to the committee that the government had been in consultation with the Law Society of Manitoba on this scheme and that negotiations were currently going on. Now I could be mistaken as to the exact detail but I remember distinctly saying that to the committee because it has taken place and the report was made to the committee. It may be a minor point but I didn't want my honourable friend to be inaccurate in too many of his comments this afternoon.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): That last sentence should be stricken from the records.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General states that I am so anxious to report what didn't take place in that committee that maybe I have overlooked what did. It's true that we had two lengthy days and this was at the very end after six o'clock of that day, and since I am older than the Honourable the Attorney-General, it may well be that he has a better recollection of what he said, but the word "negotiating", that doesn't strike any sort of a chord. Oh, he's corrected himself now by saying "discussion", but I'm sure he did say earlier when he was on his feet that he had reported that there were negotiations. If there are negotiations that's very interesting. Why doesn't he report to us? This committee, which is charged with this responsibility, had the right to get some sort of a report from the Honourable Minister who was charged with it, but what he did apparently was tell us that the government was discussing - and the word "negotiations" is now a questionable one - with the Law Society. How long does it take? What is involved? What are the problems? How could this committee have helped the Honourable the Attorney-General in dealing with this problem? He shakes his head and says "it couldn't". And that's his attitude to this committee or to any other, I believe. His attitude is the committee can not help him because he and his cabinet members know what they want to do.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, could I ask my honourable friend, has the committee the power to raise any money?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Honourable the Attorney-General does have to come to me for some guidance in the powers of a committee, and I'm happy to be able to tell him that I do not believe that a committee has the power to raise the money, but I do believe, and I think it's an important part of the committee's work, to assess the burden on the people who are affected by the program involved, the cost involved, and then try to measure the cost against the benefits, and to that extent this committee could have been of great help to the Honourable the Attorney-General. This committee could have come unanimously in support of some project that could have been discussed and dealt with, because again I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, we sit on opposite sides of the House and we represent important policies which our respective parties have accepted as principle.

I don't believe the question of the provision of legal aid is a matter which is or should be the primary concern of any one or other political party, and when we meet in committee - lately I've noticed that the government members line up on one side of the table and the opposition on



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . the other; that may be an accident, it didn't happen a few years ago, but I've noticed it latterly and I don't know which side started it - but on the question of legal aid, is there any doubt in anybody's mind that if the committee could have discussed it it could have arrived at a consensus - more than a consensus - a unanimous support to the government for what it could be doing, but the committee was not given that opportunity, and I do say it was an affront, and I do say that it was an abuse of the power of the government in controlling the opportunity and ability of the committee to meet.

The other matter on which the committee heard comment was that of compensation to victims of crime. Now of course I don't speak with too much modesty or embarrassment when I refer proudly to the fact that I had the honour to be able to bring this first to this House back in - I don't know - 1966 I think it was, some few years ago, and I remember the congratulations which I received in the hallway and in this House, by the fact that it was a motion which was unanimously accepted by this House. I was told then by people, members of the Legislature who had been here a much longer time than I, that it's not very often that a member of the opposition has the opportunity and the honour of having the House unanimously accept a proposal, and I think it was the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre who studied at great length this entire proposal which I had made, who borrowed all the material I had - and there was a good deal of it - and who made a comprehensive study to the extent that he even obtained more material than I had and was able to report to this House on what was being done elsewhere, and what were the considerations involved and what were the principles. The House accepted it unanimately from that time until now and has done very little about it.

Now I say very little because we did last year pass an Act which I said, and I think others may also have said it, it's right in principle but does not deal with the real problem. As I said last year, I quoted a letter from Chief Blow of the Winnipeg Police Force, that he thinks it's very worthwhile legislation, but that when he discussed this with other senior members of his force, they did not come up with one occasion when a person suffered injury as a result of being called to help a police officer in carrying out his duties. So although the Chief of Police welcomed this legislation, as we all did, he also said, I don't know of any occasion when it would have had to have been used. I think I said last year that I too welcomed it but I didn't think it meant much, and I would like very much to hear if anybody has even applied for compensation under that Act, much less have received it. Maybe they have, because the legislation was good, but it was just a step in that direction, a baby step in that direction. And then the comment made by the Honourable the Attorney-General - and he will tell us what it is if by any chance I don't report it quite accurately - the comment was that we have yet to study whether or not we can find the money for it, the feasibility of finance, and we want to know what's happening in Saskatchewan which has this. -- (Interjection) -- Did the Honourable Minister -- would he mind confirming that he did mention that they wanted to look at Saskatchewan's experience.

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in fact I think I told the committee that the Deputy Minister had already been to Saskatchewan and that we were in consultation, in addition to Saskatchewan, with Ontario and the Province of British Columbia, both of the latter provinces having enacted similar legislation to what Manitoba enacted last year.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, that's fine. Now we're clear on that. Both of those have the same Act, which does very little, as Manitoba has. Why they had to talk to Ontario to find out, to consult with them about an Act similar to the one we already have, I'm not clear on, but that's all right. -- (Interjection) -- No, that's enough, the Honourable the Attorney-General will be given every opportunity by you, Mr. Speaker, to make a speech.

MR. LYON: Glad to help you along.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Saskatchewan government brought in legislation such as I have proposed, and such as the committee and the Citizens' Paper proposes, about a year ago, and it's not very long ago when there was a report from Saskatchewan that the first payment had been made.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might interrupt the honourable gentleman for just a moment and remind him that he has five minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you. I wouldn't need that much, Mr. Speaker. But has the Attorney-General found out what has been done in New York and in California and in New Zealand and in England? Does he not know their experience? Does he have to wait for some new act having been passed in some neighbouring province to find out what the experience is

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) ... about? This is a delaying tactic, but what is worse, there was no opportunity to discuss it. That's really the point that I'm making in this, because I'm going to have an opportunity later on to present a resolution specifically on this question.

But the question that I want to stress today is that the committee was insulted, and through it so was this Legislature, by the denial by this government to the committee of an opportunity to discuss this matter. That's the point I want to make. This government because of its dilatory attitudes made it impossible for a decent discussion on the matter assigned to it. That is a major complaint I make at this time. And the government smugly sit back and members of the government say, "well the committee makes its own rules"; and on one occasion I was told, "Well you were a member of the committee, why couldn't you see to it that it sat." I answer that by pointing out that I made two efforts recently to get it to meet and was unsuccessful. And for the failure of this government to give the committee an opportunity to do what it was charged to do I think is a terrible situation and a terrible affront to all members of the Legislature, and especially to those people who sit behind the Cabinet benches and who have to take the criticism which is not their fault but for which they are accountable because they do sit in that position.

I would like very much to be present at a caucus meeting to hear what is told to the Cabinet by members of the committee. I would believe and I have enough confidence in the integrity and sincerity of the members of the Conservative caucus who sit in the back bench that at a meeting of their caucus they would have the courage and they would have the -- use the word "sincerity" again -- to tell the Cabinet Ministers what they think of the method in which they are operating the business of this House and the business of this Legislature.

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

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, the lack of leadership of this government while dealing with the -- (Interjection) -- The Attorney-General thinks that this is a joke but I don't think the rest of us ... -- (Interjection) -- What's that Red?

MR. LYON: Your opening line is the same every year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right. That's right.

MR. LYON: Having heard it for ten years I couldn't help but laugh again.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that a point of privilege or is he stretching his legs? If you've finished stretching your legs I'll tell you now why it is the same every year, Mr. Speaker. It should have been made quite obvious the lack of leadership in this government dealing with provincial affairs when the three members of the opposition spoke in this debate yesterday. Now that should suffice under ordinary circumstances, but not one of the members of this committee, members representing the government, had one word to say about this. Not one. And this is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, because all the members of this House were elected to look after the affairs of Manitoba, provincial affairs. And this government is certainly not doing it. They don't want to do it and the senior Cabinet Minister on this committee admitted that himself, the Minister of Transport said that he didn't have to do it. Oh I'd love you to make your statement that you made in committee Mr. Speaker, if he's ready to do so, it's priceless. I think it should be put on the record. Would you care to put your records now -- put the record straight.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would just care that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would be accurate in his statements in this House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much for the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I'll be very accurate. The Minister said that he did not have to do anything, after all he had other things to do and he said that after all let us remember that it wasn't the government that moved this, and he was in error, he said it was the Honourable Member from St. John's. Did you or did you not say that? -- (Interjection) -- He's not sure.

MR. McLEAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be silly I suppose to waste my time exchanging any comments with the honourable member.

MR. DESJARDINS: Fine. Don't waste your time. This is fine. This is the leadership -

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . they call this wasting your time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . remind the honourable gentlemen to address their remarks to the Chair rather than across the Chamber.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, Mr. Speaker, I'm just talking about this Minister of Transport, that's the same gentleman that last year said that he . . . told his constituents, "Don't worry about the Boundaries Commission, it doesn't matter what they say. We are the ones. I am the one that decides where you build these schools." Remember that, Mr. Speaker? That's the same guy. Now I wish the Attorney-General would give him a lecture on democracy you know and then we can start and say again "the same as last year." The same as last year. He's absolutely right. We've had a committee on this for the last -- not last year -- the last three years, 36 months, 36 months. The first meeting after the 23rd month, Mr. Speaker. That's the leadership we're given. Now I brought this up last year when we -- no, not the Honourable Member from St. John's but I think it was the Attorney-General moved that this committee be re-appointed. Remember that? That was a mistake. I was going to say you made but he made it, Mr. Speaker. This is the people that don't give a darn about the people of Manitoba. What happened in this debate? The Attorney-General finally give us a description that we wanted, the meaning of the word. We couldn't find it, we couldn't find it in any dictionary, now they told us last year you're part of this committee, it's up to you, everything. So my Leader asked the government to call a meeting. The Member from St. John's said yesterday that he wrote the Attorney-General. Do you know what he said? In due course. Finally we know what "in due course" means: when we're damn well good and ready, Mr. Speaker. Maybe never but this is "due course" from the Attorney-General because they never called any meeting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you're talking about democracy or the Attorney-General is talking about democracy and the people of Manitoba they've heard all about the Federal Government, they want to know about these priorities. They want to know what we're going to do in this province and I think that the First Minister has got to stand up here today and tell us why we have committees. Does he say that the Minister of Transport is speaking for the government? Is that government policy when they say we don't have to do it because we did not move this motion. Have you ever heard anything so ridiculous, Mr. Speaker? We don't have to vote, we don't have to work, but they're all ganging up on these committees. Boy I'd better watch out. I shouldn't use the word "gang" because the -- what's their name -- what's this new title? Government Services Propaganda Machine and -- (Interjection) -- what's that? Services. I'll find out. Oh boy . . .

MRS. FORBES: It will take you a long time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that a challenge?

MRS. FORBES: . . . a long time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is that a challenge Thelma? Boy that'll be lovely, lovely, lovely.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Just my buddy and I had a . . . Talking about stacked, or packed, I think that's what we're talking about. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I propose that the Member from St. John's should be the chairman of this committee. My French accent again. I said I propose -- but this group they weren't stacked, they weren't packed, I don't know what they were, but nevertheless they weren't a darned bit interested but they voted against it. -- (Interjection) -- Ya loaded, they were loaded all right. So they set up the same chairman. Poor fellow, he's got to listen to the senior member the dicta -- I was going to say the dictator but that's not parliamentary -- the one that says "we decide", you know the committee don't mean a damn thing. Well this is the one anyhow I was referring to. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General's got the nerve to say "the same thing as last year." Well this is not a laughing matter. The people of Manitoba and the people of this House want to know, we demand to know why you set up these committees. We started these -- we've had committees for years but it was 1966 - everything. We had a committee that would look after the rights of the youth of this province, the rights of the women, the rights of old age, the rights of animals, because they even added artificial insemination, everything was . . . committees for everything . . . everything. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you think that this is the purpose of these committees? Is that the reason why we have committees here so these great leaders, these great leaders who when they can't talk about federal affairs must talk about their priorities -- (Interjection) -- what's that Thelma? -- talk about their priorities and so on. What priorities have they got

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) ... now? When in the heck are we going to discuss this? Mind you they haven't got the time but let them have a posh committee like the denturists. They are going from Vancouver to B. C. and all over the place. They'll go to Lower Slobodia, all over the place -- now as we heard "no report" -- I know Vancouver is in B. C. I was just ...

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable gentleman doesn't wish to make my position too difficult but I would hope that he would keep to the problem ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh no. No, I appreciate you and I have been good friends for a long time and I wouldn't want to change that, Mr. Speaker, but I'd like to make their position difficult, because they're the one, they're going all on this free-loading on these committees, but let them have a committee that they have to do some work. And my friend the Minister of Transport says "Well after all I didn't move this motion. Why the hell should I do any work on this committee -- I mean why should I work on this committee?" Excuse me ...

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I think on a point of personal privilege, I made no such statement about not doing any work. I pointed out to the committee that the motion had been made by the Honourable Member for St. John's, and that's the plain unvarnished truth and the fact of the matter. I made no other comment. The honourable member has persisted in deliberately -- (Interjection) -- now I'm talking -- deliberately misstating ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Has he got the floor, Mr. Speaker?

MR. McLEAN: ... and I must ask that he desist immediately.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I don't intend to desist, not a bit. It might not be unvarnished but it's whitewash. Why would you tell us that the motion was made by the Honourable Member from St. John's? Why did you tell us that? Because you tell us after all we had time, we should reword it. We weren't expected to have any meetings and after all why should the government be interested. Isn't that what -- I was going to say what you said, but what he said, Mr. Speaker. You weren't there but ask him -- that's exactly what he said and you can ask the Member from St. John's and you can ask the Member from Selkirk -- this is exactly what he said or certainly what he meant, "why should the government be interested in this."

Now that committee was first set up -- and by the way this as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, was wrong. The original one, 1966, the original motion was proposed by the Honourable Member from St. John's and it was passed unanimously and so did the one in '67, so did the one in '68, I imagine the one in '69 too and for the next ten, fifteen years, they'll all be unanimous. And does that mean that the government has no responsibility to lead? They move and they second and we've had our first meeting 23 months or -- no 26 months after the first committee was set up. Now is that responsible and is that leadership? Even the Attorney-General will -- you know the way he can connive and bring in something, whitewash everything. I defy him to show us that this is leadership. And he's right when he said that it was the same thing last year; he's absolutely right. Well I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier will take part in this debate and will tell us if the Minister of Transport was delegated to give the government policy on this or is there a reason why we have these committees and are we going to get down to work even if it's not a free-loading committee that you go all over the place and then hide the report in a corner somewhere.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills  
Orders of the Day

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Milk Board and the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture.

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the leave of the House to make an announcement that I think will be of interest to members of the House, and indeed important to the agricultural community of the Province of Manitoba. Last session, Mr. Speaker, members will recall we enacted the Agricultural Credit Development Act which was to replace at that time the Agricultural Credit Act of the province. As members will recall, the Agricultural Credit Act was enacted in 1959 to fill a great need at that time in respect of long term credit. However, through the years the federal legislation has been upgraded to the point where they now have an Act, another policy, that is filling the needs of the farmers insofar as long-term credit is concerned, very well. And so for this and other reasons we have changed our policy through the Act that was brought into the House last year. At this point I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we believe that the policy over the past years under the old Act has done a great deal for the province and I want here to give credit to the members of that corporation for their contribution to the province and the work that they have done on the old credit corporation where they loaned to farmers of the province on long-term credit something in excess of \$40 million.

So today I want to announce that we now have regulations established for production credit loans. I think for further reasons that in agriculture today the cost has exceeded by far what it was back in the years prior to 1960 and earlier years. The cost of fertilizer now and of chemicals, machinery and cost of basic livestock and so forth have led us to believe that we should institute in this province production credit. For some months we have been negotiating with the banks and with the lending institutions and we have finally come up with regulations that we believe will satisfy the needs of agriculture to a great extent insofar as credit is concerned.

The chartered banks and other lending institutions have shown a real interest in providing more and better credit to agriculture and it was our feeling that the proper role of government was to encourage our existing lending institutions to do their best possible job. And with this in mind we have therefore developed a system of guarantee on loans made by banks and certain credit unions. I wonder if the page boys would come and distribute. I have brochures here that will cover roughly the regulations or the terms that I propose to read out to you now.

These guarantees will be available to borrowers who agree to take out a line of credit at one source. In other words, all of the short and interim requirements must be met in one credit arrangement. The purpose for which lines of credit may be guaranteed include the following:

1. Farm Operating expenses.
2. The purchase of livestock.
3. The construction and improvement of buildings.
4. The purchase of agricultural implements and farm machinery.
5. The carrying out of permanent improvements on land, e.g. clearing, breaking, draining, fencing.
6. The consolidation of outstanding liabilities incurred for agricultural business purposes.
7. Other items related to the establishment and development of a family farm.

The part of the line of credit which is used for operating expenses will be repayable annually but the portion which is used for other purposes may have a repayment period of up to 10 years. The guarantees to the banks and approved lending institutions will be made through the Corporation from the period commencing as of today and ending on the 31st day of December 1971. The Corporation will guarantee up to 10 percent of the total amount of all approved loans made by a bank or approved lending institution for this period. A bank is

(MR. WATT Cont'd.) . . . defined as a banking company such as the Bank of Montreal, for example. For the period ending in December of 1971, and this is a cut-off period of three years that has been established, the Corporation will guarantee an amount for all lending institutions including banks up to \$150 million. There will be no interest rate established in the regulations of this Act. This rate will be determined between the borrower and the lender. The only provision in the regulation is that any interest rate agreed upon must be calculated on the basis of simple interest on the outstanding amount. The following points with regard to the rate of interest should be noted. This program will reduce the cost of borrowing to the farmers by consolidating his borrowing at one source. This will eliminate some of the high rates of interest presently being paid. The fact that a borrower has a guarantee from the Corporation will improve his bargaining position with the lender.

This new program will be administered by the new Agricultural Credit and Development Corporation and you will recall that I made an announcement on February 14th regarding the appointment of the Board of Directors to the new Corporation. We will naturally be working in very close co-operation with the banks and with the credit unions and with all who are interested in projecting this program.

This is the announcement that I wish to make today Mr. Speaker. The reason that I take up the time of the House at the moment is because I believe it's urgent that we get this policy in effect, otherwise we would have had to wait another two weeks to have this announcement gazetted. My understanding is that this will be suffice to put the new corporation in effect as of today. Thank you.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, this appears to me to be a very substantial retreat from what was being done previously in the field of farm credit. I would like to know specifically from the Minister when he says "regarding interest rates"; he appeared to indicate that this would be putting the farmers in a better position for interest rates, but he says specifically that it's a question of bargaining between the individual farmer and the borrower or the lender. Now, under the previous credit corporation there was a fixed rate of interest which was below these standard rates. Now the Minister is going to let this completely out, the corporation isn't going to be involved in getting a lower rate of interest for the borrower, the government isn't going to be involved, the borrower is left completely out on his own.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, the interest rates will be bank rates and I think this is consistently with the policy of the Federal Government insofar as their farm improvement loan is concerned at the moment. In fact, I think it's consistent insofar as the farm improvement loan for the Federal Government always was, because at one time the Federal Government had a farm improvement loan which was fixed interest rate, but the fixed interest rate that was established was established at the time when interest rates were about equivalent to the rates that were established by the federal policy. When I say it will be a distinct advantage to the farmers insofar as credit rates are concerned, my understanding is now, and I think that I'm perfectly right when I say that interest rates now are being paid all the way from 10, 12 and probably higher at the moment.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . way is this going to change this? No, not one iota of change in that regard. If the Minister and his department and the Corporation are not going to be involved in negotiating a better interest rate for the borrower, then he's at the mercy of the market. Now, the Minister says that he will be paying bank rate, well bank rate has been freed, it varies in all sorts of directions now, so there's no guarantee at all for the borrower and it's been increasing steadily, so this is very much of a worse position for the farmer borrowing than the previous Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to question the Honourable Minister on a statement. The way I understand it, all you're doing under this new Act now is guaranteeing 10 percent of the total amount that will be loaned to farmers. There is no subsidization involved in any way, is there? -- of interest rate?

MR. WATT: There's no subsidy involved.

MR. MOLGAT: If the government is going to guarantee the bank loans - a guarantee of 10 percent the Minister says - is the government not going to see to it that there is an interest advantage to the borrower? Surely, this is just using public funds to make money for the bankers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I feel very much the same as the Leader of the Opposition, that if we are going to provide some measure of backing to the banking community against losses, that surely there should have been some concession on the interest rate to the borrower. I just couldn't see where the Province of Manitoba could get involved in such a program without some sort of concession in the interest rate. The other point that I wish to draw to the Minister's attention is that it seems to me that although I haven't had time to condense this, that you are only going to make loans available to people that cannot now borrow or that have been turned down by the bank. So, really we're not dealing with a substantial program that will cover all the people of Manitoba.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the farmer who has established a line of credit with the bank, he doesn't need it. We're talking about particularly young farmers who have not established enough collateral or they haven't enough material they can put up to guarantee their own loans, who probably are in a position to contribute greatly to the agricultural industry through the years. These are the people that we are interested in; these are the people that we are guaranteeing the banks to.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N. D. P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question if I may to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I'm rather disturbed with one item particularly and that's the one dealing with repayment. I notice that it says here that that part of a line of credit used for operation expenses will be repaid annually or at the completion of a production cycle - normally one year. But if we face a year like we had last year, where the cash position of a farmer is in such a deplorable state that they're not able to pay back on their loans that they had previously, even for operational purposes, what will their situation be under the terms or the broad outline of this proposition that you have before us this afternoon?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, before the Honourable Minister answers might I ask him, is this not almost an exact duplication of a service that's already existing through federal sources?

MR. FROESE: One further question, Mr. Speaker. Is special consideration being given to the people in the Interlake area under the ARDA program? I think that this was something that was mentioned in the Act when it was passed last year.

MR. WATT: I'd have to take that question as notice. The question of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party: the provision is there for the extension of the time over a period of ten years. I don't think the -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't think it specifically sets out actually that the amount must be repaid. There's no such thing as saying that there cannot be renegotiation insofar as extension of terms are concerned. I think this would apply to any borrowing or lending institution as it stands now.

MR. PAULLEY: I think we better make sure before we go too far.

MR. WATT: The question of the Honourable Member for Lakeside: I point out to him that the federal policy is improvement loans actually, it does not apply to the purchase of fertilizer or fuel, it does not apply to seed, it does not apply to production actually, and when you start to try to separate production costs from machinery for instance or from the purchase of cattle, it's a little difficult to separate one from another. I simply stated that we have a broader loan, it's based on the type of credit that they have in most states in the United States and have had for some years. It's production loans actually that involves everything involved with production on a farm.

MR. CAMPBELL: Might I ask, Mr. Speaker, might I ask the honourable minister, are not the exceptions that he mentioned in the farm improvement loan covered by the general credit corporation of the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. If I might interrupt the Orders of the Day for a moment and refer the honourable members to the gallery where we have several students of Grade 11 standing from the Vincent Massey Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Miss Susan Enns. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one or two questions of my honourable friend the Minister. The objectives are clearly set out here and the whole purpose as I understand it is to make certain that every farmer in the Province of

(MR. SHOEMAKER Cont'd.)... Manitoba is operating an economic unit, and they go on to say that - or as I understand it - the government will determine, or the board will determine whether or not the application for the loan will in the end result in this farmer having set up an economic unit and then his ability to develop and operate it and pay the loan back. Now, does this mean that the banker will determine, will have a say in whether he considers it an economic unit or will the government, or will both; and if so, will there be a charge for that service? That is, for the advice that will be given out. Or will there be an application service charge if you want?

MR. WATT: Well, in the first instance, the banks will do the screening in the same manner as they do now insofar as the federal improvement loan is concerned, but in the case of the provincial act or the regulation, an applicant being turned down by the bank would have the right to appeal to the credit corporation. They could in their wisdom decide whether they were prepared to take a chance on the 10 percent backing and could instruct the banks to loan any particular individual money.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question. In what way, if any, will this effect the present corporation, the change, will it effect the staff in any way?

MR. WATT: I don't quite get what you mean by the question.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will this new policy have any effect on the staff now employed by the Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. WATT: Well, we're not quite sure yet but we're using the personnel that are presently working for the corporation. They will be in the field to give assistance and direction...

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will there be a reduction in staff?

MR. WATT: I'm not prepared to say at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, does this mean that the applicant for a loan who has been turned down by a bank, as I understand it, will have to go through the same procedures as before under your former Act, that is to apply to the corporation and have his farm inspected and the report then dealt with by the Board, and only at that time does he get the answer whether his line of credit has been approved or not?

MR. WATT: Yes, that's the way I understand it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, one more question in connection with the statement. What requirements have been laid down that credit unions have to meet in order to become lenders?

MR. WATT: I should have it here some place. I think I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask one question. Am I to understand - I think you already answered it but I'm not sure - that if I make an application to the bank and I'm turned down because I'm a financial risk; I go to one of the three addresses on the back here, my application is checked out and they may give me a guaranteed loan and the loan will be guaranteed up to 10 percent? Is that the way it would work? They'll give me an application guaranteeing 10 percent of the loan, is that correct?

MR. WATT: No, that is not correct. The corporation would not lend you money directly; they would direct the bank of your choice?

MR. DAWSON: No, no what I'm saying is that they will inform the bank that I choose that they will guarantee 10 percent of the loan. Is that correct? If I'm asking for \$10,000.00, you'll guarantee \$1,000.00? No?

MR. WATT: They would simply say that to the bank that you qualified to borrow within the terms of the credit regulations.

MR. DAWSON: Well how much would be guaranteed though by the government? Ten percent?

MR. WATT: Ten percent as it's set out in the regulation, I believe, in the brochure.

MR. DAWSON: What bank in their right mind once they've turned down an applicant would go for \$10,000 when they only get \$1,000 guaranteed? Don't you feel we have to have more guaranteed than 10 percent? -- If we're going to help?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.



MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is prepared to answer a question which I put to him two days ago?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): Would the Honourable Member from Brokenhead be kind enough to repeat the question?

MR. USKIW: It had to do with contractual arrangements with the Churchill Forest Products and the area of South Indian Lake. I asked at that time whether or not there is a contract affecting the area.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, yes there are no lands affected at South Indian Lake with the proposed Hydro scheme. There would be some lands along the Burntwood and Rat River that are presently covered under the agreement signed in 1966 with Churchill Industries Limited, that could possibly be affected. The precise amount or nature of it are being looked at by different officials in the department as well as from Churchill Industries.

MR. USKIW: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the government is going to proceed with the flooding of the area, is the province going to find itself in a position of having to pay damages to Churchill Forest Products under the contract?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works of the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year '67-'68; and I would also like to reply to a question from the Honourable Member from St. George of yesterday when he asked me re the policy we used in purchasing the mobile homes for Thompson. These homes were not purchased through the Department of Government Services but rather they were purchased through the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . and is this the corporation's policy not to open the tenders when they close, in front of those that submitted bids?

MRS. FORBES: The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation comes under the jurisdiction of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): All I know is the lowest tender was accepted at that time. I'll check into how they were opened.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): There are a couple of things I was going to do but before I did that I wondered if maybe I could correct what I think is a misinterpretation on behalf of the Honourable Member for Hamiota and the ten percent of an individual loan. I think it's ten percent of gross loans that would be given back rather than ten percent of the individual loan. That could be explained maybe in more detail but I was afraid there was a misunderstanding here that I thought I should correct and not let that one find itself on the record.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words, the same basis as the Federal Farm Improvement Loan?

MR. WEIR: Similar basis to the Farm Improvement Loan, or Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and things of that nature.

MR. MOLGAT: The government will guarantee to any lender ten percent of the total amount that that lender has made, the amount of money lent under this scheme?

MR. WEIR: That's just . . . , there are rules and regulations which I don't have at the tip of my fingers, but essentially it's the similar principle that I thought that I should correct in case there was a misunderstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the House that as everybody is aware we've been attempting to have a meeting with the sub-committee of cabinet at Ottawa that has been charged with dealing with the Rivers Base situation, the Armed Forces Base at Rivers, and while we haven't got an appointment with the sub-committee as yet we do have an appointment with the ministers of the two key departments involved, the Honourable Leo Cadieux, Minister of National Defense and the Honourable John Marchand, Minister of Forestry and Rural Development, who have agreed to meet a Manitoba delegation on Monday, March 17th in Ottawa. To ensure that our case is made as clearly and as strongly as possible invitations are being given to participation arranged with representatives from Westman Regional Development Corporation and from the Town of Rivers, and the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the Member from Hamiota whose constituency it falls in -- it's not very far away from my own but it falls in his constituency -- have also been approached

(MR. WEIR Cont'd.) . . . and have agreed to join the Manitoba delegation in an effort to present the strongest case that we can to the ministers concerned.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I lay on the table the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and as I lay it on the table, may I advise the House that the maps shown as Appendices B, C and D are the tentative maps that were given to all of the members of the House at the time the original proposals were made. They're not being duplicated again. The Commission is counting on you having those, but copies of the report and the new maps will be presented to each member of the House immediately.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would first like to compliment the First Minister on tabling the report as quickly as he did. The members obviously are wondering what changes the Commission has finally made and I appreciate receiving it this early in the session. Insofar as his announcement regarding the Rivers' delegation, I am very pleased that he made the suggestion that others than just government members attend and I am delighted to accept the invitation. As he knows, I have been in Ottawa on several occasions in regard to this matter along with my colleague the Member for Rivers and I am very pleased to see the government taking an all-party approach on this. I think in many of these issues this is the best way of solving our problems in Manitoba and I'll be very pleased to co-operate.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I too, welcome the tabling of the report from the Electoral Divisions Commission and appreciate the fact that it is quite within the seven days' latitude that the government has. My colleague from Ethelbert Plains did say that this was the seventh day and it is if you count last Saturday and Sunday. I am somewhat confused at times as to what the time element really is in the legislation, whether it's sitting days or complete days, but anyway we're glad to receive the report today. I would ask my honorable friend whether or not we're going to have accompanying legislation just as quickly as we have the report in order that we might give speedily passage or consideration of the recommendations of the Commission. I, too, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, welcome the opportunity of meeting the authorities down east insofar as rural re-development or extensions in Manitoba, particularly at this time in respect to the Rivers area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the First Minister for taking the initiative in arranging this meeting. I want to thank him also for including me as part of the delegation. As we know, the air base has been in question for two years now, since 1966, and I think the people of that area, and the people of Brandon as well, are very very concerned and the situation can no longer be left up in the air, something must be done. There must be a favorable decision given to us and I'm very pleased to see that we're going to take the approach, that all parties will be together on this approach and press the federal government for a favorable announcement. As I said before, it's very important to the Rivers people but I'm sure that it's very important to the economy of Manitoba, and everyone in Manitoba will benefit if we're able to retain the Rivers base.

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

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to take the opportunity to inform the honourable members of the date of the referendum in respect of the Unitary Divisions to be held in four of the remaining non-unitary divisions. These are Morris, Macdonald, Pembina Valley, Mountain and Western, and the date of the referendum is set for April 14th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Since there has been a news report that all doctors in Thompson are opting out of the Medicare scheme and are also going to demand a payment on the spot for services under \$10.00, led by Dr. Blaine Johnson who is the head of the clinic, I would like to know whether the government is taking any steps to protect the people of Thompson from this C.O.D. brand of medicine in a monopoly situation.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I guess it's quite within the rights under the Act for a group of doctors to decide to opt out. I haven't seen the news story. I don't know about the details of what the honourable member has mentioned. I guess I don't have time to read the newspapers before I come in the House. That's the first I've heard of it; but if they're out, they're out.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. There's apparently a shortage

(MR. DOERN Cont'd.)... of doctors in the area which is one part of the problem. I wonder whether the Minister would consider examining the situation with a view to establishing a public clinic or taking steps to alleviate this shortage. Is the Minister doing anything to provide more medical care in that area?

MR. JOHNSON: We're doing our very best to provide more medical staff, and during the estimates I'll tell you some of the frustrations I've had with Health Resources Fund with great concern. But insofar as this particular matter is concerned this is the doctors' decision, I don't know if all the doctors in the area are involved or not.

MR. DOERN: A further question. As a doctor, do you regard the demand for payment on the spot as being a violation of the Oath of Hippocrates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Can the Minister indicate whether the government has decided to hold the line on university tuition fees for 1969 by providing sufficient grants?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the matter of university fees is a matter of concern to the university. The Boards of Governors of the three respective universities which we have in the province and their level or proportion of their total costs that are recovered from university fees are entirely in their hands.

MR. TANCHAK: Is it true that if the government provides sufficient grants that it will not be necessary for the university to raise the fees?

MR. CRAIK: As a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that would depend on how many other programs the university was in the midst of undertaking at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Another question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources regarding South Indian Lake, Mr. Speaker. Is it conceivable, or is it possible in the Minister's opinion to undertake negotiations with Churchill Forest Products to in fact take or cut the timber in the area that may be subsequently flooded for the Hydro project rather than having a complete waste of the resource?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think the government has indicated its program in dealing with the whole matter of South Indian Lake and would suggest that we leave that subject until that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster:

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the fact that the issue of South Indian Lake will be coming before the legislature, would the Minister arrange to see to it that transcripts of the hearing, where much information was given, are made available to the members of the House so that they can intelligently consider the question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there may be some difficulty in any wide distribution of these hearings, strictly from the point of view that they are very voluminous. The girls have been busy transcribing these from the tapes. It was my intention to make them available to the House. It may be restricted to several copies to each party in the House rather than -- I don't think that I could make a commitment that I would have sufficient copies available to all members.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad of the Minister's offer to have at least some available and certainly that would be helpful if he can't have them made available to everybody. But I would urge the Minister to find out quickly because I assume that the legislation will be coming before the House and the material will be needed.

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

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. As you are probably aware, Mr. Speaker, that in the constituency of Swan River, Roblin, Ethelbert Plains and Dauphin, we probably have the sweetest bears on the continent. However, at the same time we have bee keepers who have suffered great losses in the past few years as a result of damage done by bears. My question to the Minister is: what is the Minister or department prepared to do to reduce the number of bears in this area and if any compensation is in the program for these bee keepers to help alleviate the damage experienced by them?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rise on a point of order and perhaps implore the honourable member and some of the other honourable members on question period

(MR. LYON Cont'd.) . . . to refer to the rules which indicate . . . . The question period is for the purpose of getting information on questions of urgent matters, the word "urgent" is stressed Beauschene and all of the other areas. There will be opportunity to discuss the question that my honourable friend has raised, which I dare say is important in his area, but in the course of the estimates discussion. But I hardly think that, with respect, Sir, to your judgment, I hardly think it's a question suitable for the Orders of the Day, some several months after bees stop flying in Manitoba.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my honourable friend that the matter is of great urgency because of the fact that bee keepers have to go down south very shortly and obtain bees for the next season and they must know at this time just how many to get.

MR. PAULLEY: The Attorney-General wouldn't know.

MR. KAWCHUK: I know, he's not aware of the situation but this is the fact and some of the fellows are anxious to know the intentions of this government so they can plan their program accordingly for the ensuing season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wondered if he could tell me if all the monies advanced or loaned by the Manitoba government or any of its agencies or Crown corporations to the San Antonio Gold Mine has been recovered? I have a second question I might as well ask as well and he may be able to answer the two at the same time. And have all the monies that San Antonio Gold Mines owed to the Manitoba government or any of its corporations that they had owed for services, has it been returned?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this calls for an Order of Return. If the member would care to make one, I can answer it that way.

MR. MOLGAT: If the member was asking for the figures I can understand an Order for Return, but the question is simply, have the monies been repaid. Is this not a proper question. . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: I am at a loss to know as to how urgent the question is, and as a consequence I allowed it to stand. There will of course be another opportunity to discuss this matter as was pointed out a few moments ago by the Attorney-General. But at the same time I would remind the House that in listening to the question it is very, very difficult for me to determine as to how urgent it is at this particular time. The honourable member did not indicate any urgency, and if there isn't any urgency probably we could abide by the rules and that the matter be taken care of at the appropriate time when Mines and Resources are being dealt with. I'm open to a little guidance.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, just on a Point of Order if I may. I wouldn't like us to get off on a wrong tangent on the matter of questions. I don't think they have ever been abused in this House and I wouldn't like them to start to be abused, but nor do I think that the Attorney-General is quite correct when he says that urgency is one of the prime factors. I think that if a member feels that this is a matter on which he wants an answer now that he has the right to ask the question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I fear to rise lest I be admonished by my honourable friend the Attorney-General, but I would like to direct a question and make a request of the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: We still have the matter of the question by the Honourable Member for Hamiota. Did the Honourable the Minister reply to the effect that -- would you care to?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in my recollection of the question, it seemed to me that he was asking for figures of some kind, and this is why the suggestion was made that it may be more suitably replied to by an Order for Return. I would take the question as notice in any event, Mr. Speaker, to give him the reply to.

MR. DAWSON: . . . question is taken as notice. I did not ask for figures, simply yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their co-operation. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health, Welfare, Corrections and Social Services. In view of the widespread interest in medicare and the provisions, and because of a lack of any regulations having been printed and made available, I wonder if my honourable friend would consider having a

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd.)... telephone number advertised so that people seeking information may call to obtain answers to their questions. I'm sure my honourable friend realizes the anxieties of many of the citizens of Manitoba respecting their individual situations which are not answered in the pamphlet that has been issued by the Department, and I would suggest and request that the Department give consideration to setting up a special number, or a number, and advertising the same similar to what was done by the Minister of Finance when we went into that great venture that nearly rocked the boat in Manitoba, namely sales tax. That was done then. I make a similar request to the Minister at this time respecting medicare.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the corporation are looking at this. I'll try and give a report as soon as possible and I'll try and get as much information, though it should be coming in large gobs pretty soon.

MR. PAULLEY: Before April 1st?

MR. JOHNSON: Well ahead of April 1st.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce accepted a question on notice on March 3rd. Is he prepared to answer the question now?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker -- from the Honourable Member from Portage?

MR. JOHNSTON: The question pertained to the Macdonald Air Base and whether or not the government would consider selling back land to people whose land was originally expropriated for the base.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that was not the question.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Portage heard the reply.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'll read the question that was put to the Minister and he accepted. It was the Honourable Member for Lakeside speaking. "Well, I understand my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce to say that the question of whether -- I'll wait until the conference is finished, Mr. Speaker -- I take it it's concluded. I understood my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce to say in answer to the question of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the question of selling to the original owners of the land was a matter of government policy that he would have to consider." Without reading the full paragraph, I quote: "Mr. Spivak: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice."

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think it's necessary to read the whole paragraph because the question that was asked by the Honourable Member for Lakeside was: "Now I asked my honourable friend was he aware that the government has already announced a policy which would not only permit but approve such an arrangement?" Mr. Speaker, I took that question as notice. I have been endeavouring to determine whether there is such a government policy. To the best of my knowledge there is not. I have not completed all my investigations or enquiries. If the Honourable Member from Lakeside has any information that would enlighten me I would be prepared to listen to him, but at the present time all I can say is that from my investigation we do not have such a policy.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, could I give the information to my honourable friend at this time? If my honourable friend could have continued the consultation with the Honourable the Attorney-General the other day without interruption from me I'm sure he would have heard of it, because the Honourable the Attorney-General I'm sure was attempting to communicate to him the fact that in the principles that were laid before the committee that was dealing with the revised Expropriation Act that that principle of giving the former owners of land the first opportunity to buy was enshrined as one of the principles. Will my honourable friend accept that as good authority?

MR. LYON: That's why I asked my honourable friend if I may speak on this point, Mr. Speaker, the other day, if that was what he was referring to, and now he having assured me that this was the example he of course will be as well aware as I am that the analogy fails because this was a Federal Government expropriation and the Government of Manitoba merely took over this property at a later date and the analogy really does not exist. In any case, the original expropriation on that non-urgent matter was 29 years ago I recall.

MR. CAMPBELL: But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the legislation that we were dealing with before the committee is provincial legislation.

MR. LYON: . . . provincial expropriation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Provincial legislation and for provincial expropriation, and the honourable gentleman has certainly committed his government to that principle, that the owner, former owner, should get the first opportunity to buy. Now the Honourable . . .

MR. LYON: On provincial expropriation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Pardon?

MR. LYON: On provincial expropriation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well the principle is presented to us as one that should be incorporated in the new Act. Now if the government believes in that principle, then where it's in control of certain lands surely it will apply its own principle. However, I think that the education of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has been completed with regard to this particular subject, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable the Attorney-General and I can carry on the discussion at some other time.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, for the record, I was aware of the principles expressed by the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Two days before the by-elections the government increased provincial assistance to the Metro Transit System. I see no reference to it in the Throne Speech and I wonder if legislation is going to be brought down this session in respect to assistance to transportation. And my second part of the question is, will the same consideration be given to other transit systems in the province?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q.C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, legislation on that matter will come forward from the Minister of Municipal Affairs since it is one of the Acts under his jurisdiction, and the legislation will apply to all publicly owned transit systems in Manitoba.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for Hamiota. -- Does someone wish to speak on his behalf? With a view to having it stand? The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think the question . . .

MR. LYON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe that these matters can only be debated on Private Members' Days.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention that . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the intention of the Member for Hamiota to speak on this so I think it automatically will revert to Friday.

MR. LYON: Tomorrow.

MR. MOLGAT: Friday, wouldn't it?

MR. LYON: Friday - right, Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on this matter, therefore how do you wish it referred to Private Members' Day? Shall I move it and then let it stand or just refer it now?

MR. LYON: I can say to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, if it will be of any help to him, I would like him to move it because I intend to oppose it on a point of order because I don't think it's within our rules. So I would suggest he move it and perhaps we could deal with the question as to whether or not it's in order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

The number and dates of meetings of each Standing and Special Committee appointed during and since the First Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature to commencement of the Third Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature and the general and specific responsibilities assigned to each.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would just take a brief preliminary objection to this Order on the ground that I'm sure will be familiar to you, Your Honour, and to other members of the House. I'm referring to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, 1958, Paragraph 171 on Page 147,

(MR. LYON Cont'd.) . . . Annotations, Comments and Precedents relative to the putting of questions. "A question oral or written must not (ff) seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner as statutes, published reports, etc." The information which the honourable member is seeking is readily available in the journals of the House and he requires no Order for Return to get it. In fact a call at the Clerk's office would give him the information without an Order for Return, so I suggest that the question is out of order, Sir, on the basis of 171, (ff). Perhaps you would like to take that into consideration.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may, on a point of order. The committees that were appointed, as far as their general and specific responsibilities assigned, could be traced back through the journals, but I am not sure that the journals will reveal the number and the dates of meetings of each of the committees. Now it may be that on some occasion a report is filed which does give that information, but I don't believe that we must assume that that report contains all that information and therefore I think we have a right to request the information to come formally so that we do have confirmation of what may or may not appear in the journals.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I support my colleague from St. John's but at the same time it may be advisable in view of the fact that some of us haven't got Beauséjour in front of us at the present time, that if the matter is taken under advisement by you, Your Honour, and that you - and I'm not suggesting this as an order - that you may invite consultations by my colleague or myself or others in arriving at a decision for discussion purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen for their several opinions, and it is my intention to take this matter under advisement and I will report in due course.

Orders for Return. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

The report or reports of the review by the Government of its administrative and financial management practices designed to ensure maximum efficiency in Government services, with particular reference to procedures which could be changed to permit further efficiency in the present functions of the Comptroller-General and his reporting requirements, as referred to in the resolution passed by this House on the 25th day of May, 1968 dealing with the suggested proposal for the appointment of an independent Auditor-General.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this Order. It's subject to the usual rules of the confidentiality of information.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's,

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The names, positions in their departments, and salaries paid to all Civil Servants of the Inner Service, earning \$8,000.00 annually or over, and whose employment has been terminated and the dates of termination for the period May 1/66 to February 1/69.

(2) The same information for all members of the same grouping who have become employed in the same period.

(3) The names and terms of engagement of all consultative agencies retained by all departments of Government during the same period.

(4) The names, salaries, responsibilities and departments of all planning and research personnel on staff at February 1/69 correlated with the establishment provided for same.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this Order. I would like to discuss one point with my honourable friend, that is to say, the phrase "civil servants of the inner service", which I would take to mean employees engaged under the provisions of The Civil Service Act. He nods in agreement so he seems to have no objection to that interpretation. The second point I would make concerns his phrase "earnings \$8,000 annually or over". I would take that as the salary rate at the date of termination of the employment. And if my honourable friend seems to nod again, if those interpretations are correct, I am pleased to support the motion.

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

March 5, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on this one, so if you care to refer it to Private Members' Day. As I understand it, if I wish to speak on this I must leave it for Private Members' Day and you would refer it then. Is that not correct?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. CHERNIACK: We're a little rusty on this but I presume I don't move it until Friday.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, in referring these to Private Members' Day, what about it if it is more than two days, you stand it more than twice. Is it not out of order then?

MR. LYON: No.

MR. FROESE: Sure it is.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think you're well aware that the rule specifically provides that if there is to be debate that the debate must take place on Private Members' Day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the New Democratic Party, he has the next item.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

Copies of the last financial statement lodged with the Government of Manitoba covering their operations in Manitoba for the following firms:

- (1) Canada Cement Company
- (2) Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Company
- (3) International Nickel Company
- (4) Manitoba Paper Company
- (5) Churchill Forest Industries Ltd.
- (6) British American Construction Materials Ltd.
- (7) Winnipeg Supply & Fuel

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

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

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

- (1) The total cost of the Boundaries Commission;
- (2) Number of meetings held;
- (3) The time, date and places meetings held;
- (4) Names, positions and salaries of civil servants who assisted the Commission.

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

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

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

- (1) The total cost for the Special Committee on Dental Services, cost to include fee for writing of report;
- (2) Number of meetings held;
- (3) The time, date and places meetings held;
- (4) Names, positions and salaries of civil servants who assisted the Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection to accepting this order, with the same reservation that I made with respect to the earlier order of the Honourable Member for St. John's, namely 171 (ff) of Beausheerne would appear to apply to questions No. (2) and (3), but subject to those questions, the answers to which are already available, subject to that reservation, the other information required can be provided.

MR. PAULLEY: Why be pernickety? Why not put them in there?

MR. LYON: Because that's what the rules say.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, come now.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General where members of the House would find the answer to question No. (3) and question No. (2).

MR. LYON: They're part of the records of the House.

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



MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate - fourth day - the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake and the Proposed Motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto, and the Proposed Motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we are getting to a late hour in the afternoon to start off, but I know that I'll have my 40 minutes and probably not go far beyond that this afternoon.

First of all, let me congratulate you in occupying the Chair once more. I do hope we have a fruitful session and that I will not cause you any unnecessary trouble at this session.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder on the reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both of them are not in the Chamber at the present time but I think they brought forth some valuable points and also on particular matters pertaining to their constituencies.

Then I too want to congratulate the new Minister of Agriculture on his appointment. I'm sure that he will do a good job and give credit to the office that he holds.

Then too, as has been done on previous occasion at this session, we also give our best wishes to the Leader of the official Opposition in this Chamber now that it is official that this is going to be his last year in the position that he has, and while I can feel with him that things didn't go too well in the by-elections, I'm sure that he personally was not to blame for the outcome because I feel other matters beyond the provincial borders had their effect on the by-elections and on the outcome. We need only take a look at the Speech from the Throne, and I would like to refer to the matter in connection with the problem of the damp grain, and we find two lines in the Throne Speech in connection with this, and I read: "My ministers are gravely concerned about the severe problems created by the large quantity of damp grain on Manitoba farms. They're also disturbed by the serious effect upon farmers and all the people in Manitoba of the failure to sell grain produced in our province." This, Mr. Speaker, had a large bearing on the by-elections and their outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer back to what I said at the last session in connection with the matter of grain on farms and also in connection with the proposal that I brought forward to provide inland storage for grain on Manitoba farms, and that this was a matter that our provincial government could tackle and that they could provide leadership in this area by providing storage facilities at central points to which farmers could deliver their grain, and under the Canadian Wheat Board get paid for it. This need be very inexpensive storage, just a matter of a slab floor and some cover on top so that the grain would remain dry, and I'm sure this would be something that would have been appreciated very much by farmers in Manitoba. After all, there is still a large amount of dry grain from previous years in farmers' hands and in their storage which they would be very happy to deliver and to sell at the present time. This also would have provided an answer to many other problems that they are presently facing. The value of this grain that they would be able to sell would provide funds for them to carry on their business of operation. They would be able to pay the municipalities for taxes owing, they would be able to pay their operating costs and fuel and so on, their hired help, and many other bills that are owing by farmers. And this also applies to fertilizers, because I'm afraid if things do not improve that many Manitoba farmers will not be able to buy the necessary fertilizer for the coming year to bring forth maximum production in the coming year. I could not see the reasoning of the government advanced at that time by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I think it was just drawing some red herrings and trying to misrepresent what we were trying to bring about, and then the government naturally voted in opposition to it; they opposed it.

Now certainly we have a matter of record, even in biblical times, where things of this nature occurred, that crops were stored in fat years so that they could be used in lean years, and surely enough we have no security that farmers will be able to grow crops as plentiful as they have in the past in the years to come. We know this from the year 1961 when we had a drought and farmers were very anxious at that time in connection with the production of their crops, because if we do not have rains, and probably have some other pests, that we are not necessarily assured of crops in the future and that certainly this storage in our local province could do well for us in the future.

Then too, as I have pointed out on previous occasions, I think we need some grain on hand because of the long-term commitments that our Canadian Wheat Board is making through the International agreements with other countries. We found out this to be true in 1961 when the pile was getting lower and that they certainly were the ones that held back and would not sell the

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . total amount of grain produced and on hand in Canada, that they are then holding back, at the farmers' expense mind you, because he is the one that is carrying the load in not being able to sell or having to pay the carrying charges. Then, too, think of the benefits that would have been derived if farmers would have been able to receive cash for their outlay, for their work in producing the crop in the past years.

I already mentioned the dire need that some of the machine companies and creditors . . . farmers are in need of at the present time. Then, too, I think it would restore confidence in the farm industry in this province and also it would give him a feeling of contributing to something to the usefulness of society and to the food resources that are so badly needed in this world of ours. I for one do not believe in an over-production of food in a world where we have starvation of hunger, and this is what we still have at the present time. We should never restrict food production. If there is one thing to blame it is our distribution system, and I might refer to our Social Credit policies and objectives to one particular section under agriculture which reads this way: "(a) the recognition of agriculture as an essential primary industry and the implementation of such measures as are necessary to preserve the incentive for production adequate to provide for the full needs of the Canadian people, with sufficient surpluses to enable Canada to assist in banishing world hunger." This should be one of our prime concerns too, to help people in other countries so that they do not need to go hungry, and here I think our distribution system is very much to blame.

I have a personal friend presently working under a voluntary service program in India, and he writes of conditions out there where people are starving of hunger. He says that the people that he is associated with are doing road work with pick and shovels, and when the day is over, what do they get? Four pounds a week. This is the earnings that they make in a day, and I'm sure when we take a look according to our values here in Canada and in Manitoba per week, this would be the equivalent of probably 10 cents or a little more. This is what the people out there earn and they're only too happy to get some food. He writes of the many people in the larger centres that are just starving, and people are hungry, and I'm sure when we talk of our surpluses here that some of the red tape that is presently involved in getting some of our wheat across to some of these countries should be gotten rid of so that our wheat could flow more freely to these countries. Also, that our government provide the farmers with credit or with cash. In other words, arrange credit with these countries so that they could buy our wheat. We have had in past years large sales to the Communist countries such as China and Russia. These countries were able to get credit arrangements because they were not party to the Breton-Wood Agreement, whereas countries that were party to that agreement were not extended the same arrangements. I think here is an area that we should be working on and make improvements.

It is also sickening, in my opinion, to think that we have so many brains in this country, and qualified people, and that we cannot solve a simple problem as the kind that I have mentioned. Isn't it astounding that for all these years that we have had these surpluses and people hungry on the other side that arrangement cannot be made whereby we can send our surpluses across to other countries. I think it's a shame to the agricultural industry and to the community at large to let things go and drift as they are doing at the present time.

How long does our provincial government want to sit idly by and watch the bankrupting of our farm community? This could be rectified in my opinion in a very short time. I think the short-term method should be as I have been proposing, that we provide inland storage so that our farmers could be delivering their grain and get payment for it. Is the government really concerned of the farmers' failure to sell his grain as the Throne Speech mentions, or do you sometimes doubt it? Why would they not accept my proposal of inland storage so that farmers would be able to sell. It is a very simple solution in my opinion. Mind you, this wheat would still have to be sold, but that is the obligation and the prerogative of the Canadian Wheat Board, a Crown agency of the Federal Government. I am speaking of what this government could do and should be done. This proposal would require no policing and the cost would be very small in proportion to providing storage at the Lakehead and the facilities once paid for would belong to the province, to the people, and no extra charges and costly charges would not have to be paid for in the future. Why then are we sitting back? Is the government afraid of the grain companies and their reaction to this proposal? I for one will not have this proposal dismissed lightly at this particular session. I intend to go after it and see that something is done, because I see no other solution as far as this government and the people in this province as to how this can be rectified. This, in my opinion, is the only solution that we here in

(MR. FROESE cont'd) ... Manitoba can offer.

Then, too, when you take a look at the statistics of the amount of wheat in this province it is much smaller than the amount of wheat held by the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. We have roughly 100 million bushels of deliverable wheat, therefore, this proposal is much more easier done. The 100 million bushels is held by the producers in Manitoba on their farms and this does not include the amount that is presently in elevators or held by the Wheat Board at the Lakehead. And if you multiply one million bushels by \$1.50, which is presently the amount the farmers receive at the elevator, this would mean \$150 million for the farmers at this time. Would this not be a boon for the farmer?

Then, too, when we take a look at what is happening this particular year we find that the Lakehead receipts of wheat from August 1 '68 to date are down 30 percent over the previous year. This is a very considerable amount and this means that the farmers in Manitoba have that much less money to make reach. It is down from \$120 million to \$85 million. Then we take a look at oats; oats is even worse. It is down 55 percent; it is down from 25.9 million to 11.6 million bushels. Barley is also down 26 percent, from 34.3 million to 25.3 million bushels over the same period last year, that is from August 1 '68 to the present time. And when we look at the number of stations that are still on the unit basis we find that Manitoba is by far the worst off of the three prairie provinces. We still have 129 stations that are still on the unit basis, on the unit quota. We have 121 stations that are on the one bushel per acre quota and 56 stations on two bushels per acre quota. That accounts for the bulk of the total of 324 stations presently in Manitoba. So that we find that the farmer in Manitoba is by far the worst off who is strictly on grain, who is strictly on wheat and coarse grains. He's much worse off than the farmer in Alberta and Saskatchewan. And when you take a look at the overall situation we find that marketing is down by over 100 million bushels this year over the corresponding period of time. In my opinion this government used the grain situation in the by-elections to advantage and were quite successful, but I do hope that they not just take advantage of it at times like those but do something about it and bring in some measure whereby we can help the farmer in Manitoba. Certainly we should not be content to let things ride and drift. We should be making some effort to correct the situation and the proposal that I offer is the only one that I can see that could be implemented for the time being and would be of benefit, except for the federal government to take action. I think we should not always just look on other administrative bodies or other areas to do some work for us. I think we should also try and do our best wherever we can to help the situation.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the Throne Speech there are so very many things that I should probably be speaking on and dwelling on but I will have to limit my remarks to some of the major items as I see them in the Speech from the Throne. I note that assistance will be given to the schools that are operative under the unitary system and also that municipalities are to receive relief for this purpose. The papers quote that the amount of 65 percent is to be increased to 75 percent. I don't see this in the Throne Speech. I don't know where they got the information from. Is that factual or is it not?

But, the government is still set on and intend to carry on the program of discrimination against those divisions that have not subscribed to the unitary principles. How long is this to carry on? Are people who exercise a right of choice to be penalized in this way forever, because we know that these schools operating in the divisions that are non-unitary receive much less in grants and therefore the taxpayer has to pay and shoulder a larger burden. This applies to teachers' salaries, grants, to capital, transportation, supplies, etcetra. The people in the two municipalities that lie in the constituency that I represent have been penalized this way for all these years since the government brought in this measure. At the same time not only did they penalize them in this way but they also brought in an increased assessment at that particular time assessing the municipalities by almost double the amount. This made it that much worse because a general levy is applied on the assessment and the total amount derived from that goes to the government and actually reduces the grants that are earned by these schools in that area by that amount, so that the people in that area have lost a large measure of support in this way, not only through reduced grants but through the higher assessment that was imposed at that very time; and I have come to the conclusion that this particular reassessment was carried out purposely at that time so that these people would come and would have to subscribe to government policy in order to get the additional money. Not only did we have an increased assessment, we very soon found that someone in the Department of Municipal Affairs was

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . combining titles of certificates and lumping them and in this way farmers were denied their tax rebates that was justly theirs, should have been theirs. I am also happy that the Department of Municipal Affairs has done something to correct the matter but only for the year '68 - '69. The year '67 is still left the way it was. I feel that this was an injustice and that this should have never happened in the first place and that this should also be corrected. I do hope action will be taken to correct this matter before long.

Then we, too, found that very shortly after a sales tax was implemented which was first tabbed an education tax to which the people of the area have been contributing large amounts to the government coffers for which they have not received any benefit in the way of increased grants to schools. Yet it was brought in originally as an education tax; later on was changed to a revenue tax.

Then, too, when you take a look at the report on the Constitutional Conference in Ottawa which was held in November of 1968 and read what our First Minister was telling the people out there and how he implored that we should have regional grants, as there were regional disparities across Canada and that Manitoba was affected, you find that these things have a hollow ring when you find similar actions taking place here in Manitoba as I've just outlined. I'm sure that we would like to see help from the federal government but at the same time I feel that we should also be willing to correct the disparities at home.

I feel that the people in the non-unitary divisions are entitled to a just treatment and that this situation should be corrected without any further delay. After all, what improvement has the unitary system brought about? I feel that our education system is only as good as the teachers that you have in your schools and I still feel that our other schools in the non-unitary divisions are just as good and are providing just as good a service as those of the unitary, therefore should be entitled to the same grants. In my opinion the government is using a compelling force by withholding increased financial support for the education of our young people in these eight divisions that have not subscribed to the unitary system. Must these people come to the government on bended knees and subscribe to their program, an ideology, or else why not leave them the right to exercise their freedom of choice without having to become second class citizens. Then, too, does everyone have to subscribe to this monolithic system without any elbow room? I feel eventually this will be our downfall. It also reminds me what happened in Czechoslovakia where the people wanted a little more freedom but were crushed by an iron hand. What about our private schools? Are they to continue without any assistance indefinitely? If and when they do capitulate you will be asked to bear the full cost of their education. Why not give them a partial relief now? They provide an alternative to monopolistic system, and in my opinion they still instill values in our young people that are absent in many of our public schools today. I think it's high time to reassess our old school system and strike a sounder course for the future.

Coming to the matter of the Public School Finance Board which is supposed to receive increased powers to control spending, I have some very strong reservations in this matter. This is controlled from the top down. In my opinion they already have this power as was outlined in the White Paper when the plan was first brought in to this House, and I refer to the White Paper under Administration, the bottom paragraph reads thus, I quote: "In short, it will be the general responsibility of the Public School Finance Board to regulate and control financial matters related to the Foundation Program." So they have the powers to regulate and control budgets, because also under the first item they mentioned that budgets are to be reviewed by this particular board. In my opinion it was a foregone conclusion when the unitary system was brought in that this would happen, namely that controls would have to be brought in because you lost all incentive to economize by pooling the resources and then distributing them from this pool. Everyone is thus entitled to his share and they all make a maximum demand on it. After all, why should I pay for someone else's bills and be denied a similar service? It's inbred in the system and the government should have realized it. Incentive to economize is lost because there is no local reward for efficiency, initiative and economy. This is an inherent weakness in the system, and to place control on spending comes as no surprise to me because I think it's just a natural. It had to come about. My reservations are how will the controls be imposed and in what manner. Policies have to be broad because of their all-encompassing nature. Will one division be denied a service that another one is giving? What areas lend themselves to control? Will teachers' salaries be affected? Is consideration being given to one salary schedule for the province? I do not believe in regional collective bargaining

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . as was proposed by one body last summer. No doubt representation was made to the government in that connection. Will trustees be denied the wherewithals to finance our children with the proper education? I think these are questions that should be answered, that this body should know. The controls are now from the top down; no longer is the local community to decide how much they are prepared to spend on education on their children. I feel that this Public School Finance Board will be exercising very large powers and I think we should be more fully acquainted with how these controls are to be imposed and how they are to be brought about.

Then, too, will the controls be applied on a per capita basis and let the division board decide on what programs, extra curriculum or otherwise will be sponsored in the division? I think it would have merged as a certain element of choice would remain so that the local boards would still have some say. What is needed in the unitary system is a forum such as an annual meeting to provide for discussion and action that would be binding on the division by the electorate. I think savings or control of spending could be exercised much better in this way and with community accord. Some division boards are doing this presently however without any legal status or sanction. I would appeal to the government that opportunity be given to call the Public Schools Finance Board before a committee of the House to discuss this all important matter of controls. Likewise, the University Grants Commission should also be called to appear to find out how the \$36 million allocated by them is being spent; how are the grants supplied; in what manner; who is subsidized; and also the use of T. V. in universities; whether or not action should be taken against groups such as the S. O. S. operating within the university. I think this Legislature is held too much at arm's length from the administrative boards and there should be much fuller knowledge of their activities, as such, by members of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the honourable gentleman that he has five minutes.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure I won't be able to complete in five minutes, however I'll have to take another opportunity at a later date.

I find notice in the Throne Speech of the action that is supposed to be taken in connection with soil and water erosion. I welcome this action that is promised. After all, we're having heavy losses because of this erosion and loss of productivity as a result of soil and water erosion. Action is definitely needed, and I do hope that its a good program that will be put forth because once your topsoil is gone the land is almost worthless. We must preserve our topsoil because it is an irreplaceable asset. I also note that capital funds will be required for education, building construction, etc., and while you may come up with a balanced budget for operating expenditures, this does not mean a pay-as-you-go policy. There is a very definite distinction between pay-as-you-go and a balanced budget, because pay-as-you-go means an all-inclusive program of expenditures including capital. Therefore, telling the people in Manitoba we're going to have a balanced budget can be very misleading because large amounts of monies can be borrowed in addition to what is being spent for operational purposes and thus creating large debts.

We find this to be true of the federal government because I think they are an example in this case. Nowhere do we find such a constant creation of debts and not repaying them as what our federal government is doing. I have a leaflet here which gives information as to the deficits that have been incurred by the federal administration over the last ten years, and I would just like to briefly give some of those figures because they're really immense and they just show up how much interest has to be paid on debts outstanding. For instance in the year 1957-'58, the federal government had a deficit of \$38 million; in '59, \$609 million; in '60, \$413 million; '61, \$340 million; '62, \$791 million; '63, \$691 million; '64, \$619 million; always running up large deficits. In '64 and '65 and '66 they were much smaller though. In '65 we had \$38 million and in '66 a \$39 million deficit in the federal government. Then again it is increasing. For '67 it was \$421; '68, \$792 million; and '69, \$675 million. These add up to a total of \$5,469,000,000 over a period of ten years. These are the deficits that were incurred. This does not include the money that was borrowed but just deficits incurred through the operations of the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has of course exceeded his time by a few moments, but . . .

MR. PAULLEY: As far as we're concerned in this corner we'd be -- we have to close at 5:30 anyway and possibly the honourable gentleman from Rhineland could utilize that period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: As I pointed out, the deficits of the federal government - and in addition to that we have also large public borrowings added to the gross public deficit of the federal government. In '58 we had a federal debt of \$18,418,000,000. This increased by 1968 to \$32,926,000,000, so that you can see how the cost of government and the expenditures that are made, both operative and capital, how they can add up, and this means that large amounts have to be spent for interest on the public debt. In fact the interest and other public debt charges, I think, amount to \$11,674,000,000, so that when you take a look at the overall budget of the federal government we find that better than 10 percent of their budget is applied to cover the interest on the national debt, and the situation is getting worse year by year and is not being improved.

When I referred to pay-as-you-go policy I mentioned that there is a vast difference from that of just having balanced budgets, and I would refer briefly to an article in the Canada Month October issue where we have an article headed: "The Choice of One Canadian. Stockwell Day has taken a positive step to contribute to a movement he feels will stop excessive socialism." The article goes on this way and I will quote two paragraphs. "Stockwell Day is not a refugee from the rat race. Many people will think he's an oddball and disapprove of the course he is following, but believing that the only chance to save Canada from the hopeless state of becoming a complete bankrupt socialist country would have to be leadership from the west, and wanting to become part of that movement, Stockwell Day decided to leave Montreal and his position of Vice-President of store operations with Zeller's Limited to fight what he considers the left-wing philosophies of the federal government in its refusal to accept a responsible attitude. A businessman sensitive to the government put pressure on his freedom. Mr. Day has moved out of Quebec to Victoria to a province he feels is more hospitable to freedom concerned people." Maybe I should read another paragraph. "Day finds it somewhat difficult to explain how he made up his mind. Perhaps it was the parade of the Finance Ministers who kept saying that everything would be fine if I just worked harder. Well, I worked harder so income taxes, sales taxes, taxes on liquor and tobacco all went up. Prices on everything of course went up too, so did interest on purchases, bank loans and mortgages, and up went the national, provincial and municipal debts."

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon. Order please.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would I have an opportunity to complete the balance of my speech on the next . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I called time at the 40 minute hour, which is the time allotted to honourable members, and the House through its wisdom allowed you to continue for the other five minutes to 5:30. I simply got up to call it 5:30. However, we have a motion from the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and the House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30. It's been quite a day.